DOMINION OF CANADA

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF

DEBATES

HOUSE OF COMMONS

FIRST SESSION—TWENTIETH PARLIAMENT

9-10 GEORGE VI, 1945

VOLUME I, 1945

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE SIXTH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 1945,
TO THE SEVENTEENTH DAY OF OCTOBER, 1945, INCLUSIVE

BEING

VOLUME CCXLVI FOR THE PERIOD 1875-1945

INDEX ISSUED IN A SEPARATE VOLUME

OTTAWA
EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., B.A., L.Ph.,
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
1946

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

FIRST SESSION—TWENTIETH PARLIAMENT

The nineteenth parliament having been prorogued and dissolved by proclamation on Monday, April 16, 1945, and writs having been issued and returned, a new parliament was summoned to meet for the dispatch of business on Thursday, September 6, 1945, and did accordingly meet on that day.

Speaker: The Honourable GASPARD FAUTEUX

Thursday, September 6, 1945.

This being the day on which parliament is convoked by proclamation of His Excellency the Governor General for the dispatch of business, and the members of the house being assembled:

Arthur Beauchesne, Esquire, C.M.G., M.A., K.C., F.R.S.C., the Clerk of the House, read to the house a letter from the Assistant Secretary to the Governor General informing him that the Honourable Mr. Justice Thibaudeau Rinfret, in his capacity as Deputy Governor General, would proceed to the Senate chamber on Thursday, the 6th of September, at 11 a.m., to open the session.

A message was delivered by Charles H. Larose, Esquire, Acting Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:—

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

His Honour, the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General, desires the immediate attendance of this honourable house in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly the house went up to the Senate chamber, when the Speaker of the Senate said:

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:
Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I have it in command to let you know that His Excellency the Governor General does not see fit to declare the causes of his summoning the present parliament of Canada until the Speaker of the House of Commons shall have been chosen according to law; but this afternoon, at the hour of three o'clock in the afternoon, His Excellency will declare the causes of calling this parliament.

And the members being returned to the Commons chamber:

ELECTION OF SPEAKER

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Beauchesne, the first duty of the Commons at the beginning of a new parliament is to ascertain the reasons why His Excellency the Governor General, the king's representative, has summoned its members to meet with him in parliament. As hon. members have just been made aware, His Excellency is not prepared to impart those reasons until the Commons have elected a Speaker. As a matter of fact the house itself will not be duly constituted until a Speaker has been elected; therefore our first duty this morning is to choose a Speaker.

In matters of parliamentary procedure our parliament largely follows the procedure at Westminster; there are certain differences, however, that, in the past, have been observed in reference to the selection of a Speaker. The first difference is that at Westminster the Speaker of one parliament, if he proves to be acceptable, is frequently reelected from parliament to parliament. I recall quite well the occasion when Mr. Speaker Lowther of the House of Commons in London visited Canada some years ago and presented to this House the Speaker's chair which is in place here. It is a replica of the one at Westminster. Mr. Speaker Lowther informed our members that for sixteen years he had occupied that seat while the Commons was in session, and that, during that period of time, he had never left the precincts of parliament while either the Commons or the Lords were in session. Since Mr. Speaker Lowther's day three or four other speakers have been appointed. The latest selection was made a few days ago when Mr. Speaker Brown, who had been the Speaker in the last parliament in the United Kingdom, was again chosen Speaker. At that time this action was commented upon as being in accord with the best tradition of recognizing that where a Speaker has shown himself to be impartial, a change of government should not necessarily mean that there would be a change in the position of Speaker. The fact that Mr.

Brown had served under a Coalition government which was largely Conservative, and was now under a Labour administration, selected as Speaker was commented on very favourably on all sides.

For reasons of our own, however, we have for the most part found it desirable to have a Speaker chosen at the beginning of one parliament, and a new Speaker chosen at the beginning of the following parliament. That has not always been the case; there have been three exceptions. Mr. Speaker Cockburn, Mr. Speaker Rhodes, and Mr. Speaker Lemieux were, as I recall, elected for more than one parliament. However, they are the exceptions rather than the rule. We have thought that, at this time, we should follow the general practice of choosing a new Speaker at the beginning of a new parliament.

The reason why this difference prevails between the custom in our country and that in the United Kingdom, is that it is felt desirable in this as in many other respects to give recognition to the two races that laid the foundations of our country. That recognition is given, after a Speaker whose mother tongue is English has occupied the chair, by choosing at the next parliament a Speaker whose mother tongue is French. If the Commons is agreeable we propose to have that practice carried out at this time. The Commons itself is, of course, complete master of the situation.

May I point out a further difference in procedure. In the United Kingdom the Speaker is usually nominated by a private member and the nomination is seconded by a private member. That is done in order to make it perfectly clear that so far as the government is concerned, or any other authority, there is no authority greater than that of the members of the Commons themselves; and that, among the members, there is equality in the matter of their rights and privileges. In Canada it has been the custom to have the Speaker nominated by a member of the government, and, I believe, in each case the nomination has been by the Prime Minister.

I should like to make it clear that the Commons is not obliged in any way to accept the nomination of the Prime Minister. Any member is free to nominate and to support the candidature as Speaker of any other hon. member. I am hopeful, however, that the name I intend to propose to the house is one which will prove to be generally acceptable, and that the Speaker who is to occupy the chair throughout this parliament will be elected unanimously.

I have noticed from the press that there appears to be doubt in some quarters as to the correct procedure in the selection of the Speaker both in the Commons and in the Senate. I have made it abundantly clear, that so far as the Commons is concerned the government is not in any way seeking to impose a Speaker on the house. We are simply carrying out the custom that has prevailed in the past.

In regard to the Senate, I give the following to the members of the house for purposes of information. From section 34 of the British North America Act it will be seen that the Speaker is appointed by the government. He is not chosen in the same manner as in the Commons. Section 34 reads:

> The Governor General may from time to time, by instrument under the great seal of Canada, appoint a senator to be Speaker of the Senate, and may remove him and appoint another in his stead.

The section of the British North America Act which governs the selection of a Speaker in the Commons is section 44. It reads as follows:

> The House of Commons, on its first assembling after a general election, shall proceed with all practicable speed to elect one of its members to be Speaker.

That then is the position in which we are at the moment, namely, we are about to elect a Speaker with all practicable speed.

Perhaps I may be permitted, before placing before the house the name of the hon. member I intend to nominate, to say just a word about the position of Speaker and the qualities expected in the occupant of that position.

The position of Speaker is the highest office in the gift of the Commons, it is also the most honourable. The Speaker is the first commoner, he is also the presiding officer of this house and is the custodian of its honour, its rights, its privileges and its prerogatives. The Speaker must possess qualities of good judgment and a judicial temperament, also many other qualities that I would not say are too rare, but, found in combination, are often rare enough. He should in his occupancy of the chair be wholly impartial in his manner and in his preferences as between members of the house. Impartiality between the two sides of the house and towards all members in the house is a first requisite in the fulfilment of the office of Speaker. Hon. members who have been in previous parliaments will agree that a great deal of patience is required, a certain sense of humour, together with as much as possible of a conciliatory attitude. I noticed in reading some remarks made recently in the British

house, it was said the Speaker must be possessed of a capacity to sit still for a long time. A Speaker, of course, should be a person of quick perceptions, firm, tactful and wholly familiar with the rules of the house and with the procedure of parliament.

As I have said, this is a remarkable combination to find in any one person, but I do believe the hon. member of this house whom I am about to nominate does possess all these qualities to an exceptional degree. The hon. gentleman whose name I wish to place in nomination is Mr. Gaspard Fauteux, the member for St. Mary, Montreal. Doctor Fauteux, I believe, has the character and ability which eminently fit him for this high position. He is a young man, which is all to the good, though he is not too young to be a veteran of the first world war, during which he served in the ranks, nor is he too young to have had considerable parliamentary experience. For some time he was a member of the Quebec legislature and, as hon. members are aware, he has been a member also of this parliament for some time past. Doctor Fauteux comes of a family that has contributed much to our public life. He is a grandson of Hon. Honore Mercier, a former very distinguished Premier of Quebec, and is a nephew of another premier. I refer to the Hon. Sir Lomer Gouin, who not only was also a distinguished Premier of Quebec but for some time Minister of Justice of Canada.

Those who know Doctor Fauteux will say that they recognize, in his abilities and public service an inherited strain that is all to the good both for him and for our country. And I may say that Docteur Fauteux possesses a good deal in the way of political prowess in his own right, as is evident from what we have seen on his part in political campaigns. However, now that he is being nominated for the Chair, if he is elected to that office, he will be expected to leave behind him the controversies of party and to be wholly impartial.

In nominating Doctor Fauteux, I have much in mind that he recognizes that the great problems of to-day relate themselves not merely to our own country, but to the countries of the world in general. During this period of transition from the terrors of a world war that has been unequalled in its frightfulness, unequalled in history, it is fortunate that we may have in this office of Speaker one who, for years past, has given very special study to international questions, has spoken upon many occasions in this and in other countries of the world situation, and has done much to educate others on the importance of a wide outlook in international affairs.

I may repeat that Doctor Fauteux has, I believe, the qualities of quick perception, keen discernment, patience and impartiality; and if elected by the hon. members of this house, he will, I believe, fill the high office of Speaker with dignity, with honour and distinction to himself and to parliament and with credit to the traditions established by his predecessors.

May I be permitted to add a single word. The ability of a Speaker to preside over the house in a manner which will commend itself generally is dependent even more upon the attitude of hon. members themselves than upon the one who may occupy the Chair. This is certain to be a difficult parliament. The questions which will have to be considered here will be much more difficult of solution than those which have had to be faced by any previous parliament. For this reason, if for no other we should recognize that the Speaker may have upon occasions an exceptionally difficult time. In some parliaments there has been I think a tendency to question far too often, the decisions of the Speaker. I am not in any way trying to lecture the house; I am seeking to emphasize what has been stressed very strongly at Westminster, namely, that the more the Speaker can be supported by the house, the better it will prove in the long run for the dispatch of business and also for the reputation of parliament itself in all parts of the world. I hope hon. members will not think I am unduly anticipating possibilities of that kind. I would only say that the more hon. members strengthen the hands of the Speaker, in his decisions, and in his maintenance of order and decorum in the house, the more rapidly and effectively will it be possible to proceed with the dispatch of the business of the house.

Mr. Beauchesne, I would move, seconded by Mr. St. Laurent:

That Gaspard Fauteux, Esquire, member for the electoral district of St. Mary, do take the chair of this house as Speaker.

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): Doctor Beauchesne, speaking for the members in this section of the house I am very glad to have the opportunity of supporting the motion made by the Prime Minister. The right hon. gentleman has outlined something of the circumstances leading up to the present situation and has given us something of the historical background of the choice of Speaker. With his motion I am in agreement. With his practice I am not fully in accord.

My remarks to-day will not be at all contentious and will be very brief. The position of Speaker in the House of Commons carries

with it the highest honour in the gift of this assembly. For that high task the hon. member for St. Mary has been proposed. In expectation of his election I want, on behalf of my associates and myself, to extend our sincere congratulations and best wishes for his successful tenure of office.

In the choice of a presiding officer for the House of Commons there are three essentials we ought never to forget. One is that he is elected by us; another is that he is our officer, and the last is that in no degree is he an officer of the government. In democratic parliaments these facts ought never to be overlooked.

As the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) pointed out, in Westminster special care is taken to protect the independence of that position. As he has explained, private members make the motion appointing him and, we have found that speakers, once appointed have continued from one parliament to the next, even though in the meantime there may have been a change of government. The action of the Labour government in Great Britain within the last few days when they continued in office the Speaker of the previous administration is evidence of that fact.

I draw attention to these facts at this time, not in a spirit of censure of the procedure we are witnessing here to-day. Rather I do so for the purpose of pointing out that the government's action a few days ago—like some similar actions in the past—in designating in advance of the meeting of parliament who would be Speaker of the House of Commons, was not in accordance with the best parliamentary tradition. It was, in fact, and I say this in all deference to the Prime Minister and to such of his predecessors as followed the same procedure, an affront to that tradition; and, to that extent, was an invasion of the rights of the house.

I mention this matter to-day only because if it becomes a regular practice that the Speaker be chosen by the government, without, as in the present instance, any consultation whatsoever with the members of the house, it will tend to prejudice the independence of the office, and to that extent hamper its occupant in the sometimes delicate task of satisfying members of all parties that he is, in fact, completely impartial.

I need scarcely add that this protest is not in any sense directed against the hon. member who has been proposed as Speaker, and in no way detracts from the commendation and good wishes which I express to him personally.

It is one of the happy traditions of the House of Commons that a Speaker of one parliament who is of English descent shall be followed by a Speaker of French descent, and vice versa. The government's choice is in accordance with that worthy tradition. Furthermore, on grounds of personal merit, I feel it to be a wise one. I believe it will be generally accepted as fortunate that the government's choice has fallen upon the hon. member for St. Mary.

During his period of public service in the house and in the legislature of his native province, the hon. member has demonstrated that he possesses ability and tolerance of a high order. If it be true, as the Prime Minister has said, that the hon. member has in the past been a strong partisan and a doughty fighter for his party, that need not be held to his discredit in his new role.

We on this side of the house are hopeful that, in the tradition of his many distinguished predecessors, the hon. member will be able, as they did, to cast off the mantle of partisanship in the administration of the onerous duties of his new task. We are confident that he will consider himself the guardian of the rights of members wherever they may sit in the house; and we trust that he will be equally zealous in protecting the rights of those who sit in opposition as well as those who sit on the government side.

To the degree that he succeeds in doing this, his administration will be a success and he will be assured from all sides of the house of the respect and deference due his high position.

In assuming the speakership the hon. member for St. Mary will follow a long line of predecessors, whether of Anglo-Saxon or of French descent, who brought distinction to that position. It is our hope and expectation that his record will be no less distinguished than theirs.

For myself and associates I say to the hon. member so soon to be chosen Speaker that he will have our full cooperation in making his term of office a credit both to himself and to the twentieth parliament now about to open.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Doctor Beauchesne, on behalf of one of the numerically smaller parties in the house, I wish to support the nomination of the hon. member for St. Mary (Mr. Fauteux) as Speaker.

Doctor Fauteux came to this house some three years ago in a by-election, and since that time those of us who had come to know him paid respect to him for his views, and for that sense of humour which has been

mentioned by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). I am rising to support the nomination of Doctor Fauteux because I believe he will bring honour to himself and, I hope, add to the dignity of this chamber in the years to come. I support him, not because he chose his ancestors carefully, but rather because I think he is eminently suitable for the office.

The high office to which he has now been nominated is one which concerns the whole membership of the house. Perhaps I have a rather strong sense of history, because I once taught it for a number of years. When we went to the senate chamber this morning my mind recalled that occasion when a Speaker of the English House of Commons, during the reign of Charles I, when the King violated the Commons chamber, informed him when he came to wreck his vengeance upon a small minority in that house that he had no knowledge of their whereabouts, and that he could not tell the King other than he was told by the House of Commons to tell.

It seems to me that the Speaker of the House is the guardian of the privileges of the house, and of those of individual members. I would hope that in this parliament, one which is quite different in its make-up from parliaments we have had since I have been here in the last ten years, Mr. Speaker will always remember that the fortunes of the government must not take precedence over the rights of individual members, or other parties in the house. I am sure that the nominee for this very high office, one who is to be the first Commoner of Canada, will remember this during his tenure of office; so that when the time comes for him to lay down his cares of office we may regard him with the same esteem and respect as we did the Speaker of the house who retired from that position at the end of the last parliament.

Mr. SOLON E. LOW (Peace River): Doctor Beauchesne, speaking for the minority group in this section of the house, I wish to associate myself with other hon. members who have spoken in supporting the nomination of the hon. member for St. Mary (Mr. Fauteux) to this high and important office.

I have not had the pleasure of knowing Doctor Fauteux prior to this morning and therefore I am not able to speak with any authority or any knowledge about his background or his ancestry, but having had ten years' experience in the provincial legislature I have had impressed upon me the importance of his office and have gained some knowledge of the onerous duties which devolve upon him.

I sympathize with him in the duties that he will have to perform, and I hope that sympathy will be carried into action by myself and all who are with me in this organization to give him full support in seeing to it that the best traditions of this house are observed. I trust, Doctor Beauchesne, that the new Speaker—I am anticipating his election—will also keep in mind the best traditions of true democracy and watch over and observe and preserve the rights of the minorities in this chamber as well as those of the majority.

I wish to assure the Speaker-elect that we will at all times give him every support in the carrying out of the heavy duties that will devolve upon him and I assure him, and the other members of this house, that we will always stand ready to observe the rules and to do that which will assist in the carrying out of the business of this house with dispatch. I take great pleasure in supporting the nomination of the hon. member for St. Mary.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I had not anticipated that it would be either necessary or desirable to say any word in reply to the remarks that might be made by the different speakers at this time, but my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) has taken me to task for having intimated to the public in advance of this morning's sitting the name of the person it was intended to nominate as Speaker of the house. My hon. friend has said that that was not the correct practice to follow and he has taken exception to it. May I say to my hon. friend that if he will look through the records of this parliament from the days of confederation up to the present time he will find that the practice I have adopted has been the one that has been followed by all previous prime ministers. Far from limiting or restricting in any way the privileges of the members of the house in making their own choice, the action taken, which has permitted them to know in advance the name of the individual whose name is likely to be placed in nomination, gives to all hon. members an opportunity which otherwise they would not have until the last moment, namely, to decide in their own minds some time in advance whether the choice of the government is one they wish to approve or oppose. Hon. members would have resented it very strongly if I had changed that practice and had given to them and to others no intimation in advance as to the one whom the government had in mind to nominate for the position of Speaker. I wish to make it clear that, far from being censured for departing

from the practice, I should be commended by my hon. friend for following established and most desirable precedent.

There is one other point to which my hon. friend has drawn attention, namely, the desirability of not permitting the selection of a Speaker to alternate between one whose mother tongue is English and one whose mother tongue is French. May I say to him that the longer he remains a member of this house and the more he desires to command its confidence, the more ready he will be to see that so far as the English speaking and French speaking members are concerned—

Mr. BRACKEN: I want to correct that.

M. MACKENZIE KING: May I say to my hon. friend that, if I misunderstood him, I am prepared to withdraw.

Mr. BRACKEN: I commended that practice.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Did my hon. friend not say that the practice he would like to see followed was to have one Speaker continue?

Mr. BRACKEN: No.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I understood that such was his first comment.

Mr. BRACKEN: I commended the practice of the house in alternating between an English speaking Speaker and a Speaker using the other language.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I must say that I thought my hon. friend's first comment was that the British practice of having one Speaker from parliament to parliament was the practice which should be followed.

Mr. BRACKEN: No.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If I misunderstood my hon. friend, I of course am only too ready and too happy to apologize to him. I do wish to make it abundantly clear that every hon. member in this house has the same privilege as has any member of the government in the making of nominations.

The Clerk of the House declared the motion carried in the affirmative, *nemine contradicente,* and Hon. Gaspard Fauteux, member for the electoral district of St. Mary, duly elected to the chair of the house.

Hon. Mr. Fauteux was conducted from his seat in the house to the Speaker's chair by Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King and Hon. L. S. St. Laurent.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. SPEAKER-ELECT said: Madam and gentlemen of the House of Commons, I must thank you from the bottom of my heart for the testimonial of good will that you have just conferred upon me so generously.

Being conscious of my unfitness for this high office, I find great comfort in your sympathy and generosity. I hope that with your co-operation as well as your enlightened advice and counsel I shall prove myself deserving of your trust in presiding over the proceedings of the House of Commons with justice and in upholding British parliamentary traditions.

Again, madam and fellow members of the House of Commons, thanks from the bottom of my heart.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the sitting be suspended until three o'clock this afternoon.

At 12 noon the sitting was suspended until 3 p.m. this day.

SITTING RESUMED

The house resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. SPEAKER read a communication from the assistant secretary to the Governor General, announcing that His Excellency the Governor General would proceed to the Senate chamber at three p.m. on this day, for the purpose of formally opening the session of the dominion parliament.

A message was delivered by Charles H. Larose, Esquire, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable house in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly the house went up to the Senate chamber.

Then the Hon. Gaspard Fauteux, Speaker-elect, said:

May it please Your Excellency,

The House of Commons have elected me as their Speaker, though I am but little able to fulfil the important duties thus assigned to me. If in the performance of those duties I should at any time fall into error, I pray that the fault may be imputed to me, and not to the Commons whose servant I am.

The Honourable the Speaker of the Senate, addressing the Honourable the Speaker of the House, then said:

Mr. Speaker, I am commanded by His Excellency the Governor General to assure you that your words and actions will constantly receive from him the most favourable construction.

Then His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to open parliament by a speech from the throne.

And the house being returned to the Commons chamber:

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to state that the house having attended on His Excellency the Governor General in the Senate chamber, I informed His Excellency that the choice of Speaker had fallen upon me, and, in your names, and on your behalf, I made the usual claim for your privileges, which His Excellency was pleased to confirm to you.

OATHS OF OFFICE

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved for leave to introduce bill No. 1, respecting the administration of oaths of office.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the house that when the house did attend His Excellency the Governor General this day in the Senate chamber, His Excellency was pleased to make a speech to both houses of parliament. To prevent mistakes, I have obtained a copy, which is as follows:

Honourable Members of the Senate:
Members of the House of Commons:

You will rejoice with me that the opening of the Twentieth Parliament of Canada comes at the moment of the victorious conclusion of the war.

It is just six years ago that Parliament met in special session in anticipation of a declaration of war. Since that time, war has been waged continuously, first against Germany, later also against Italy and Japan. From the very beginning, the resources of Canada and the utmost efforts of our people were committed to the fight for freedom and to the winning of victory.

One by one, the aggressor nations and their satellite states have suffered total defeat by the armed forces of the United Nations. All have been compelled to surrender unconditionally. The terms of surrender were signed by Italy on September 8, 1943; by Germany, on May 8 of the present year; and by Japan, on the eve of the present week. The month of August witnessed the devastating use of the atomic bomb against Japanese cities, and the entry of the U.S.S.R. into war against Japan. Thus the world-encircling conflict, the most terrible of wars in human history, was brought to its close. Not only has victory been complete, it has been won over strongly organized and sinister forces working in combination in an attempt at world conquest and domination.

As you assemble at the opening of a new Parliament, I join with you in giving humble and grateful thanks to Divine Providence for the deliverance which His mercy has vouchsafed to the peoples of our own and other lands. We of this day and generation have been the witnesses of a mighty manifestation of the workings of the moral law which inexorably connects wrongdoing with retribution. It is as applicable to nations as to men.

In this titanic conflict between the forces of good and evil, it has been ours to behold the triumph of right and justice. In this victory, we find the assurance of the ultimate triumph of righteousness as we seek to bring into being a new order founded upon world security and social justice.

The victory over nazi and fascist tyranny in Europe and over Japanese militarism in Asia has been bought at a great price. As the appalling extent of the power of the forces of aggression and tyranny was revealed, the free peoples of the world slowly began to realize what they owe to the allied nations who first opposed the aggressors. To their heroic resistance and to the armed might of all the united nations, humanity owes not only its freedom, but everything which free men value and cherish most.

Our thoughts at this time are especially of the members of Canada's forces who have given their lives that victory might be ours and not our enemies'. The whole nation reverently bows its head in tribute to their sacrifice. At this hour our hearts share in special measure the hopes and expectations of those who yearn for the return of their loved ones, now liberated after three and a half years in Japanese prison camps. The deep sympathy of Canada is with all who have been bereaved, and with those who have suffered impairment of body or mind, imprisonment, privation or want.

It will be for history to record the magnitude of Canada's contribution in this global conflict. We rejoice that our armed forces have achieved so much in helping to defend and liberate nations to whose past and present our own is so closely akin. Our country will ever remember with pride the heroic exploits of Canada's fighting men and merchant seamen.

We pay tribute as well to the men and women without whose loyal and steady work on the farms, in forests, mines and fisheries, in factories, workshops and offices, in hospitals and homes, and in transport and other services, victory could not have been achieved. Canada's great contribution to victory has been made possible by the unbroken partnership of her warriors and her workers.

To all who have contributed by service and sacrifice to victory, I would, in the name of parliament, express our country's gratitude.

So far as the future could be foreseen, my ministers had taken steps to see that Canada was prepared to meet the very difficult situations which would arise when victory had been won. Under the authority of Parliament, relief was provided to assist in feeding, clothing and housing destitute populations, and in rehabilitating areas devastated by enemy action in

Europe. Additional measures to assist in meeting these and other imperative needs will be submitted for your consideration.

Preparations for the demobilization, rehabilitation and reestablishment in civil life of the men and women in the armed forces were well under way when Germany surrendered. The same is true of measures for the reconversion of the economic life of our country from a war-time to a peace-time basis, and for the maintenance of a high level of employment and national income. The plans thus developed to meet the requirements of the period of transition are now being put into full operation.

In the building of a new world order, my ministers are determined to seek above all else the promotion of peace, work and health in domestic and international relations. To further these great objectives, the government has received a definite mandate from the people of Canada.

The charter of the united nations which was signed by the representatives of the fifty nations who took part in the conference at San Francisco will be submitted for your approval. The charter expresses their determination to maintain peace in accordance with justice and respect for human rights, and to promote the welfare of all peoples by international cooperation.

To the promotion of national well-being, cooperation and goodwill between the dominion and provincial governments are as essential as these attitudes, between nations, are to the maintenance of world peace and international prosperity. You will be pleased to know that at the dominion-provincial conference held at Ottawa during August, a successful beginning was made in the consideration of proposals designed to contribute to the maintenance of a high level of employment and national income, and to the establishment of nation-wide social security. It is the earnest hope of my ministers that, when the conference resumes its deliberations, agreement may be speedily reached which will place the dominion and all the provinces in a financial position to discharge effectively their several responsibilities. Such agreements would make possible a reorganization of the dominion tax structure on a simpler, more equitable basis, conducive to the expansion of enterprise and employment.

Every effort is being put forth to ensure the return to Canada as rapidly as military commitments and transportation facilities will permit, of our armed forces serving abroad, and to accelerate the orderly release of men and women from the forces.

Through the joint efforts of the government, industry and labour, the conversion of war industries to civilian production is taking place with a minimum of delay and inconvenience.

It is the intention of the government to abolish war restrictions in progressive steps as rapidly as that can be accomplished without occasioning inflation or other economic disturbances. Such controls as are essential to the welfare of our people will be continued for as long as they are necessary.

You will be asked to approve a measure to extend certain specified emergency powers to meet emergency conditions in the period of reconstruction.

The maintenance of long-term markets for our primary industries is receiving close attention. The continuing need for foodstuffs both at home and abroad will ensure, for some time to come, a heavy demand for the products of our farms and fisheries.

The government is continuing its efforts to stimulate the restoration and expansion of external trade. Measures to this end will be submitted for your approval.

In furtherance of stable international exchanges and adequate provision for international credit, you will be asked to approve a measure to provide for Canadian participation in the international monetary fund and the bank for reconstruction and development.

The provision of houses is being pressed forward as rapidly as the supply of materials and labour will permit. Plans already in operation provide for the expansion of home construction to keep pace with increases in the output of building supplies. Priority is being given to houses for war veterans and their dependents.

Plans for the establishment of a national minimum of social security and human welfare are being advanced as rapidly as possible. Unemployment insurance, floors under farm and fish prices, and family allowances are now in force. The government's proposals for the promotion of health and welfare made to the dominion-provincial conference include plans for a nation-wide system of health insurance and preventive medicine, and for old age pensions on a more generous basis.

Other measures demanding your consideration will include a consolidation, as a veterans' charter, of the various orders in council relating to the care, rehabilitation and reestablishment of war veterans; a bill to repeal the act establishing the Department of National War Services; a bill to merge the Department of Munitions and Supply and the Department of Reconstruction into a single Department of Reconstruction and Supply. The army and the navy have already been placed under the jurisdiction of one Minister of National Defence. A further consolidation of all defence services under one minister of the crown will be made in due course.

Members of the House of Commons:

You will be asked to make financial provision for all essential services, also to meet expenditures arising out of the war, and for the purposes of reconstruction. My ministers' proposals with respect to taxation measures will be disclosed in the budget.

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

My ministers believe that the position attained by our country among the nations of the world, makes it desirable that Canada, like the other nations of the British commonwealth, should possess a distinctive national flag. You will be asked to appoint a select committee of members of both houses of parliament to consider a suitable design for a Canadian flag.

The government has directed that, pending approval by parliament of a particular design, the Canadian red ensign which was the flag carried into battle by the Canadian army, and which was flown from the peace tower on V-E day and V-J day as a tribute to the valour of our armed forces and to Canada's achievements in war, may be displayed wherever place or occasion makes it desirable to fly a distinctive Canadian flag.

The government also considers that it is advisable to revise and clarify the definition of Canadian citizenship, and to bring the legislation respecting national status, naturalization and immigration into conformity with the definition of citizenship. You will be asked to approve the required measures.

The government has also been giving consideration to the most suitable manner in which to commemorate, in the capital of Canada, the service and sacrifice of Canadians in the war just ended. In the past, the sacrifice of human life in war has most frequently been commemorated in monuments of bronze and stone. Such a memorial our capital already has. My ministers are of the opinion that something more expressive of the vision of a new world order would, at this time, be most appropriate. They believe that this vision would best find expression in the planned development and beautification of the national capital and its surrounding area as a national memorial. Steps have already been taken to plan the development of the city and region of Ottawa on both sides of the Ottawa river. As plans are formulated, specific proposals will, from time to time, be submitted to parliament for consideration.

On the recommendation of the government of Canada, His Majesty the King has been pleased to select Field Marshal the Honourable Sir Harold Alexander as my successor as his representative in Canada. Field Marshal Alexander's duties will not permit of his assumption of office until early in the new year. Meanwhile Her Royal Highness Princess Alice and I will pay a short visit to the United Kingdom, returning to Canada for a brief stay before our official departure.

As you take up your heavy responsibilities in these difficult days of reconstruction, I pray that Almighty God may guide and bless your deliberations. May you be inspired by the vision of the better future for humanity which it is now within the power of the united nations to create.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That the speech of His Excellency the Governor General to both houses of parliament be taken into consideration on Friday next, and that this order have precedence over all other business, except the introduction of bills, government notices of motions and government orders, until disposed of.

Motion agreed to.

STANDING COMMITTEES

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That a special committee be appointed to prepare and report, with all convenient speed, lists of members to compose standing committees of this house under standing order 63, said committee to be composed of Messrs. Mackenzie, Chevrier, Casselman, Knowles and Weir.

Motion agreed to.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) presented the following message from His Excellency the Governor General:

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons a certified copy of an approved minute of council appointing the Honourable Ian A. Mackenzie, Minister of Veterans Affairs, the Honourable J. L. Ilsley, Minister of Finance, the Honourable J. A. MacKinnon, Minister of Trade and Commerce, and the Honourable L. S. St. Laurent, Minister of Justice, to act with the Speaker of the House of Commons as commissioners for the purposes and under the provisions of chapter 145 of the revised statutes of Canada, 1927, intituled: An Act Respecting the House of Commons.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

INTERIM SUPPLY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Members of the house who were present at the last session of the last parliament will recall that supply was voted only until the end of August. There is no supply at the present time to carry on the business of government during this month of September, and should a measure of interim supply not be voted meanwhile, if the debate on the address should continue for several days, running past the fifteenth of this month, it would not be possible for members of the civil service to receive their cheques at that time. It is customary now to set up the committees of supply and ways and means until after the address in reply to the speech of His Excellency has been agreed to. Having this in mind I conferred this morning with the leader of the opposition and with other leaders of groups opposite, and I believe I may say that, reserving all rights to members of the house with respect to such discussion as may arise on a motion for the purpose, they would be agreeable, if other hon. members are, to the house immediately setting up these two committees of the house. This procedure would enable the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) on Monday next to ask the house for interim supply, of an amount sufficient to enable us to carry on for a limited time. If that is agreeable to hon. members I would move:

That this house resolve itself at its next sitting into a committee to consider of supply to be granted to His Majesty, notwithstanding the provisions of standing order 57.

Standing order 57, the one to which I refer, reads:

The house will appoint the committees of supply and ways and means at the commencement of every session, so soon as an address has been agreed to, in answer to His Excellency's speech.

What I am now suggesting is that, notwithstanding this order, the house agree to constitute these two committees at the next sitting.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I also move:

That this house resolve itself at its next sitting into a committee to consider of the ways and means for raising the supply to be granted to His Majesty, notwithstanding the provisions of standing order 57.

Motion agreed to.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

APPOINTMENTS OF CLERK ASSISTANTS AND SERGEANT-AT-ARMS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the house that the governor in council has appointed Roy T. Graham, Esquire, K.C., as Clerk Assistant of the House of Commons, Charles W. Boyce, Esquire, Second Clerk Assistant of the House of Commons, and Lieutenant-Colonel W. J. Franklin, M.C., V.D., Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Commons.

ADJOURNMENT—COUNCIL OF FOREIGN MINISTERS

Righ Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move that the house do now adjourn.

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): Before the motion is put, Mr. Speaker, might I, with the indulgence of the house, be permitted to ask the Prime Minister whether any arrangements have been made for Canadian representation at the meeting of the council of foreign ministers which will open in London on Monday next? It is reported in the press that the Australian Minister of External Affairs has arrived in London, and I am confident that Canadians would also wish to be represented at this meeting, which may play such a large part in determining the future course of world affairs.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I expected that my hon. friend would ask that question, and I had an answer prepared to give to him.

The Prime Minister of the United Kingdom did a few days ago invite the Prime Ministers of Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa either to come to London themselves, or if that were impracticable and if they so desired, to designate special representatives for consultation in London with United Kingdom ministers during the proceedings of the council of foreign ministers. It was suggested that these representatives would also be available to participate in the proceedings of the council if the council so decided.

I understand that none of the prime ministers of the commonwealth countries have found it possible to visit London at this time themselves.

In my reply to Mr. Attlee, I welcomed his desire for full consultation between commonwealth governments on questions of common concern and said I should be glad, if opportunity offered, to talk over with him questions of mutual interest to our governments. With parliament opening to-day, however, I found it quite impossible for me or one of my colleagues to go to London to attend commonwealth discussions to be held during the course of the meeting of the council of foreign ministers. As members of the house know, our channels for swift and direct intergovernmental communication between the countries of the commonwealth are excellent. I myself believe that the most effective means of consultation within the commonwealth are provided through the continuing conference of the cabinets of the commonwealth, which use of those channels makes possible.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 4.40 p.m.

Friday, September 7, 1945.

The house met at three o'clock.

MAIN ESTIMATES, 1945-46

A message from His Excellency the Governor General transmitting estimates for the financial year ending March 31, 1946, was presented by Hon. J. L. Ilsley (Minister of Finance), read by Mr. Speaker to the house, and referred to the committee of supply.

Mr. ILSLEY said: Mr. Speaker, these are the estimates that were laid on the table of the house and referred to the committee of supply in the last session of the last parliament. No change has been made in them. Five-twelfths of the estimates were voted at that session and the government will ask this house to vote the remaining seven-twelfths at a later date. May I add that on Tuesday next I shall ask the house to vote interim supply, that is, one-twelfth of the main estimates that have been placed on the table of the house to-day, and at the same time I shall ask the consent of the house to the introduction of a resolution, notice of which has already been placed on the order paper, for voting a portion of the appropriation that is required for war and demobilization purposes. That I propose

to ask for on Tuesday as well. Both these interim votes are necessary if the expenditures which are falling due from day to day are to be met.

MUTUAL AID

MEANS OF ENSURING FLOW OF ESSENTIAL SUPPLIES TO ALLIES FOLLOWING END OF HOSTILITIES

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I believe it is desirable to take this first opportunity to inform the house of the action the government has taken in regard to Mutual Aid and to means of ensuring the continued flow of essential supplies to our allies following the end of hostilities.

It has been understood from the beginning that Mutual Aid was purely a war-time measure, intended to make possible the most effective prosecution of the war and to end when victory was achieved. The government has always endeavoured to make this clear to parliament and the Canadian public, as well as to the allied nations receiving Mutual Aid.

Immediately upon receiving word of the readiness of the Japanese government to surrender on the terms offered them, the Canadian government notified the governments of countries receiving Mutual Aid from Canada that transfers of supplies as Mutual Aid would cease at the end of hostilities. These recipient governments were asked if they wished to continue to receive foodstuffs and other civilian supplies which they had expected to receive as Mutual Aid, had hostilities continued, and we indicated our willingness to continue to ship such supplies on the understanding that any of those transferred after the end of hostilities would be paid for. In order to avoid useless and wasteful activity, the production and delivery of munitions and other military supplies were halted immediately it was evident that Japan was going to surrender, although the governments which were to receive such supplies were informed of our action and given an opportunity to say that they would like production to be continued for their account. Exceptions to the policy of immediate cancellation were made in a few instances where manufacture was nearly finished and it was considered more sensible and economical to complete production in the hope of being able to sell the finished article for some useful purpose. There was no interruption in the production, procurement and shipment of foodstuffs and other civilian supplies during the course of these rearrangements. I should also add that the provision of supplies to UNRRA for relief and rehabilitation has not been affected by the termination of hostilities.

The date of the end of hostilities for the purpose of terminating the transfer of supplies as Mutual Aid has been taken as September 2, the day of the actual surrender of Japan.

Under the provisions of our Mutual Aid agreements the Canadian government may decide whether supplies which have been transferred as Mutual Aid and which are still in Canada or in ocean transit at the cessation of hostilities shall be repossessed by Canada or allowed to go forward to the countries to which they were transferred. The government has decided it will retain title to such supplies as had not been loaded on ship board before September 2, but will not repossess supplies which were in ocean transit on that date.

The end of Mutual Aid transfers will not end or delay the flow of essential civilian supplies to our allies. The government has offered to continue to buy such supplies for allied governments if they request us to do so and undertake to reimburse us for the costs so incurred on their behalf. Already several governments have made such requests and purchases and shipments are continuing.

Most of the countries which have been receiving Mutual Aid from Canada will require credits if they are to continue to obtain what they need from this country. Negotiations are proceeding with several with a view to the provision of credits under the Export Credits Insurance Act, passed by parliament at the last session. It would be out of place for me to make public the nature of these negotiations until a later stage.

The United Kingdom and the sterling area generally constitute a special case, because of the magnitude and complexity of their trade and financial transactions with Canada. There will be a problem of some difficulty in working out satisfactory means of financing the deficit of the sterling area in its trade and other transactions with Canada during the period of the next few years when Britain is rebuilding and developing her export trade, which has been sacrificed almost entirely to war production in recent years. A similar problem, of course, will exist on a larger absolute scale between the United States and Britain and other parts of the sterling area. Lord Keynes, representing the British government, has been in Ottawa for several days, discussing with other ministers and myself the financial and trade problems arising from the sudden conclusion of hostilities. We have not endeavoured at this time to devise arrangements or negotiate terms for the financing of Britain's trade and that of the rest of the sterling area with Canada over the whole period of transition, which undoubtedly will last for several years. Full discussion of that problem must

be deferred until later. Our conversations have so far been confined to the problem that will exist over the next few months until more definite agreements can be worked out. Fortunately it appears that, as a result of the settlements still to be made in respect of past transactions, as well as the continuing expenditures of the Canadian forces overseas, Britain and the sterling area will be receiving sufficient Canadian dollars during the next few months to finance all or nearly all of their requirements in Canada. Consequently we anticipate that the question of providing for a deficit will not arise during this interim period. If there should be a small deficit, it might be covered simply by postponing for a few months payment by the United Kingdom or other sterling area countries for supplies received during this period through Canadian government procurement agencies, or possibly by other purely temporary expedients. These would be simply interim arrangements made in anticipation of a definite agreement which has not yet been considered.

PRISONERS OF WAR

INQUIRY AS TO LIBERATION OF CANADIAN FORCES AT HONG KONG

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): I have two or three questions I should like to ask the Prime Minister. One of them has already been very well answered by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley). It had to do with Mutual Aid. If I may I should like to thank the minister for his very fine statement on that matter. I am sure it will be taken by the public as an assurance that no serious interruption of trade will be permitted.

My first question is: In view of the anxiety of Canadians generally regarding the liberation of the Canadian forces taken prisoner at Hong Kong, would the Prime Minister make a full statement to the house at the earliest opportunity, giving all information in the possession of the government?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I may say to the leader of the opposition that the government has made it a practice of giving out just as quickly as it is received any information with respect to those who have been prisoners of war in the far east. At the moment I have not a comprehensive statement that I could give to the house, but as soon as information has been received of a character which will permit of that, I will have the statement made.

[Mr. Ilsley.]

EMPIRE PREFERENCE

PRESS REPORTS OF UNITED STATES DESIRE FOR ABANDONMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): Press reports indicate that the government of the United States is seeking to induce the United Kingdom to abandon the empire preference system. Would the Prime Minister advise the house whether any representations to this effect have been received from the government of the United States or from the United Kingdom, and if so, what attitude the Canadian government has taken?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): No such representations have been received.

FORT McMURRAY OIL

DESTRUCTION OF BUILDINGS AT ABASAND PLANT—INQUIRY AS TO RECONSTRUCTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. R. MacNICOL (Davenport): May I inquire from the Minister of Mines and Resources or from the Minister of Reconstruction, whichever one is directly in control, whether in view of the destruction of the oil separation mill and adjacent buildings of the Abasand plant at Fort McMurray the government proposes to reconstruct the destroyed buildings or to return the property to private interests?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction): I may say in reply to the hon. member's question that discussions leading to a decision are now taking place between the government and the Abasand company who wish to take over.

HALIFAX V-E DAY RIOTS

MR. JUSTICE KELLOCK'S REPORT—REMISSION OR REDUCTION OF PENITENTIARY SENTENCES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Justice in connection with the report made by Mr. Justice Kellock on the V-E day riots in Halifax. Is it the intention of the government to file that report? Is consideration being given to the remission or reduction of the penitentiary sentences that were passed on the naval personnel as a result of the riots?

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Minister of Justice): The report of Mr. Justice Kellock was submitted while parliament was not in session, and it was immediately turned over to the king's printer. The copies became

available some two or three weeks ago. In view of the widespread public interest in the matter it was felt that it should be made public at that time, and it was made available to the Canadian press. If it is desired to have a copy tabled here I will arrange to have it done at one of the early sittings. Copies of the report are in the office of the king's printer and can be obtained by any hon. member of the house who wishes to have one.

As to the second part of the question, the remission branch of the Department of Justice has been making the usual investigation into the matter of the sentences passed upon not only naval personnel but others as well who were convicted of having participated in the disturbances of that day at Halifax. The hon. member knows that it is not the practice to announce in advance at what time a ticket-of-leave will be issued or at what time a recommendation will be made for a reduction of sentence. It is only when the moment has arrived to give effect to the recommendation that it is transmitted to His Excellency.

There are no reductions made in sentences until they become effective when announced; but a very careful and, I may add, sympathetic investigation into the situation has been under way for some considerable time. As soon as it is completed, and if it appears that it is possible at once to give effect to a recommendation for clemency, it will be submitted. I can assure the hon. member that the most sympathetic consideration will be given to the cases of the misguided young men who participated in that unfortunate disturbance.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

INQUIRY AS TO HOSPITALIZATION IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. CHESTER S. McLURE (Queens): I understand that a resolution has been sent to the Minister of Veterans Affairs by the government of Prince Edward Island, and in explanation of the question I am going to ask I should like to be permitted to read that short resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. McLURE: This is a copy of a minute of his honour the lieutenant governor in council—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. That may not be read.

Mr. McLURE: Then I will just ask the question. Has the resolution been received by the Minister of Veterans Affairs, and what action has he taken with reference to it?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. Only the question is permissible.

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): I have received several resolutions from Prince Edward Island in regard to the hospitalization situation there. Negotiations are still proceeding as a result of the recommendations of the wartime hospitalization committee, by whom all recommendations must be endorsed in reference to the hospitalization of veterans in Canada.

THE WAR

INQUIRY AS TO FORMAL ANNOUNCEMENT OF TERMINATION OF HOSTILITIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (Macleod): May I direct a question to the Prime Minister, based upon the announcement of the Minister of Finance with respect to Mutual Aid, in which evidently it was recognized that hostilities have ceased. At first blush my question may appear a bit foolish, but I have a reason for asking it. Is it expected that the government will make a formal announcement, so far as Canada is concerned, that the war is ended and, if so, when may we expect that announcement?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I would say to my hon. friend that I will take note of his question and answer it at another time.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

ADDRESS IN REPLY, MOVED BY MR. W. M. BENIDICKSON AND SECONDED BY MR. J. G. L. LANGLOIS

The house proceeded to the consideration of the speech delivered by His Excellency the Governor General at the opening of the session.

Mr. W. M. BENIDICKSON (Kenora-Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to move, seconded by the hon. member for Gaspe (Mr. Langlois), the following resolution:

That the following address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General of Canada:

To His Excellency Major General the Right Honourable the Earl of Athlone, Knight of the Most Noble Order of the Garter, a member of His Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, Knight Grand Cross of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath, Grand Master of the Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George, Knight Grand Cross of the Royal Victorian Order, Companion of the Distinguished Service Order, one of His Majesty's Personal Aides-de-Camp, Governor General and Commander-in-Chief of the Dominion of Canada.

May it Please Your Excellency:

We, His Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the House of Commons of Canada, in parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Excellency for the gracious speech which Your Excellency has addressed to both houses of parliament.

I understand it is the privilege of the mover of this resolution to make a few remarks to the house. First it is my pleasure to express to you, Mr. Speaker, my sincere congratulations upon your election to the high office of first commoner, which took place yesterday. I believe my sympathy should also be extended to you, sir, because you have before you a great number of members of parliament, I think something in the nature of one hundred, who are making their first appearance in this chamber. I feel, however, that the new members may expect from you consideration and courtesy, in that despite this high honour you yourself have not long been a member of this House of Commons, though we all realize that you have had much more experience in parliamentary procedure than we have had, by reason of your service in the legislature of your province, and also because of the family school in which you have been brought up, which has given so many distinguished members to the public life of the Dominion of Canada.

I am well aware, sir, that a signal honour has indeed been conferred upon me in the invitation to move the address to His Excellency in reply to the speech from the throne. It is, of course, the custom in this house to select for this high privilege one from among those who are taking their first faltering steps in national politics. In my own case, however, I recognize that another and far from personal reason is responsible for my selection and possibly that of my good friend the seconder of the motion. I believe we have been selected for this high honour particularly because we have been associated with the armed services during the war. It is true that in previous sessions during war time this honour has been conferred upon members of the services, but I understand that hitherto it has been performed by members of the major Canadian service, the army. Therefore I deeply appreciate the tactful courtesy that has been shown to-day in asking that the address be moved and seconded by members who have been associated with the other branches of the services of this country. It will be pleasing to them that in this great hour of final victory this additional accolade has been bestowed upon these two services whose achievements have been sometimes overlooked in recent days, when the course of the war focused public attention so completely upon the work, the distinguished work, of the Canadian Army.

[Mr. Benidickson.]

Mr. Speaker, if I may be forgiven I should like to interject a purely personal note of satisfaction. I had heard the name and rank of the hon. member for Gaspe (Mr. Langlois) as one elected to membership in the house; but until yesterday, when we met again, I had not realized that he was a former Halifax messmate who had been most helpful to a member of the Royal Canadian Air Force who, rather nervously, was feeling his way in his first contacts with the Royal Canadian Navy as their first air-liaison officer.

In expressing appreciation for the compliment that has been given to the service to which I was once attached, I decline to believe that there was not intended some measure of recognition of the constituency to the representation of which I have been elected. I wish to thank the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and his colleagues on behalf of all the electors and all the citizens of my riding for this honour.

The constituency of Kenora-Rainy River is a very large one. In fact, it is one of the few which can be said actually to span the country, for in the south the constituency of Kenora-Rainy River skirts the boundary of the United States, and moving northward through the rapidly developing mining district of Red Lake, encompasses the shore line of Hudson bay.

Therefore, I say that in the minds of Canadians it might very well occupy an equally strategic position, for it is the constituency in which it can be truly said that east and west meet and mingle.

Many of us, when we think of the city, have in mind the western city of Winnipeg. But always—and of late, unhappily—when we have referred to the fountain-head of our provincial government we have of course referred to the city of Toronto.

Since the creation of our riding some twenty years ago we have sent to the house, consistently, followers of the present Prime Minister. During that time we have sent two distinguished members who have placed upon a neophite the very heavy burden of upholding a high reputation. Our first member, the Hon. Peter Heenan, was a privy councillor. He had the great honour, one which the constituency still appreciates, of moving the introduction of a bill which made the old age pensions scheme part of the law of our country. All hon. members will appreciate those observations in the speech from the throne which indicates a very necessary extension—

the dominion-provincial conference permitting —of the benefits flowing from that splendid piece of legislation.

The second hon. member to represent our constituency was Hugh McKinnon. I am sure a great number of members in this chamber, with me, regret his untimely passing during the last parliament. I have already had evidence of the great affection in which he was held by former members of the house, through the number of courtesies already extended to me by members of this house as his political heir, by reason of it being known that he and I were great personal friends.

Traditionally both these hon. members were Liberals who regarded the title as being as well spelled with a small as with a capital "L". It was they who pioneered the very natural association between Liberals and Labour which was so decisive a factor in the last election.

And, speaking of that election, may I say that I became convinced and tried to convince other people that the retention of the present government in power after the war was necessary in the best interests of the country. This opinion was based largely upon the government's splendid direction of the Canadian war effort, and naturally upon the conviction that a government with so much behind it in the way of war-time accomplishments could not fail to show equal wisdom and equal imagination in the handling of the equally difficult problems of peace. They, I felt, could not fail to understand that the world of 1938 had, in fact, dissolved before our eyes, and that a new world had stirred toward its birth six years ago this week.

From its programme it was evident that the government neither clasped the past too firmly, nor reached too eagerly toward the distant future. The record of the government and the outline of its programme during the election campaign were such, I believe, as immediately to satisfy the great majority of the people of Canada. According to the people's verdict, the government's programme approached most closely their requirements. I am pleased to note from what I read in the speech from the throne that performance is following closely upon the heels of promise.

The governor general's speech which we heard yesterday embodied at least the spirit of those reforms which the times demand. And if as members of the house we cannot ensure that the letter and the detail of those reforms are made effective, then I suggest, with all deference and respect, that we shall have failed in our task.

The raw material has been dropped into our laps by a government which, I believe, has appreciated what must go into the warp and woof of the new fabric. As I understand the matter, our task is to suggest into precisely what patterns it shall be woven. The materials given to us as outlined in the speech from the throne, are good materials. They conform with what we had been led to expect from past performance and practice.

For those materials, the spinning of which we gained some intimation during the 1944 session of parliament, and during the election campaign which followed, I should like personally to acknowledge the definite hand of the Prime Minister. We younger men who think we feel within ourselves and are led by the precepts of Liberalism—even left wing Liberalism—are told that this is a phase in our philosophy which young men rightly experience, but which they will forget as they grow older. I think the thirties are the time when we are supposed to abandon and to break away from some of those ideals.

Sometimes when, through private business success, we attain a degree of prosperity, we are inclined to abandon what I should like to call real liberalism. However, in the face of this allegedly natural transmutation, and in contradiction of all that we have been told is an inevitable and natural process, I would make so bold as to draw to the philosophers' attention the Right Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King. The years have not changed his relative position to the right or to the left. He remains one of those fortunate ones, regarded by one party as radical and by the other as conservative. To-day, as always, he fulfils the ideals of those who are most eager to do what they can for social reform and for the advancement of their country, without entirely scrapping the whole system under which so much progress in Canada has already been made.

We may disagree on details, but I claim that in the speech from the throne which we heard yesterday were included the indications of all the major policies which we can count upon to carry Canada through the difficult years which lie ahead.

May I be forgiven if for a few minutes I give expression to what is possibly obvious to all hon. members. First, Canada has fought a great war. The magnitude of our achievement is, I think, not readily discernible as yet to Canadians as a whole. For example, we say that we had an army in the field, but I wonder if any one has yet been able to explain properly to Canadians what is meant by that very technical word "army"? We have had a

navy. Possibly my hon. friend who is to second this motion may wish to have something to say as to what is involved in the way of men and ships when we say "navy".

We have had an air force, and in this connection I am on more familiar ground. The Royal Canadian Air Force has meant that there have been Canadian airmen from Iceland southeastward to Burma. For example, when we say that Canada had a bomber group in action I wonder how many Canadians were able to translate that innocent word "group" into the immense formation, among many other formations, made up of ten thousand men and millions of dollars worth of aircraft which was dispersed over hundreds of square miles of England and which was carrying as much as fifty per cent of the British bombs launched against the enemy.

These illustrations of the contributions of Canada to victory were obvious to the men overseas, but how well were they understood at home? On the other hand, how well was the achievement of Canada's home war effort appreciated by the men in the field? How well could those men, satisfied by what they saw of the deliveries of men and equipment, yet concentrated upon the evidence before them, appreciate and evaluate the excellence of the home war effort, the handling of the financial aspects of the war and the equally excellent handling of the defeat of inflation? How well could they evaluate what had been done in fulfilling the appalling demands for supply and equipment which must have staggered those responsible for meeting them as truly as did the instructions to wipe out Brest and Lorient which were given to our troops in the early days of the air war or which were given, I imagine, later on to the army at the time of Dieppe?

In passing, I suggest that we have within the government departments adequate facilities for writing what might be called the statistics of this war, the brave ones of the number of free enlistments and the tragic ones of those who have not returned. There will be the statistics of the food and munitions we produced and the hours of work that were put in in this country to assure victory. But there are no statistics, nor can there be, of the intangible things which went into the winning of the war. By "intangible things" I mean the sacrifices made by men and women who were parted in the doubtful early days of the war; and the sacrifice that was made by a man when he gave up a good job to enlist. At that time, in the eagerness with which men threw overboard their present happiness in order to serve a cause in which they believed, there appeared an example of the Canadian spirit which is all too readily overlooked to-day when men say, as if ambition instead of idealism had motivated that action, "Oh, he did well enough in the army or the war plant, but he will have to work for much less now that the war is over."

For a moment I have strayed from my theme. I had meant to argue that no one of us can yet grasp the extent of Canada's effort and I hope that none of us will deny the fact that as a result of this great conflict this country has become a great nation. I have heard expressed in private conversations our peculiar Canadian brand of isolationism, and I have no doubt that we shall hear of it hereafter in this house. It follows naturally upon the fact that we in Canada have not what might be called the normal ambitions of a nation. We do not want anyone's territory; we are content to keep the peace and leave other people alone. So far so good, but I think there is more to be said.

Whether we like it or not, as a result of our achievements through the war years, the achievements of our armed forces, of our economic administrators, of our diplomatic representatives, of our scientific forces, we have been lifted up far above the stature of a northern adjunct to the United States or a western dependency of Great Britain. Whether or not we like it we have been forced into the position of being respected as a great power in the world; we are the spokesman for a great deal of the best in the world that we hope will emerge from the holocaust. This fact has already been recognized by much more of the world at large than some of us at home are prepared to realize. I believe we confuse ourselves by thinking that the major figures in the world of to-day stop off in Ottawa only for reasons of courtesy or convenience.

As a great nation we have ever increasing obligations. With our immense resources of food, minerals, forest products and manufactures we must ensure that the rest of the world is supplied with its share of what it needs. Morally, we must exert every influence to ensure that whatever settlements or agreements are made to-day, twenty years from now they will not disturb the peace that Canada loves. Socially, we must use to the full, as we have always done before, the progressive spirit of our own people to introduce reforms which may in turn be a pattern for other parts of the world. Economically, we must prove that our existing freedom will work and seek to enlarge it rather than narkening to those who say that either it must be scrapped or so changed in one direction or the other that it is no longer freedom.

I believe that these suggestions of mine are implicit in the speech from the throne. Asking your patience, sir, and that of the house I should like to touch upon two points, one of which was not mentioned in the speech but both of which I regard as being of special importance. They both concern the man who has served in this latest war. On all sides of the house we are obviously determined that the best possible deal shall be given to him. I think that some confidence will be given to these men in the knowledge that in this house there are over thirty veterans of this war in addition to possibly many more who saw service in the great war that went before.

In the first, and lesser place, there are numbers of young men who after long service in our forces during this war have decided that their special aptitudes and special interests lie in continued membership in the armed forces. They were volunteers at the outset of the war. To-day they would like to be members of that relatively large permanent force which we expect Canada to maintain as a nation, if not to contribute to an international police force. To the best of my knowledge two at least of these services so far are not making it possible for the men so minded to remain in the service. I suspect that in consequence the cream of the crop, from the military point of view, is being lost.

In the second, and much greater place, I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the government give the utmost priority to provision for the housing of veterans. I am glad to see that subject mentioned in the speech from the throne. We know that constructive action is under way in cities, and we are hopeful that when the occasion comes a still broader programme will be announced. We are also hopeful that control over housing, the major emergency which Canada faces to-day, may be vested in one central agency. We would welcome an assurance that the benefits of the wartime housing policy will not be concentrated in the cities but will be dispersed among the smaller towns as well, where the problem of overcrowding is relatively equally severe.

In the meantime may I respectfully ask my colleagues in this house, including older and wiser members, to remember that the final victory is not much more than a week or so behind us and that while the transition from the old to the new is ahead of us, it cannot be accomplished overnight. At the same time we as members of this house must as legislators and public servants keep ever fresh in our minds a vision of our worthy calling. In this connection I should like to plagiarize a story that appeared recently in a popular magazine.

There were three stonemasons at work, and a passerby asked each of them what he was doing. The first replied, "I am cutting a stone." The second one said, "I am making a wall." The third replied, "I am helping to build a cathedral." And so I say, Mr. Speaker, that even those of us who are new here and back-benchers must keep in our minds the fact that we have the great privilege of being stonemasons in the building of a better social order.

Mr. J. G. LEOPOLD LANGLOIS (Gaspe) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I rise to second the motion which has been moved with so much eloquence by my honourable friend the member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Benidickson).

I thank the honourable member for his very kind remarks, and wish to assure him of my most sincere friendship.

May I first be permitted, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate you for having been selected to preside over the debates of this house. Your high qualities and your past parliamentary experience give us the assurance that you will discharge that important function with dignity and impartiality.

I must also compliment the great Canadian who is our prime minister, the Right Honourable William Lyon Mackenzie King, on the splendid victory which he and his party have recently won. It must be quite comforting to a patriot like him to see an entire population put its trust in him at the most tragic time in its history and I hasten to add that never was such a comfort so well deserved.

I have often heard it said,—of course by political opponents of the prime minister,—that his greatest quality was that he knew how to choose able associates. His opponents perhaps find in this fact an excuse whereby to account for his outstanding success at the head of the Canadian nation for nearly twenty years and perhaps they also find in it a reason for trying to minimize the great work he has accomplished for this country.

To my mind, Mr. Speaker, a man must be great in his own right to be able to secure the cooperation of outstanding associates. That is the secret weapon of our prime minister; his personal greatness which, with his inborn humility, he is forever trying to conceal.

In a recent article entitled "Canada's Mackenzie King" published in the September issue of *The Readers' Digest,* Mr. Stanley High confirmed this opinion when he said:

Mackenzie King that is to say is one of the world's important figures.

He is also one of the least known.

And in order to illustrate that statement, better, I should add: because Mackenzie King always places the interests of Canada before his personal interests.

As regards the prime minister's associates, there is one of whom I now wish to make a special mention; I refer to the Honourable the Minister of Justice, (Mr. St. Laurent). He is a worthy successor of Laurier and Lapointe and the province of Quebec is proud to number him among her most illustrious sons. The confidence that has recently been shown to him by that province and especially by the constituency of Quebec-East where he had an unprecedented majority, affords an ample proof of that fact.

Mr. Speaker, I also tender my sincere congratulations to our new Minister of Fisheries (Hon. H. F. G. Bridges) who last week had the well-deserved honour of being the first veteran of this war to enter the cabinet.

May I also refer to the presence in this house of another member of the Royal Canadian Navy, the honourable member for Churchill (Leading Stoker Ronald S. Moore). I congratulate him most sincerely on his election.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a great honour for me to have been requested to second the address in reply to the speech from the throne. I know that such an honour has been conferred on me on the one hand because I represent one of the finest constituencies in our Canadian confederation, and on the other hand because I am a member of the Royal Canadian Navy. On behalf of each one of the men and women electors of Gaspe, and in the name of our Canadian sailors, I offer the prime minister my heartfelt thanks.

Mr. Speaker, I represent in this house the beautiful constituency of Gaspe. The Gaspe peninsula is the oldest section in the country from an historial standpoint. Indeed, it was in my constituency that the first white man set foot on Canadian soil and took possession of it in the name of the king of France. Let me carry you back in thought to the year 1534 and to the great French explorer, Jacques Cartier. This land where Cartier set foot four hundred years ago is now an immense territory inhabited by honest and generous people. The population is mixed and the soft accents of the French language mingle with those of the language spoken by the majority of the citizens of Canada. Indeed, it is a miniature Canada except, of course, for the proportions represented by both racial groups.

It is devoid of industry, except lumbering, and the majority of our people are engaged in the toilsome occupation of fishermen and in the more peaceful chores of the farm. This lack of industry in the Gaspe country upon which nature seems to have lavished its richest resources, while endowing it with matchless scenery, is due to the almost total absence of communications. Except for the railway running between Matapedia and Gaspe and the highway which circles the peninsula, both of minor importance for that matter, waterways are the only commercial means of communications available to our people. And here again, our harbours are highly inadequate. Even our fishermen have few harbours where they can shelter their boats when, tired out, they finally return to their homes after having battled the sea in their attempts to wrest from it its savoury harvest.

Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding all those difficulties of an economic nature the people of Gaspe have responded most generously to the country's appeals in recent times. We have witnessed an endless procession of future heroes, brave fishermen and doughty farmers going towards remote recruiting centres of our Canadian navy, our army and our air force. In proportion to its population, our constituency has sent as many men to the armed forces as any other constituency in Canada; and we are proud of our record. Soldiers from Gaspe were at Hong Kong, at Dieppe, in Africa, in Sicily, in Italy, on the beaches of Normandy, in France, in Holland and finally in Germany, on those battlegrounds where the valorous Canadian army has written the finest pages of our history.

The Victory Loans, the appeals of the Red Cross and other auxiliary services afforded another opportunity to the people of Gaspe to show their patriotism, and here again their contribution was no less substantial. They have made those sacrifices in order to contribute to the great allied victory over the enemy of our civilization.

Mr. Speaker, the part played by our country in attaining victory has been as great as, if not greater than, that of any other nation and we may justly be proud of our achievements. Under the capable leadership of the prime minister, Canada has shown to the whole world that we are a nation that must hereafter be reckoned with. Our war effort, voluntarily agreed to in the early days of the conflict, has enabled England, this great democratic nation, to weather the storm at the outbreak of hostilities. At that time, the whole world, a large part of which was already trembling under the enemy's blows, was looking up to Canada, the chief ray of hope at the sides of brave Albion.

We have remained united and firm in this gigantic struggle. Mr. Speaker, our men of the Royal Canadian Navy and of the Canadian Merchant Marine were the first to take part in the battle. I wish to pay tribute here to the valour of those brave sailors, heroes of the first phase of the battle of the Atlantic, who did not hesitate to man their inadequately equipped ships in order to bring supplies to the last bulwark of democracy and of civilization. Their courage has never faltered and their contribution to final victory was of an inestimable value.

Mr. Speaker, I take the liberty to digress for a moment. I wish to emphasize the praiseworthy work done by our first minister of Naval Services, the Hon. Angus L. Macdonald, which was zealously continued by his worthy successor, the Hon. D. C. Abbott. From a few obsolete units at the outbreak of the war, our navy has developed, in less than six years, into a powerful fighting force. It is easy to visualize the ardruous work which this task must have imposed upon those two ministers.

Our brave soldiers and airmen followed closely our sailors in the struggle and they brought great credit to our country on the battlefields and in the skies of Europe. Nor must we overlook the patriotism of the Canadian women in the various auxiliary services who so ably supported our armed forces.

Mr. Speaker, in these opening days of a new era of peace, we must say a grateful prayer for all those brave sons of Canada who have made the supreme sacrifice in the service of their country.

It is the custom in all the countries of the world to erect monuments to the memory of those who have died on the battlefields. To that end, we attempt to carve in stone a symbol which will remind future generations of the ideals and greatness of those who have gone before.

I congratulate the government for wishing to commemorate in this manner the memory of our dead, for this memorial will express the nation's everlasting gratitude. To my mind, however, we will raise the most beautiful memorial to our gallant men by giving a practical expression to the ideal for which they fell. A more symbolic or lasting monument we can never build.

Mr. Speaker, when our sons fought with such courage and sacrificed so much, it was to give the world a lasting peace, peace among the various nations which people the universe and peace within each of these nations. How can our country participate in winning this peace? In the international sphere, it is our duty to promote understanding and co-operation among freedom-loving nations, since liberty is the basis of our democratic civilization. Our sons fought to restore to the world its lost freedom, and plain logic demands that we share in the protection of this privilege. Our country has already made great strides in that direction at the San Francisco peace conference, whose decisions will be submitted to the approval of the house. At this point, I wish to express the admiration Canada feels for her representatives at this memorable Conference and particularly for the head of our delegation who represented us with such distinction. From the aforementioned article, I quote Mr. Stanley High's opinion on the matter:

> Canada has heretofore been classed as one of the small nations. Under King's leadership, it has emerged from that category. Representing a people conscious of their increased unity and strength, Mackenzie King, at the San Francisco Conference, made Canada leader and spokesman for "The Middle Powers".

I express the wish that our country will pursue this path and make itself heard just as eloquently in future international meetings.

We must insist on being kept informed of all decisions of international import taken by major or minor powers. We must press for front rank recognition and specify this as a *sine qua non* condition of our fellowship with other nations. This right we have acquired by the loss of thousands of young Canadian lives and by our country's magnificent war effort.

Mr. Speaker, the principles of liberty which form the basis of a lasting world peace apply just as well in our own country. We must keep in mind that Providence has entrusted two great races with the mission of moulding the Canadian nation in this land of America, and every Canadian should deem it his duty to help bring about the success of this mission. Our present Prime Minister has, on various occasions, shown more skill and firmness than any other Canadian in effecting the unity of the two races. Among his numerous achievements, I feel convinced that history will consider this accomplishment the most outstanding and most characteristic of his long political career. Our national unity has just survived its most severe assault during the war years, and we must preserve it, for twice in a quarter of a century our sons have sealed it with their blood.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this solemn unity will soon be symbolized by a Canadian flag and an official national anthem. The speech from the throne informs us that this house will be called upon to consider the first of those two projects. Let us hope that the second will follow very soon.

Mr. Speaker, in my humble opinion, in order to develop within the mind of every subject of this country, to whatever racial group he may belong, the legitimate and commendable pride of being an outright Canadian citizen, it is necessary that concrete symbols of his Canadian citizenship be given to him. A distinctive flag and a national anthem constitute the greatest of these symbols and they will serve as a stimulant to the external manifestations of the love we have for our country. Once those two great projects have been carried out, the people who are entrusted with education in the nine provinces of this country will perhaps agree, at least I hope so, to consider another no less important project, which would consist in making available for our students a uniform textbook of Canadian history. It should not be a history doctored so as not to offend certain touchy people, but an impartial and complete history. It would be to the benefit of every citizen of this country to study such a history dealing jointly with the two great races that form our nation. Our greatest educators have always attached considerable importance to training through the study of history. If this science is shorn of certain prominent facts, it loses its formative value. The truly Canadian soul is shaped through the knowledge of valourous deeds as well as of past errors.

Mr. Speaker, we must win the peace in the economic field as well. To this end, we must without delay reconvert our war economy to a peace footing. Let us thank God that the government have initiated their efforts in this field before the close of hostilities. That our country was not taken by surprise on the seemingly unexpected surrender of Japan at this early date and the complete suspension of hostilities which had kept our people on a war footing for the last six years, is due to this commendable forethought of the administration. Among the measures already enacted and in force, I shall mention the Unemployment Insurance Act. A crisis in the employment situation may easily be provoked in the transition period; in fact, I understand that it already exsits in certain districts. The conversion of our war plants to peace industries, following the cancellation of large war contracts, the accelerated demobilization of our armed forces, and other transition activities, cannot take place without a certain decrease in the demand for man-power.

The Family Allowance Act is another social measure which the last Parliament passed at the appropriate time. The advantages of this measure are many. It constitutes a new application of the principle of reducing war taxes in proportion to family responsibilities and it also has the merit of assisting the poorer classes, taking family obligations into account. It will offset a possible decrease in wages and raise educational standards, making it possible for a larger number to benefit from longer periods of schooling.

We must think first of rehabilitating and reestablishing our soldiers and, here again, the government have fulfilled their duty. On the return of our veterans, the Department of Veterans Affairs was already in full operation. I realize that temporarily uncontrollable circumstances, the lack of trained personnel among others, have delayed the normal operation of this important service. The task was far from easy, especially while the war was still being waged; however, I hope that peace will permit this department to operate with the greatest efficiency at a very early date.

Mr. Speaker, if one class of our citizens is more deserving than others of the greatest interest on the part of the government, it is that of the war veterans. We have the obligation, not only of reestablishing them after a fashion in civilian life but also of guiding them in their new callings. I hope it will be possible to increase the scope of our vocational training services, which I consider essential. Our young men leave the army without experience of normal life and are therefore easy targets for speculators; they are readily attracted to new experience which may be disastrous for them and society in general. On their leaving the forces not only should they be thoroughly informed of the advantages offered them, but they also should be advised by specialists in the choice of a career according to their respective skills. I shall make another digression here to praise the government and especially the Hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Chevrier) for their practical recognition of the valorous services rendered by the members of our Merchant Marine in granting them a service allowance based on the length of service. They have well deserved of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, we have also witnessed the inauguration of the Department of Reconstruction. This service has done a considerable amount of work both in the field of planning for the future and in implementing certain measures for maintaining industrial employment at a high level. The creation of the War Assets Corporation, the rapid reconversion of our industry, the inauguration of the Industrial Development Bank and the National Housing Administration, the promoting of greater credit facilities and more extensive banking services are reconstruction

steps full of promise. A third department, just as important as the others, has been created, that of National Health and Welfare. Its programme is essential to the social welfare of Canada and, in common with the other two, its efficient operation will require the close cooperation of the provinces. Let us hope that the Federal-Provincial Conference, which met, on the invitation of the government, on August 6 last, will have a happy ending for the future of the country. The progress and development of Canada demand that the various governments come to an agreement.

(Text): A great task has been achieved, Mr. Speaker, in connection with the winning of the peace and the smooth transition of the whole economy of our nation from war-time to peace-time needs.

The speech from the throne outlines what the government proposes to do to implement what has been done in previous sessions. The new sessional programme mentions, among other things, the intention of the government to speed the orderly release of men and women from the armed forces ,to maintain long-term markets, to restore external trade, and to promote a high level of employment.

We are endeavouring to ensure world security by promoting lasting prosperity. As this objective cannot be accomplished by any nation in isolation and requires international cooperation, we must therefore restore and expand world trade. Canada has the obligation to share in this cooperation by obtaining export markets and also by stimulating larger imports, which will respectively, and as direct advantages to this country, increase employment and raise our standard of living.

Apart from the aforesaid advantages, this increase in the volume of our exports and imports will soon necessitate the establishment of a Canadian fleet of modern ocean-going cargo ships. Such a fleet, in my opinion, would add to Canada's prosperity, because it will give employment to a greater number of Canadians both as crew members to man the ships and as workers in our shipyards which will build and repair them. It is to be noted that our country ranks second only to our neighbours to the south in the production of cargo ships. Furthermore, the creation and maintenance of a merchant fleet will require proper nautical schools to prepare deck and engine room qualified personnel. Naval architecture and marine engineering are among other fields of activities which will thus be opened to our Canadian youth.

Canada, Mr. Speaker, is a maritime country. It is bordered on the east and west by two oceans, and our inland waters form a waterway which goes to its very heart. We must therefore take advantage of this gift of nature and make more use of the cheap means of communication it affords.

I sincerely hope that in our post-war planning, our coastal and inland shipping will receive the attention of our government. This brings me to matters of particular interest to my county. There is a large number of these smaller ships in the gulf and river St. Lawrence. These ships provide an essential link by water between Montreal and Quebec and outports along both the south and the north shore. Better port facilities and an increase in the number of existing harbours along the coasts will be of benefit to those engaged in this trade and consequently to those parts of the country which depend entirely on these ships as their only means of communication with the industrial centres I have mentioned.

The government has shown its interest in our fisheries by the very appropriate floor placed under fish products. This measure is much appreciated by our fishermen and will be followed, I hope, by the consideration the government will give to markets for these products when new export markets are sought for our Canadian trade. The fishermen of my county, in addition to the building of other fishing harbours, would also welcome the establishment of a meteorological service. In my opinion, such a service could be provided at very little cost by using local radio stations to broadcast weather forecasts at regular and frequent intervals. This improvement should also prove of great assistance to our coastal shipping.

Furthermore, a plan of insurance to cover at low cost to their owners the fishing boats and their gear against marine perils could also prove feasible, with the cooperation of provincial governments, and would surely be beneficial to our fishing industry. I must add that for various reasons it is almost impossible to cover the smaller sized fishing boats through private marine insurance companies.

We are assembled here, Mr. Speaker, for the opening session of the twentieth parliament of Canada to fulfil the definite mandate we have individually received from the people of this country at the polls, which consists in the laying of sound foundations for a better and greater post-war Canada, whilst contributing our share toward international security. This task is great and far from being easy. I also wish to draw the special attention of this house to the many difficulties which will present themselves along the road which our country must travel to revert to its peace-time

activities. We have united in our efforts to make Canada great in war, and we shall also unite to make it great in peace. This common objective cannot be attained without the full cooperation of every citizen of this country. I pray God, who has granted us victory and peace, to guide us in our endeavours to preserve that peace in both international and national fields.

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, it is not expected of me that I should continue the debate at this time, but before moving its adjournment I should like the privilege of making two or three brief observations.

It is a very great pleasure in my first words to have the opportunity of complimenting the mover (Mr. Benidickson) and the seconder (Mr. Langlois) of the address to be presented to His Excellency. Each of these hon. gentlemen is to be commended upon the manner in which he has discharged his responsibility, and I am happy to be the first to offer my congratulations. It has been my privilege to know the mover of the motion since his early days at the university of my adopted province, and from his experience and training I feel sure he will prove to be a useful and valuable member of this house. It has not been my privilege to know the seconder of the motion, but judging from his performance to-day and from his experience while in uniform I feel that he too will be able to make a valuable and constructive contribution to our work.

With much of what these hon. gentlemen have had to say there will be general agreement. With some portions of their remarks it is perhaps scarcely to be expected that those who see the government from a different angle will be in entire agreement. If each of the speakers has shown unsual zeal in the task of discovering virtues in the government and in the art of keeping a blind eye turned towards its errors, I am sure I shall not wish to be the first to censure them for what they have done. It will be for those who follow to fill in the omissions and to shed any necessary light on the places they have not seen fit to enter.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to extend to you my compliments, before you were elected to your present post. To-day on behalf of those sitting in this section of the house I wish to welcome you to your new work and to wish for you the same high measure of success which characterized the work of your predecessors.

With respect to the plans of the government as announced in the speech from the throne and its administrative record over recent years, and with respect to the state of the public welfare generally, I propose to reserve such comments as I wish to make until the next sitting of the house. Therefore I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the house adjourned at 5.00 p.m.

Monday, September 10, 1945.

The house met at three o'clock.

PRIVILEGE—MR. COLDWELL

REFUSAL OF ACCESS TO PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS BY CITIZENS SEEKING TO INTERVIEW MEMBERS

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I rise to refer to a matter affecting the privileges of parliament and of myself as a member of parliament. This morning, citizens who sought to interview members of parliament were stopped outside the entrances to this building—not within the precincts of the building, but on the outside near the doors. Among those who were stopped were the premier of Saskatchewan and a member of the legislative assembly, who were required to show some evidence that members of parliament wished to see them. I want to refer this to you, Mr. Speaker, as custodian of the rights of members of this house, because I believe that inquiry should be made and we should be informed under what authority and by whose direction this very extraordinary procedure was followed.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must inform the hon. member that this is the first time I have heard about the matter. I will confer with the Clerk of the House, and the Sergeant at Arms, whereupon I shall be pleased to give an answer to the hon. member.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): May I say a word as well in reply to my hon. friend? I am obliged to him for bringing up this matter. It is the first intimation I have had that anything of the kind had occurred, and I shall be happy to join with his Honour the Speaker in having the matter carefully looked into.

Mr. COLDWELL: Thank you.

DIVORCE

JURISDICTION OF COURTS IN PROVINCE OF MARRIED WOMAN'S DOMICILE

Mr. GEORGE BLACK (Yukon) moved for leave to introduce bill No. 2, to amend the Divorce Jurisdiction Act, 1930.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

CLOSING OF ARMY CAMPS—SERVICE PERSONNEL ON MAINTENANCE WORK

On the orders of the day:

Mr. CLARENCE GILLIS (Cape Breton South): May I be permitted to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence (Army) arising out of a telegram I received this morning. I sent a copy of it to the minister and therefore I will not quote it. It has reference to the closing out of army camps across Canada. Service personnel doing maintenance work and living in camp or barracks with their families are now being evicted, and in the section to which the telegram refers there is no available living space. These people are not able to get quarters. Can the minister inform the house what the government's policy or attitude is in a matter of this kind?

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of National Defence for Naval Services): As my hon. friend has stated, he was good enough to send me a copy of the telegram. I do not know the particular area to which he refers or the particular camp he has in mind, but the general policy is that in the case of rented premises watchmen are retained until such time as the premises are returned to the lessor. In the case of premises owned by the government, or premises constructed on leased land, watchmen or maintenance people are retained until such time as the premises are turned over to another government department or declared surplus and turned over under the Surplus Crown Assets Act to be disposed of by the war assets corporation. It is clear, I think, that it would not be possible for the Department of National Defence to retain the services of watchmen or to continue to provide accommodation for them after the particular premises have ceased to be administered by the Department of National Defence. If my hon. friend will give me the particular case he has in mind I will look into the circumstances, but that is the general policy so far as army premises are concerned.

Mr. GILLIS: It is in Sydney, Nova Scotia, the Royal Avenue barracks. Four families are affected.

DISCHARGE OR RELEASE OF PERSONNEL DESIROUS OF ATTENDING EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. A. KIDD (Kingston City): May I direct a question to the Minister of National Defence? Will the minister kindly inform the house whether steps can be taken to speed up the discharge or release from the service of members of the armed forces whose applications for discharge have been made, in order that they may attend or reenter university or other educational institutions? The matter is urgent in view of the shortness of time within which they must register at the university.

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of National Defence for Naval Services): I do not know whether anything can be done to speed up the existing procedure. As my hon. friend the member for Kingston City knows, the policy was announced a week or ten days ago whereby university students can obtain discharge from the army upon producing evidence that they have been accepted for the university or other educational institution which they propose to attend, and upon making application and producing that evidence they will be discharged immediately, subject always to the general conditions that, if they are performing some work in which it is essential that they should be retained for a short time, the application might have to be refused. I know of no case in which discharge has been refused. That policy has been in force only a week or ten days, and I am advised that it is operating fairly satisfactorily.

Mr. KIDD: Does this apply in the same way to the forces of the Pacific command now in training at Fort Benning, Georgia?

Mr. ABBOTT: These instructions have gone out to all commands.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: By leave of the house, will the minister allow a supplementary question? Does this rule apply to service personnel who desire to enter collegiates, intermediate schools? The reason I ask the question is that a number have been refused discharge who desire to enter collegiate rather than university.

Mr. ABBOTT: My hon. friend refers to collegiates. We have not that expression in my own province. I may say that it does not apply to high schools. The ruling is university or equivalent educational institution, which would be a technical school. It contemplates higher education as distinct from secondary schools.

NATIONAL WAR SERVICES

INQUIRY AS TO ABOLITION OF DEPARTMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (Macleod): I would ask the Prime Minister to clarify the situation respecting the Department of National

War Services. Do we understand that this department is now obsolete? If so, I would point out that there were certain branches that came under that department—I refer to the national film board and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. Under what department do they now come?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The department of war services remains under the Minister of National War Services until this parliament repeals the act establishing the department. The department will be abolished by a bill to be introduced into this house this session, and which, I presume, will be passed by both houses. Until that time the several agencies that are now under the war services department will remain there unless transferred under the transfer of duties act to some other department. If and when they are transferred the house will be advised, as I have advised it to-day with respect to some other transfers of governmental functions.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY

EMPLOYEES INVOLVED IN 1919 STRIKE—REQUEST FOR ROYAL COMMISSION ON PENSION RIGHTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. STANLEY KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): I wish to direct to the Prime Minister a question, notice of which I sent him earlier to-day. What consideration has been given to the request from the heads of a number of railroad unions for the establishment of a royal commission to investigate the matter of the reinstatement of the pension rights of Canadian Pacific employees who were involved in the general strike at Winnipeg in 1919? The Prime Minister indicated at the close of the last session that consideration would be given to this request. Can he now state whether the commission is to be established?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): My hon. friend inquired about this matter in April last. I am informed by the Department of Labour that one of its senior officials has been appointed to explore the situation. The official has been seeing the organizations concerned and has made an interim report to the department. He has indicated that he wishes to proceed further with his investigation. That is all the information I can give at the moment.

[Mr. Abbott.]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

SALE OF CROWN PLANTS—HONOURING OF UNION AGREEMENTS OF REEMPLOYMENT OF WORKERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ALISTAIR STEWART (Winnipeg North): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Reconstruction. Is it the policy of the government, as a condition of sale for crown plants, that union agreements at present in effect be honoured so that employees will be rehired on the basis of seniority?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction): Such a policy is obviously impossible of general application. For example, a plant which to-day is engaged in the electrical industry may be sold for a totally different industry which would qualify it for a union covered by another trade. There is no general application of such a policy where a plant is sold for continuance in the same industry. Indication is given to the buyer that we should be glad to see him adopt the same union and follow the same seniority practice as was followed by the previous owner, but that is not made a condition of the sale.

HOGS

PRODUCTION IN WESTERN CANADA TO MEET SHORTAGE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. H. CASTLEDEN (Yorkton): May I ask the Minister of Agriculture what steps are being taken to restore hog production in western Canada in order to meet the present shortage situation in Canada and in the devastated countries?

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): The question as submitted to me deals with all Canada. I presume the hon. member for Yorkton refers to all Canada, although he said western Canada—

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I so stated in the question.

Mr. GARDINER: He asks what steps are being taken to restore hog production in Canada to meet the present emergent shortage of meat in Canada and in the devastated countries. There is no shortage of meat in Canada. We have a very great surplus of meat in Canada. There is only one year in our history when we had a greater surplus than in 1945, and that was 1944, so that it is scarcely correct to say that there is an emer-

gent shortage of meat in Canada, but there is of course a shortage of meat in the devastated countries, and the amount that Canada is asked to provide to supply that shortage is about six per cent of the requirements. We are making every possible effort to get a production in Canada which will meet that requirement. The main provision to that end is the making of agreements in advance under which we can state to farmers across Canada the price they will be able to obtain for their product, at least twelve months in advance, or, as has been the case recently, twenty-four months in advance. They know when they are breeding and putting in stock for feed exactly what they will secure for them.

CIVIL AVIATION

WRANGELL, ALASKA—TELEGRAPH CREEK, B.C., AIR SERVICE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. G. ARCHIBALD (Skeena): I addressed two questions to the Minister of Reconstruction this morning. I do not know whether I wrote the wrong department or not. Is the minister aware that air service from Wrangell, Alaska to Telegraph Creek, B.C., has been discontinued because the air service operator formerly operating from Wrangell has been unable to obtain permission to cross the Canadian border?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not permitted to read a telegram or make a statement; he must just ask the question.

Mr. COLDWELL: The hon. member is reading a copy of the question he sent to the minister this morning, Mr. Speaker. It is not a telegram; the place is called Telegraph Creek.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: Residents of Telegraph Creek, an isolated community without any other means of transportation have petitioned the air transport board, but without result, even in grave emergencies affecting life and property. Will the minister give his immediate—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. HOWE: It is all right; I shall answer it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must remind the hon. member that he has not the right to make any statement or to give any explanation, but just to put his question, and put it briefly. That is the rule of the house.

[Mr. Hansell.]

Mr. ARCHIBALD: Will the minister give his immediate attention to this situation? The matter is urgent.

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction): The question involves a service with headquarters in the United States. By agreement between Canada and the United States an application by a United States company to operate into Canada must be filed with the civil aeronautics authority of the United States. That authority approaches Canada, and Canada either permits the service to operate or not. Thus by mutual agreement each air line must deal with the country of which it is a national. If the company in question will apply to the civil aeronautics authority, and the civil aeronautics authority communicate with Canada, we shall be very glad to give serious consideration to the matter. In the meantime I may say that Telegraph Creek is served regularly by a Canadian company, and I feel that the situation is not as grave as has been represented to the hon. member.

RADIO RANGE STATIONS AT SMITHERS AND TERRACE, B.C.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. G. ARCHIBALD (Skeena): What department takes responsibility for operation of radio range stations at Smithers and Terrace, B.C., and is the government going to operate them now that the war is over?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction): The department of which I am the minister has that responsibility. The radio ranges mentioned were operated as a war service when traffic was heavy. They are not warranted by ordinary bush service. They have been closed down and dismantled.

THE WAR

INQUIRY AS TO FORMAL ANNOUNCEMENT OF TERMINATION OF HOSTILITIES

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell) asked me a question on Friday and I said I would give him an answer a little later on. The question was:

It is expected that the government will make a formal announcement, so far as Canada is concerned, that the war is ended and, if so, when may we expect that announcement?

I would say to my hon. friend the question is one which in the opinion of the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) has many im-

plications. It will be necessary to have those implications carefully examined before an answer is made. I am giving the hon. member the statement at once in case he may wonder why a reply may be delayed.

Mr. ROWE: It is not going to be too soon this time.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Friday, September 7, consideration of the motion of Mr. W. M. Benidickson for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session.

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, for the first time in six years we are meeting here to-day in the atmosphere of a world at peace. After six years of conflict we find ourselves freed from the attack of enemies who would have deprived our lives of meaning and made of our institutions of government a hollow mockery.

For that deliverance we are indebted to the people of many lands and to the sons and daughters of many homes in Canada—a great multitude to whom history will apportion due praise.

The mention of their contributions takes us back in thought to some of the major incidents of the early days of the war—to Great Britain, for a time standing alone against the might of German arms, "the prisoner of her own historic greatness"; to the embattled republic of China which had carried the fight since 1932; to our great neighbour to the south, technically at peace but marshalling her tremendous strength for the decisive battles ahead; to another great ally—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—biding her own time to thwart the enemies' attack before joining the forces of freedom; at home a generation of gallant young men, of the navy, the army, and the air force, offering itself a living sacrifice to save our civilization from collapse.

To all these we owe the sincere tribute of a grateful nation. As for our own sons and daughters in uniform, they have put us forever in their debt. They have made us all more proud to call ourselves Canadians.

Nor should we forget the devotion to duty of the workers in the less perilous but equally exacting tasks of the farms, the mines, the factories, the offices and the laboratories. Without them our victory would not have been achieved. To them also is due the thanks of a whole people for tasks faithfully performed.

The spontaneous rejoicing of the nation was a welcome release from the discipline of war. But beneath the surface of it all, there lies a sombre undertone of seriousness. Men and women are counting the price of victory, measuring the sorrow and personal loss that all too often visited their homes, and laying plans to try to make the new day a better one.

It is in that atmosphere we gather here to-day—to try as best we can to mend the wreckage of the war years; we assemble here to take up the tasks of peace; we come to accept the challenge of a new day.

What is to be the answer of this nation to those in Canada who saved it from catastrophe and to those who will live with them; and to all the others who will follow after? That question brings us to the realities of to-day.

The answer of this house to the men who fought and to the men and women who made the equipment with which to fight, as well as to all others, cannot be made in words and high-sounding phrases or in tablets and monuments of bronze and stone. Comprehensive measures to make possible opportunity, useful jobs, needed production and assured security, particularly for those who return from war, for the wounded, and for the dependents of the fallen, is the only answer this parliament can give to those but for whose sacrifice we would not be here. It is needless to add that the same general objective must be our ambition for all others.

And a second answer we must give if we are to be worthy of these days. We must build an economy in which our people will have faith; a democracy in which we can all have confidence and a programme for Canada in which, on its fundamentals, we can all be united.

On such a basis we can build a new spirit of unity in Canada, a new sense of responsibility for public affairs, and a new vision of positive destiny for the nation.

The ideal state does not fall ready-made from the heavens. We gain it only at a great price.

Upon the members of this house therefore has fallen a great responsibility. It is that of making a worth-while contribution toward a more generally acceptable state at home, and the best possible relationship abroad.

Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, I look forward with eager anticipation to my work during the coming session of this parliament, not only with those who have sat in this chamber

in the past but, as well, with the new members who, like myself, are here for the first time.

To the members I see around me—the members of all political parties—I wish to say at once that I give to each of them credit for equal sincerity and honesty of purpose with my own. In the political parties and groups who occupy seats, both to your left and to your right, Mr. Speaker, I recognize one common objective, namely to promote what each conceives to be the best interests of our country and the well-being of our fellow citizens.

The function of His Majesty's Opposition in this house is one of great responsibility. If ever the function of an official opposition in parliament be reduced to a perfunctory role, the whole British common law structure, which secures to us so many of our individual liberties, will be in danger of falling into decay.

We have come here as individuals—we have come as individuals supporting the policies of one or other of the parties represented. I concede to each individual in every party credit for worthy motives. Where we differ is largely in the means to reach the desirable ends that most of us share in common. If we can but maintain a real democracy, what is best among us will in the long run come to the top.

As to the attitude of the official opposition to the government, I wish to say a word. We recognize that the government is carrying heavy responsibilities. That is inherent in the task it sought and was granted. It in no way excuses it from the consequences of its errors; it in no way justifies its wide departures from responsible government; it in no way warrants its excursions into dictatorial and bureaucratic methods.

It will be our purpose to assist the government to meet the problems it is facing. We are denied the right to assist in the formulation of government policy, denied also any share in the administration of that policy. But we are not denied the right to constructive criticism. That, in fact, is our duty.

We shall expect the government to present its programme and to take parliament fully into its confidence.

We shall look upon the members of the cabinet as a board of directors of a great national cooperative enterprise—a board of directors responsible for the economic health of the state. We look upon ourselves—and here I include all members of all groups—as representatives of the shareholders of that enterprise, the people of Canada.

In the interests of those whom we represent, we will want to know what is going on in the government. We will expect a discontinuance of dictatorial methods, a discontinuance of secrecy in matters of public concern, a discontinuance of government by order in council rather than by parliament, and a frank exposition of all matters affecting the people's interest.

The blanket denial of information on the flimsy excuse that it is not in the public interest will not be tolerated. The government does not own the assets it exacts from the people. It is but the trustee and custodian of them. How those assets are used must not longer be withheld from the people's knowledge.

Traditionally, the speech from the throne is supposed to give an outline of the government's policy. The speech before us to-day is longer, more vague, and has less substance than usual. I have seldom seen a government document which takes up so much space to say so little in so many words.

The first few paragraphs are good literature and good philosophy, chiefly on the subject of war. But they state no policy. Other paragraphs speak only of vague plans and pious hopes in the government's mind. As an example of this, we are told that the maintenance of long-term markets for our primary industries is receiving close attention. This is the same story the Prime Minister has been telling for the last twenty-five years.

Belated notice is taken of the acute problem of housing. But the fact is the government's housing programme is a flop. The words "too little and too late" fit the situation perfectly. There has been too much talk and propaganda and too little reality.

The veterans are to have a charter; all acts and administrative measures are to be put in one document instead of several. That is supposed to make a charter. The substance will be no different from at present but it will be handed to the returning veteran under the caption: "The Veterans' Charter." There is obviously no harm in doing this, but leaving the programme the same and calling it a charter in no way eliminates red tape or humanizes the administration of veterans' affairs, or makes rehabilitation measures more efficient.

The service and sacrifice of Canadians in the war are to be commemorated by the planned development and beautification, some time in the future, of the nation's capital. I agree wholly with the planned development and beautification of the national capital. I think the parliament of Canada ought to develop the

national capital and its surrounding area so as to worthily represent Canada, without using the excuse of a national war memorial to do it. It will not help the veteran vainly seeking housing accommodation in Saskatchewan or Nova Scotia, or any other province, to read that his service and sacrifice in war have been suitably commemorated by the beautification of Ottawa. The right kind of memorial to commemorate the service and sacrifice of the men and women who fought is a Canada of to-morrow with jobs, security and opportunity for all. One of the first concerns of all members of this house at this particular time ought to be the care and rehabilitation of war veterans.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the government's administration of its own plans has failed to meet the needs of returned service men and discharged war workers. Its policies, after the blueprint stage, have been fumbled in administration from beginning to to end.

One of the government's outstanding defaults, as far as veterans are concerned, is the general lack of accommodation for them on their return. The government spreads its propaganda to the four winds of heaven, telling about generous gratuities, while concealing the cruel fact that the gratuities of many veterans will be eaten up completely by the extra cost of building a home, due to increased building costs. From all indications, the situation is likely to be worse before it is better.

To produce prompt and adequate housing accommodation for all service men in need of it is the imperative and immediate duty of this government.

I want to say, with all the emphasis at my command, that this nation will not stand for any chiseling down of the promises and commitments made to service personnel while they were fighting our wars abroad.

I now come to another question—that of controls.

This nation has made it clear it does not want socialism. This nation has made it clear that the people are opposed to regimentation. They do not want to have bureaucratic controls in operation any longer than necessary. It is important, however, that the road from control to de-control be an orderly retreat and not a disorderly rout.

The scarcity of important basic materials rendered certain controls necessary, but, as someone has said, "coercion is insatiable." Controls seemed automatically to breed and multiply till they invaded practically every department of life and became almost intolerable, even in the patriotism of war time.

[Mr. Bracken.]

Moreover, the new controllers exercised powers quite unprecedented in our experience—powers which, in effect, were exercised free from the parliamentary control to which ministers of the crown are subject.

The public counts on these controls and controllers being removed as rapidly as possible. It seems clear that, as shortages were put forward as the justification for their imposition, controls should be removed as fast as shortages disappear.

While on the subject of controls, let me deal with one very controversial one. The government yesterday announced the introduction of meat rationing in Canada. I ask the government to make clear the answer to a simple question, which is being asked by both producers and consumers of meat all over this dominion: is meat rationing necessary? Does the government consider it is necessary? Many do, but many others question it. All will agree that food must be provided for the people of Britain and other countries whose populations have suffered so much in the war we fought together. In this respect we must see to it that Canada does her full share. Let us have no misunderstanding on that point. I know of no one who questions that policy, or who is opposed to seeing that Great Britain and our allies receive all that we can send them of our supplies.

If the government can show the necessity of meat rationing at this time when controls of this kind should normally be removed, then we must inquire why such a condition arose and who is responsible for it. If, to provide meat to Britain, there is need for rationing meat in Canada to-day, the blame can largely be laid at the door of the government itself for its failure to maintain hog production at higher levels. There is being produced in Canada this year much less bacon than a year ago. This is chiefly due to the government's policy of keeping hog prices so far out of line with feed prices as to discourage hog production.

Some two years ago, the government announced an export equalization bonus of fifteen cents per bushel for barley and ten cents for oats. Immediately farmers started to cut down hog production. They naturally took the higher price for grain, instead of feeding it to hogs. The government later gave a half-hearted recognition of the hog-raiser's position by announcing a $3 bonus on grade A hogs; but hog production continued to decline because the hog and coarse grain bonuses were out of balance. The final effects of this short-sighted policy started to show in the sharp decline in hog slaughterings in the fall of

1944. At the present time hog production is said to be down nearly a third—and the decline is continuing.

As I have said, many people think meat rationing is unnecessary. If meat rationing is not necessary, why put it on? If it is necessary, then the government is asking both the producer and the consumer of meat to submit to a rationing plan to cover up shortages in meat production brought on largely by a muddled and misguided government policy. If there is need for rationing, the government is, to a great extent, responsible for it.

There are two questions I want to ask the government in this connection. What is to be the effect of the rationing policies on small processors of meat? We are receiving complaints daily as to the inconvenience to which they and their customers are being put. And what is being done to avoid the bottlenecks at the larger slaughtering plants? Complaints are reaching us concerning the inconveniences to shippers and the losses through shrinkage resulting from delayed sales at some of the larger stock yards.

In parts of western Canada, there is a serious shortage of feed, and there will be a rush of cattle to the packers' plants in the fall. The smaller processors, both there and in the east, say they must buy within their quota, and the farmer and consumer both suffer.

In the August 15th issue of *Maclean's* magazine, I noticed a penetrating article on this subject. The writer of the article fears that rationing will be a stimulus to black market operations and that extensive policing measures may be necessary to prevent it. There are many who fear that the government's policy will result in such a black market condition as will be very difficult to control.

We must not let this immediate problem obscure entirely the long-range picture of live stock marketing. Cattlemen are fearful of the future of their market in the United States. What consideration has the government given to permitting at least token shipments to that country, for the purpose of helping to safeguard that market for the future? I am of opinion that we ought to seek freer access to that market for our future needs. As it is, I wonder if we are not in danger of losing that export market.

There is no matter on which there is greater unanimity in Canada than the feeling that there must be some reduction in the rates of income tax. With that view this party is in entire accord. Substantial tax relief is indicated from both Washington and Canberra.

We look upon the government as the custodian and trustee of the taxes it demands from the people. It can be prudent in spending them, or it can be wasteful. There are many who think the government has not always been prudent in its war expenditures. It is a common view that it has been wasteful of the hard-earned money it has taken from the taxpayer. In my judgment, it has been guilty of some extravagances unparalleled since confederation.

Everyone knows that modern wars come at a high cost. There will be no disposition to criticize the government for necessary war expenditures, but no one will excuse the government for waste or extravagance. There is a widespread feeling that the government has become so accustomed to huge expenditures that it cannot rid itself of the habit.

It is only necessary to point out what has happened in recent years to show the importance of this matter. Before the war, this government took from the people's pockets, in the form of taxes, in round figures some $440 million a year. Last year it took $2,440 million, or more than five times the pre-war amount. Before the war it taxed the incomes of only a quarter of a million people. Last year it taxed those of over two million people—or more than eight times as many. In the year 1938, this government spent some $530 million of the people's money. During the last fiscal year, 1944, it spent $5,300 million—or almost exactly ten times the pre-war expenditures.

Before the war, the government permitted the expenditures to be inquired into in the open. During the war, the government supporters denied the war expenditures committee the right to ask about war expenditures except behind closed doors. The consequence of all this is that the government has spent in the vicinity of $20,000 million in the last six years with but little public check upon it. That is more money than had previously been spent by all the governments of Canada since confederation. It is, in fact, nearly fifty per cent more in six years than in the whole seventy-two years of confederation which preceded them.

Last year the government taxed the people of Canada $2,400 millions, which is more than the total dominion taxes collected in the first fifty years of confederation. At the same time, during the past six years it has increased the annual debt from some $4,000 million to a

figure in the neighbourhood of four times that amount. In the face of all this, the government is now setting out on a huge programme that will involve expenditures probably three times as high as before the war. It is no wonder its Minister of Finance is seeking a way to excuse the government from making cuts in taxation of a size that the termination of the war should bring.

Mr. ILSLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I deny that I am seeking anything of the kind.

Mr. HOMUTH: You quibbled over it all the way.

Mr. ROWE: Don't deny the promises that were made before the election.

Mr. BRACKEN: The minister will have a chance to state what the reduction will be.

Mr. ILSLEY: Precisely.

Mr. BRACKEN: I gathered from the press of recent weeks that he is seeking an excuse to show why they will not be as great as the public were led to believe they would be from his own public utterances and the utterances of other hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. ILSLEY: On a question of privilege, I want to set this matter right at once.

Mr. HOMUTH: I rise to a point of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Sit down.

Mr. MACKENZIE: He is speaking on a question of privilege.

Mr. HOMUTH: The Minister of Finance has referred to—

Mr. ILSLEY: On a question of privilege.

Mr. HOMUTH: I rise to a point of order.

Mr. ILSLEY: It is clearly a question of privilege.

Mr. MACKENZIE: It certainly is.

Mr. HOMUTH: What do you know about it?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Far more than you do.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that the hon. member has given the minister permission to speak.

Mr. HOMUTH: I am not prepared to defer to the minister when I am right. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. ILSLEY: I do not think I need to argue the question. It is clearly a question of privilege, because as Minister of Finance I am being accused by the leader of the opposition of seeking to excuse the government from carrying out promises which the government made with respect to taxation before the election. I must answer that.

Mr. BRACKEN: I did not say that you were seeking to excuse the government from promises made before the election. Nothing like that can be found in my statement. I will quote from my statement as soon as you are finished.

Mr. ILSLEY: Apparently the hon. member is referring to a report of the remarks I made to a delegation from the trades and labour congress of Canada when I used the word "disappointed." I used the word "disappointed" in referring to the probable reaction of some people to what could be done toward specific proposals which were made by that delegation and other similar proposals if it was expected that they could all be met in full. One of those specific proposals was to raise the exemptions from taxation.

Mr. HOMUTH: Order. You cannot make a speech.

Mr. ROWE: That is the best apology you have ever made.

Mr. ILSLEY: One of those proposals was to raise the exemption for single persons to $1,000 and for married persons to $2,400. It was—

Mr. HOMUTH: I rise to a point of order. The minister has no right to make a speech on a question of privilege.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask the minister to be kind enough to be as brief as possible.

Mr. ILSLEY: I foresaw this situation. If I understand the rules at all I am strictly within my rights.

Mr. HOMUTH: You do not understand them, because you are certainly violating them.

Mr. ROWE: You have made four more excuses.

Mr. ILSLEY: No.

Mr. ROWE: Yes, you have.

Mr. ILSLEY: This delegation had made explicit demands for the abolition and reduction of taxation at the same time that they were requesting increased expenditures. Speaking with reference to these specific requests and similar demands, I said that some persons would be disappointed, having in mind that they could not all be met in full. That is the sole basis for the statement made by the leader of the opposition.

Mr. HOMUTH: I rise to a point of order. The minister should not make a speech. He has not stated his question of privilege.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes, I have.

Mr. SPEAKER: The minister asked the permission of the leader of the opposition to ask a question.

Mr. GRAYDON: No, he did not.

Mr. ROWE: He rose on a question of privilege.

Mr. ILSLEY: I rose on a question of privilege. I want to say with respect to the pre-election promises by the government on taxation that those promises were made by me. When the budget is introduced I shall be content to leave it to the judgment of the country as to whether they have been carried out.

Mr. BRACKEN: There was not in my remarks a single word about government promises with respect to taxes—not one.

An hon. MEMBER: Read it over again.

Mr. BRACKEN: Certainly I will read it over again; that is what I got up for. First I shall try to make clear just what statement my remarks were based upon. I am referring to the Ottawa *Citizen* of August 22 in which reference is made to a delegation which had visited the minister. The report states that the minister said these words, "Some would be disappointed when they see how much the government will be able to reduce taxation." I made no reference whatever to any political promises that my hon. friend made to the public of Canada.

Mr. MACKENZIE: They did, and that is why they are over there.

Mr. BRACKEN: This is the statement which I just made and about which there has been so much wasted time: "In the face of all this, the government is now setting out on a huge programme that will involve expenditures probably three times as high as before the war. It is no wonder its Minister of Finance is seeking a way to excuse the government from making cuts in taxation of a size that the termination of the war should bring." That is what I said, and that is what I believe. I give the government fair warning that unless there is brought down in the budget substantial relief from the burden of war time taxation there will be widespread resentment and bitterness from one end of this country to the other.

I wish now to touch briefly on another subject, that of dominion-provincial relations. The major set-back in the economy of certain provinces forced this issue to public attention in the nineteen thirties. The dominion appointed the Rowell-Sirois commission to study it. The commission took some years at the task, spending a considerable sum of money in the process and eventually reported. A dominion-provincial conference was called in 1940 to consider the report. The conference blew up, for reasons which need not here be explored. The war and the War Measures Act and a dominion-provincial taxation agreement met the needs for the time being.

But the war is now over. The dominion-provincial agreement will soon come to an end, and the War Measures Act must soon terminate. It is thus imperative that the situation be met soon—indeed, it has remained unsolved far too long already. So much is this the case that the dilatoriness of the dominion government in bringing the matter to a head is to-day largely responsible for the fact that the provinces are not in a position to lay sound plans for meeting their post-war responsibilities.

In August last, the dominion advanced certain new proposals. The provincial governments are now considering them. A progress meeting is planned for November, and no doubt other meetings later on.

I do not intend to deal with this matter further at this time, but there is one item in the government's proposals that I think should be mentioned.

The dominion proposes to pay an old age pension of $30 a month, commencing at age seventy, without a means test. This will be welcome, as far as it goes. Those who have had experience in administering old age pensions have found that the means test led many people to divest themselves of their property before they reached the age of eligibility for pension. On the other hand, many worthy citizens in need of a pension would not suffer the humiliation of meeting a means test.

There are good arguments, therefore, for abolishing the means test altogether and substituting for it, as the dominion proposals suggest, payments out of general taxation or a contributory old age pension scheme.

But the dominion proposes to require the provinces to pay fifty per cent of the cost of pensions for needy residents of the ages of sixty-five to sixty-nine and to leave the administration of this part of the scheme in the provinces. The dominion in this respect is not facing the problem at all. It does nothing to correct the errors of the past. The pernicious elements of the old system

are to be perpetuated and the dominion refuses to foot the pensions bill at sixty-five.

Its obvious dilemma is that it won't resist the pressure for pensions at sixty-five; and if it adopts pensions at sixty-five, it can't see its way clear to pay the whole bill, so it leaves the problem on the doorstep of the provinces to pay half the cost of pensioners from sixty-five to sixty-nine.

What must not be lost sight of in the discussion of dominion-provincial relations is that every person affected is a Canadian, no matter in what province he may live. What we must find is a way to see that no Canadian is denied a decent level of social services because of his geographic location or that he has to pay a confiscatory rate of taxation to secure it because geography finds him in a certain place.

The provinces have met the dominion. A constructive approach to the problem has been shown by all of the provinces. Let us hope that success will crown their deliberations and that sound progress in the way of repairing the weaknesses in our constitutional structure will not longer hamper the state in meeting the social and economic problems of the people.

The briefs submitted by the dominion government to the provinces on the occasion of that conference have dealt with a wide range of subjects of importance to the Dominion of Canada. One, however, is notably absent. There is no brief nor any reference book on international trade. It is true the provinces have no jurisdiction in that field, but it is equally true that the prosperity of every one of them is wrapped up in it.

Canada is the world's largest exporter of wheat, newsprint and non-ferrous metals, and one of the world's largest importers of coal, oil and steel products.

Under these conditions Canada is both a great exporting nation and an almost equally great importing nation. This means that both a high real national income and a high level of domestic employment will be most difficult, if not impossible, to achieve without maintaining a large volume of external trade. In this connection let me make it clear that we will support all reasonable measures put forward by the government to increase the general volume of international trade and Canada's share of it.

Admittedly, the problem ahead is not an easy one, and it is not a war problem. For a number of years prior to the outbreak of the war that has just ended, we had been losing our market in Britain for grain, milling and allied products. For years prior to the war, the lag in our exports of agricultural products was made up by an increase in our export of materials to make the instruments and tools of war. Now we have it on the authority of the Minister of Trade and Commerce that only 20 per cent of our war-time exports belong to the category of normal peace-time trade.

We must now face the fact that we have maintained an immense volume of export trade for years past largely by the simple expedient of giving our exports away; and this in some measure it is proposed that we continue to do, and with that I am in agreement.

Looking forward to the high levels of employment and national income upon which the validity of the dominion's proposals to the provinces are based, our present international trade position invites clarification.

What are the government's plans for restoring our normal export trade to Britain?

What are its proposals for increased trade with the United States and for meeting our obligations in New York, for which we can no longer count on the sterling balances we had before the war?

What are the government's plans for developing trade in the orient; in South America?

What is the government's plan for assisting in the development of economically undeveloped areas?

The present hope of civilization is that the resources of the world be put to use fully and effectively, and no country can have more to gain from this than Canada with its wide variety of natural resources.

We are to be asked to approve a measure to provide for Canadian participation in the international monetary fund and the bank of reconstruction and development, presumably the one agreed to at Bretton Woods. I do not anticipate that this parliament will refuse to give its assent to these proposals. The monetary proposals of Bretton Woods are predicated upon a world of order, peace and specialized production and trade. We must do our part to bring about such a world. There are many things to be done, however, and many measures of economic cooperation to be arrived at before that world will be achieved.

The use of atomic power for war and its prospective industrial use are sharp reminders that we face a new and different future. Science has made defence a collective problem. For their future safety, the nations of the earth must bind themselves to the principle of collective security.

As to how the measures to preserve peace which are embodied in the San Francisco

charter are to be made effective, we will expect more information from the government than his excellency's speech discloses.

It is not enough just to change the form of world security. The seeds of potential war are ever present in the world. For the moment they lie dormant. To see that they are sterilized for all time to come is the task of our day.

Signatures, even of fifty nations, on a page will not guarantee peace, even though the plans be well conceived. It is admitted that the document to be presented to us is not perfect. Nevertheless, it is a step toward peace—probably the longest step ever taken in the history of human affairs. This party intends to support the charter; and we trust it will have the unanimous approval of parliament. It provides a way by which to achieve and maintain peace, but it does not provide the will to peace—the will by which alone the nations of the world will avoid a clash of arms. World peace, desirable as it is, cannot be gained and kept by signatures on a page. That task remains and will remain a challenge to every generation of mankind as long as national boundaries exist and national selfishness prevails.

The seeds of war, unfortunately, are not sterilized by the ink of diplomats sitting around a table. They have been made to lie dormant for a time. Without the sterilizing influence of the will to peace on the part of the mass minds of every generation, they may spring to life again. Let us be thankful those seeds are dormant now. It remains for this generation to preserve and pass on to the next, and so on for all time, the spirit by which nations as well as men will settle their differences by conciliation rather than by resort to war.

Upon the major powers of to-day rests the future peace of the world. As long as the big nations stand together, there will be peace. If they fall out with one another, it will be a danger signal on the way to war. No nation or group of nations can stand against the united strength of the major powers. In their unity lies our hope; in their possible dissension our fears.

To me, Canada's mission in the world is clear. We must throw our weight wherever it will serve the will to permanent peace. That means sharing our proportionate burden of policing the world. It means trading with the world, wherever it can be done to mutual advantage. And it means looking upon other peoples as human beings even as we are human beings.

We meet here at a time when forms of government the world over are being tested and weighed in the balance. In so far as Canada is concerned, parliamentary institutions will either face to-day's challenge or they will disappear. The people are looking to parliament for enlightened, safe and progressive leadership; and they expect the members of this house to see that such leadership is given to the nation. Under our system of government, it is for the administration in power to bring forward its policies. It remains for us, as members, to support what is wise and to criticize what is imprudent in the proposals advanced.

As leader of the opposition, I accept on behalf of the party I lead the responsibilities that fall to our lot. The government may, therefore, count upon us for both constructive cooperation and constructive criticism. It is in that spirit that this party approaches the tasks of the challenging days ahead.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, there are a number of matters of policy and administration on which the government is subject to criticism. In closing these remarks, let me refer again to some of them.

One is the question of jobs. I say earnestly to the government that the one matter that must be made their concern above all others is to see to it that needed jobs are provided for those coming home from the war and for those who have been or may be dislocated because of the transition from war to peace. Whatever else the government may fail to do, failure in this respect will not be excused.

Another question is that of markets. The threat of the loss of markets—referring to exports—for farm and other products this government must take seriously. I am not suggesting that it does not. The farmers have borne their lot in this war with credit to themselves and to the country as a whole. They are fearful of what is going to happen to their markets. At the moment, live stock men particularly are concerned, recalling the history of the last war. Temporary transitional measures are not enough. The farmers will expect from their government policies that will give them confidence that markets at fair prices will be available in the future—not only immediately, but in the more distant future.

A third question is taxation. The people feel there should be considerable reductions, now that the burden of war is past. We shall expect, therefore, that substantial taxation relief will be included this session in the budget proposals.

A fourth is the matter of demobilization. The government's demobilization policy has been bedevilled by its own two-army system and by the lack of a rational man-power policy. The result is that there is criticism from one

end of the nation to the other, by the armed forces, as well as by their relatives and friends, especially with respect to discharge priorities. In particular, the overseas forces feel that they are not being fairly dealt with. Generally speaking, there has been altogether too much delay, too much confusion, and too little coordination in the government's demobilization policy.

Another is the matter of reconversion from war to peace. The government has no adequate, comprehensive and effective reconversion plans. The government war equipment plants are being closed and the men are told there are jobs if they will take them at the rates of remuneration that employers are willing to pay. There seems to be no adequate, coordinated plan even for giving advice and direction to returned men and men dislocated from war industries, who are now seeking jobs.

A sixth matter, and the last I shall mention, is that of housing. I will merely repeat that in its attempts to solve the housing problem the government is in serious default. Its plans are inadequate, its objectives will not be met, and the situation promises to be worse before it is better.

In view of what I have said, Mr. Speaker, I propose now to move an amendment to the address to be presented to his excellency. I wish, therefore, to move, seconded by the hon. member for Peel, that the following words be added to the said address:—

"We respectfully submit to Your Excellency that Your Excellency's advisers have:

(a) failed to demobilize our armed forces on a fair basis and, in particular, have failed to prevent serious disadvantage to overseas service personnel;

(b) failed to provide a speedy and effective plan of reconversion from war to peace, and failed in particular to join in partnership with labour and industry in devising a workable scheme to provide jobs, with fair wages, for discharged service personnel and war workers;

(c) failed to take adequate and timely action to meet the ever-mounting housing crisis."

That Mr. Speaker, is my motion, and with it I conclude my remarks.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I should like my first words this afternoon to be words of cordial greeting to my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) upon having assumed the office of leader of the opposition in this House of Commons. I congratulate him upon the confidence which his party has in him. May I say that, perhaps better than anyone else in this house, I am able to appreciate the great responsibility which he has assumed. My words of welcome are all the more emphatic in that I have been hoping for about two and a half years past to have the pleasure of extending this greeting.

Mr. ROWE: You are lucky to be doing it to-day.

Mr. BRACKEN: I am very glad to welcome the Prime Minister himself as the junior member of this parliament.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say to my hon. friends that the Winnipeg convention seems a long time ago. The leader of the opposition has just said to me that he welcomes me as the junior member. According to my recollection, it took only a few weeks for me to find my way back into parliament after I had met with defeat in my old constituency. It took him over two and a half years to gain admission to the House of Commons. However, I am quite sincere when I say, not only on my own behalf but on behalf of the party which I lead, that we are pleased to see the hon. gentleman in the seat which he occupies to-day.

With respect to what he has said as to the duties of the leader of the opposition, I have no exception whatever to take. The position of leader of the opposition is one that is recognized by statute. He holds an office in this house which is one of responsibility comparable in some respects with that of a minister of the crown; his is supposed to be a service to the House of Commons as a whole. In the obligation which is placed upon him of following closely the acts of the ministry, of constructive criticism as opportunity affords, that is a duty which we will expect him to perform, and will welcome his performance of it in full measure.

Before I comment on the speech of my hon. friend, may I join with him in the congratulations which he extended on Friday last to the mover and seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne. I should like to congratulate very warmly the two hon. members who spoke for the first time in this house on the excellence of the addresses which they made on that occasion. The hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Benidickson) moved the address, and it was seconded by the hon. member for Gaspe (Mr. Langlois). Both these gentlemen, in becoming modesty, credited the government with having desired to pay a compliment to their constituencies. That it was right and proper for them to believe. May I say, however, that the government had something more in mind in suggesting that they should open the debates in this particular session. What the government had in mind particularly was the feeling entertained I am sure

in all parts of this house, namely what is owing, above all else, to those who are or have been members of the armed forces of our country and have seen active service. We were glad indeed to recognize that both these hon. members had served Canada overseas in the great war just ended. It must be a source of pride to all hon. members of this House of Commons to realize, that between those who served in the first great war and those who served in the present war, there is in this house a total numbering, I believe, roughly something like one-third of its membership. That is the splendid contribution that those who are now actively engaged in serving the state in parliament have made toward the defence of their country and the defence of freedom in the greatest of wars in the world's history. It was definitely a desire to give that word of recognition to the armed forces which was primarily in the minds of the government.

There was also the desire to recognize the younger men who have come into parliament for the first time. One of many commendable features of the new house is that there has been introduced into the membership of the Commons a large number of new members, many of whom, as I have already said, have actively participated in war. They will now have to do with finding a solution for the problems which have arisen out of war. Few, if any, hon. members will be more qualified to speak with authority on war and post-war problems than those who have been in actual combat. I could not but be impressed in what both hon. members said, with the world outlook which their utterances revealed.

But may I say of the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River and the hon. member for Gaspe, that they were chosen to open the debates of this new parliament quite as much because of what of known ability and achievement they merited in their own right. I speak not only of the contribution each has made in the service he has rendered our country in war, but of the success which at an early age, each has attained in his particular profession. Both are gentlemen who have distinguished themselves in the academic world, and in their professions. I should like to congratulate each of them on having given so admirable an example to all of personal courage at a time of war and also of skill in debate in a first appearance in this House of Commons, as that which they gave to us on Friday last.

May I now come, Mr. Speaker, to the remarks of the leader of the opposition. Let me say, at once, that to a considerable portion of what my hon. friend has said this afternoon I not only take no exception but with it am in complete agreement. I was pleased to hear him, at the close of his address, speak as he did about the charter of the world security conference which will later be a matter for consideration by this parliament. I was glad to hear him say, speaking of the importance to the world of the success of that great new instrument for the maintenance of peace, that, if that new venture was to be of service to the world, we all must display the will to peace, and not trust too much to enactments of any kind. Sharing his views in that particular and realizing, as I know he does, how serious the situation is in the world to-day and will be for a long time to come, I do not think we can begin to exercise that will to peace too often, or too much among ourselves. It depends, in the last analysis, upon the attitude of individuals whether peace is to be maintained in this world. We have had six years of bitter strife which has left legacies of hatred and suspicion. Unless the world can be freed from this hatred and suspicion, all that legislators may attempt will be in vain. We shall have to make a beginning in this House of Commons in our controversies in relation to the problems that come before us. I confess that there is nothing that gives me more concern than to see, on the very morrow of the conclusion of this great war, the beginning of much that looks to me like an effort to intensify controversy in some of our domestic fields. The spirit of the approach to any question is going to be the test as to whether or not a solution of the problem can be found. I do appeal to hon. members on all sides of this house to realize that a war, such as this country and the worlld has gone through in the last six years, has left problems which will require, on the part of everyone having to do with public affairs, all of patience, of conciliation, of genuine friendship and of cooperation that it is possible for all to display.

My hon. friend in speaking of the speech from the throne mentioned its references to the war. He took exception to the length of the speech, and to its substance. He spoke of the first part of it, as I recollect his words, as being largely literature and philosophy. If my hon. friend will read again what appears in the first two pages of the speech, he will realize, I believe, that, far from its being mere literature or philosophy, it is the one tribute which above all is owing by parliament to the people of this country, a tribute which in words cannot be made too comprehensive or emphatic, having regard to what they signify. We have had six years of

war. In all its history the world has known nothing like it. Future generations and parliaments are going to turn back to the pages of the speech from the throne to see what in 1945 the Canadian people through the lips of the representative of the crown had to say of Canada's services and sacrifices, her contribution to freedom—in those momentous times. I venture to say that, in years to come, no words in any speech from the throne in Canada will attract more attention and more approval than the words my hon. friend has passed over as being merely literature and philosophy, but which, in reality, are an expression of this nation's obligation to those who offered their lives in this war, to those whose lives were sacrificed, to the bereaved, to those who were crippled and maimed and wounded, to those who to-day are looking so eagerly to their return to their home country after years of imprisonment in Japanese concentration camps and prisons. That is something of what is expressed in the early part of the speech from the throne, of what we feel we owe especially to those who have given their all or were prepared to give their all, that we might enjoy the freedom we have to-day.

But the speech in the introductory portion goes further than that. It seeks also to recognize the services of those who have worked in less conspicuous, more humble, but nevertheless very necessary ways to help win the war. I refer to the hundreds of thousands of workers on the farms, in our primary industries, in the shops, and factories and offices, to those who have served in the homes and in hospitals, to those who have made their several contributions in order that the men at the front might not lack support, to all in fact who saw that such contributions as it was possible for those in civil life to make to the winning of the war, were made in as full measure as possible.

I had the responsibility, Mr. Speaker, for the speech from the throne and for advising His Excellency to pay a special tribute to our warriors and our workers; I am sure hon. members of both houses of this parliament will wish above everything else to have it noted that among the first words uttered by His Excellency were those which gave expression on behalf of parliament to the country's gratitude.

To all who have contributed by service and sacrifice to victory, I would, in the name of parliament, express our country's gratitude.

I know the speech is lengthy. There is more than one reason for that. I have given one reason already, but let me enlarge upon it. At Westminster, Britain took the earliest opportunity to express its appreciation of the services rendered by the armed forces and those who had performed other essential tasks, by presenting a special, formal address to the King in language not very much different from what appears in our speech from the throne. More than that, the House of Commons and House of Lords, as a first act, once victory had been won, attended a service in Westminster in which they gave, as my hon. friend this afternoon has recognized is also given in our speech from the throne, an expression of thanks to Almighty God for His mercy in having saved the world from the appalling menace with which it was faced.

In view of the differences between our practices and those at Westminster the government did not consider it necessary to duplicate that procedure, but we have felt it desirable, and I am sure the nation will be pleased that it is so, to place formally on record in the speech from the throne the thanksgiving of the people of Canada to Almighty God for the great deliverance vouchsafed our country, along with other lands, and our profound appreciation of the service rendered by the armed forces of our country, together with our tribute to the men and women of Canada who, in other ways, have done what they could toward the winning of the war.

Let me pass now to the next part of my hon. friend's remarks. I think I can answer him very briefly and very effectively. Most of his time was spent in criticism of the government's policies with respect first to one subject and then to another. I have a list of them before me, but they will be remembered by all who heard him. As my hon. friend spoke it seemed to me I heard very distinct echoes of what he and members of his party had been saying, *ad nauseam*, months before the general election; and before, the people, who after all are the masters of parliament, had an opportunity to express their views. The people have pronounced on these matters and I am prepared to accept their verdict.

My hon. friend spoke about controls. He said the people had made it perfectly clear that they did not want, I think he said, anything in the way of, first, national socialism. That was directed, I imagine, toward my hon. friends of the C.C.F. party.

Mr. COLDWELL: I don't know why.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The next shot evidently was intended for the government. He spoke of bureaucratic control and of other things which he thought were not wanted by the people. May I say to my hon. friend that of things not wanted there is one thing that I think the Canadian people made very clear.

It is, that they do not want the Tory party —and that, by whatever name it may wish to call itself.

My hon. friend also waxed eloquent upon what members of the armed forces feel about the administration. Before the general elections, we heard him and members of his party say a great deal about what the armed forces thought of the government, and on the other hand what they believe the armed forces thought of the party of which he is the head. Well, I suggest that the figures in the returns which came in after the election must have occasioned a good deal of a surprise to the leader of the opposition. When my hon. friend criticizes the government's actions in respect of what it has sought to do to safeguard and further the interests of members of the armed forces, may I remind him of something which is a source of profound pride to me, namely, that in the general election the vote of the armed forces of Canada was, in largest numbers, in support of the present administration. Moreover, before he repeats what he said this afternoon, I suggest he ought not to forget that his own party received the smallest proportion of that vote.

My hon. friend next spoke about the government's housing policy. He called it "a flop"—"too little and too late". I wonder if he realized that it is less than three months since the people pronounced on the government's policies. During the time of the election much was said about the government's housing policy, about the inadequacy of demobilization, and many other matters. But the people of Canada did not take the narrow partisan view my hon. friend has been expressing to-day. They took the intelligent, wise and, may I say, liberal view as to how situations of the kind should be viewed, namely in the light of all with which the government has had to contend.

I wonder if the new leader of the opposition realizes what these years of war—six years—have placed by way of burden and obligation upon the government. Yes, six years of war; and I am wondering if his criticism has been fair in the light of that fact and all that it signifies. I am not asking to be free of criticism, or to have this party free of it, but I do say that it is due, perhaps not to me or to the government, but due to the country that those who criticize the administration should, at all times, remember the nature of the government's obligations over those six years.

Let me go a step further. Does my hon. friend realize that it is not yet a fortnight since the end of the war? Even yet surrenders are only just being made in some parts of the orient. To come forward with an amendment which says that the government:—

> . . . failed to demobilize our armed forces on a fair basis and, in particular, have failed to prevent serious disadvantage to overseas service personnel;
>
> (b) failed to provide a speedy and effective plan of reconversion from war to peace, and failed in particular to join in partnership with labour and industry in devising a workable scheme to provide jobs, with fair wages, for discharged service personnel and war workers;
>
> (c) failed to take adequate and timely action to meet the ever-mounting housing crisis . . .

I say that to come forward with that amendment within a few hours after the cessation of war does not commend itself, in my judgment, as being in the nature of disinterested or constructive cricticism.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): We did not think it would.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is rather in the nature of impetuous partisan criticism. I suggest it was hardly a good way for my hon. friend to begin, in his first address to the House of Commons.

I trust, when the amendment comes before the house for decision, hon. members will see that it gets just what it should get by way of support. I expect the friends of my hon. friend will join with him in supporting it. I should hope, however, that other hon. members will realize that, in a moment of transition from war to peace, no government on earth can begin to hope to satisfy everyone. We are prepared to be shown wherein mistakes have been made; but I would ask that, when hon. members criticize, they deal fairly with facts, at least for this particular session.

The problems now facing our country are in some respects going to be even more difficult of solution than were the great problems connected with the winning of the war. During war time a wealth of patriotism, for which we cannot be too thankful, exhibited itself. But now that the war is over, and the world is labouring in a great sea of unrest, following the storm through which it has passed, it is to be expected that many questions will be very difficult of solution. May I say that those who lend their voices to unnecessary and unjustified agitations may help to create situations which will be much more difficult to meet than they may have reason to expect. I speak with some knowledge of the problems remaining to be solved, realizing that we are only at the beginning of their solution. For that reason I would hope that hon. members will keep in mind the world situation as it is to-day.

Since V-E day, 120,500 armed services personnel have already been brought back

from overseas. I should have expected my hon. friend to mention a fact of that kind, to have commented upon it, to have wished the government well in its continued efforts. Had he done that, I believe the view the country would have taken of his first utterance would have been that at last we have in the leader of the opposition one who means what he says when he declares he intends to be constructively helpful to the administration. But, after his criticism of to-day, I doubt very much if that will be the view entertained.

In one respect I am going to follow an example set by my hon. friend to-day. His speech was brief, and I intend to make mine briefer still. I do that because I believe I have said in a word all that in answer to criticism it is necessary to say to-day, when I stated that the people themselves had very recently pronounced upon the government's action. And may I add that the electorate made its pronouncement after having at an earlier stage of the war also returned this administration to power. So far as I know there has not been anywhere else an administration which has contested two general elections during a war and which with a period of five years intervening has on both occasions been returned to power by the people. I prefer to let the people's verdict speak for itself rather than in any way to attempt to enlarge upon it.

My hon. friend has referred to taxation. Because he has been at the head of a government himself, I feel I ought to say something which he knows only too well. It is that taxation is dealt with not in the speech from the throne but in the budget. In order that my hon. friend and his party might not fall into the particular trap into which they have fallen to-day a clause was inserted in the speech from the throne which draws attention to that very fact.

I was surprised at the opinion which the leader of the opposition seemed to entertain of the intelligence of the members of the Commons when he began to tell them of the differences in amounts of expenditures and taxation between the last year preceding the war and the present time, between the last year of peace and what took place after six years of war. I could hardly believe that my hon. friend was speaking seriously, or that he had remembered that he had come into the House of Commons after leaving the provincial field where perhaps others would not be less critical of him, especially when he was at the head of a coalition government. But to-day he is speaking to members of many parties and from all parts of Canada. When he says that before the war so many millions were paid out and that, last year, so many billions were paid out; that present outlays are ten times the pre-war figure, I think I should say to him that he might well be thankful outlays are not a hundred times the pre-war figure. Instead of the administration having been extravagant, as he has implied, having regard to the magnitude of Canada's contribution I claim it has been exceedingly careful in its expenditures over the war period.

What about other countries? What will my hon. friend have to say with regard to the expenditures of other nations? What about the expenditures of the United States? What about the expenditures of the United Kingdom and of other nations involved in war? There have been vast expenditures everywhere. But I ask my hon. friend: what has been the result of these expenditures? What has been the effect of what this government has done with the public money of this country? It has been to make Canada's contribution to the war a contribution which has made Canada great in the eyes of the entire world. I say that the price which has been paid is a small price when one realizes that to-day we are enjoying liberty and freedom. I think we can honestly say that if the contribution which Canada has made—I am speaking of the people of Canada, the armed forces of Canada, not of the government—had not been made, if the sacrifices and services had not been given, it is exceedingly doubtful if to-day we would be rejoicing in the magnitude of the victory which the allied nations have won both in Europe and in Asia.

I shall leave to a more appropriate time any discussion of the dominion-provincial conference. That was another subject my hon. friend mentioned. I am happy to say that I believe a very promising start was made this year at the dominion-provincial conference. I do not think too much can be done on the part of provincial legislatures and by the dominion government to see that the excellent beginning which has been made is followed up in the spirit which was shown at that time in the endeavour to get together and to cooperate in solving these very difficult dominion-provincial questions.

My hon. friend said he noticed that in proposals placed before the conference the government policy made no reference to exports. That was surely an oversight on his part. I would direct the attention of my hon. friend to what is set forth on the very first page of the government proposals of Canada. There he will find it stated:

Opportunities for useful work and markets for agriculture and other primary industries are dependent upon remunerative outlets for the goods and services that are produced. At the height of the war effort almost one-half of the Canadian people obtained their incomes from the expenditures of the federal government. As war time government disbursements decline, opportunities and remunerative outlets must be found in the expansion of expenditures directly made by all the individuals and enterprises of the country for civilian needs and civilian purposes. The increased expenditures that replace war time outlays will have their source in the sales made into the export market, in a rising level of consumption, in private investment for the expansion of productive facilities, and in public investment for improving the productiveness of our natural resources and the construction of useful public works.

And a little further down:

First of all, the government will continue to press actively for wide collaboration among countries for the reduction and removal of world trade barriers. Even if this purpose is accomplished it will not meet all the problems with which we shall be confronted. In the immediate future and for some time after final victory in the Pacific indispensable customers, particularly the United Kingdom and countries on the continent of Europe, will not be able to make full cash payment for goods they will wish to buy from us. In order to alleviate the sufferings of liberated peoples, to help in the rehabilitation of devastated economies, and to establish the flow of peace time trade upon which we are dependent, Canada should be prepared in cooperation with other countries to grant further assistance and loans. Also, Canadian participation in the international monetary agreements are likely to involve extensions of credit. These are national responsibilities which the federal government must necessarily assume. By doing so we shall fulfil our international obligations and at the same time ensure adequate and continued opportunities for employment at home. It is essential that the federal treasury be in a position to carry these burdens.

If I wished to I could give other quotations from the same source. I might also touch upon other matters to which my hon. friend has referred, but I intend to keep the promise I have made to be brief. I shall therefore bring my remarks to an immediate close expressing the hope that hon. members of the house will profit by the example of brevity set by the leader of the opposition and myself and hasten the conclusion of the debate that we may get down to the business of the session just as soon as possible.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether I shall be following the example of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) and the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) this afternoon. I do not wish to speak at any great length, but their speeches have been so commendably short that I doubt very much whether I shall be able to equal the record they have established.

May I first of all on behalf of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation party congratulate the mover (Mr. Benidickson) and the seconder (Mr. Langlois) of the address in reply to the speech from the throne. I think it was fitting that two young men who have served this country during the war should have been selected for that honour. They performed their duty well, and may I say that it is no easy task but rather something of an ordeal to make a maiden speech in this house.

We join, too, with hon. members generally in expressing our thankfulness that since the last parliament was dissolved the war has been brought to a victorious conclusion. To those who have suffered bereavement, and to the men and women whose services have resulted in loss of life or impairment of limb, we express our grateful thanks, and to all who in many ways have served our common cause we wish to express our heartfelt appreciation.

But now the time has come for this nation to translate its sympathy, its gratitude, its thanks and its appreciation into concrete plans for the building of the bright new world which was promised during the war and which figured so largely in all pre-election speeches. The election of June 11 restored the Liberal party to power. It resulted, too, in some increase in the official opposition and quite a large increase, both in the popular vote and in membership in this house, of the party for which I have the honour to speak this afternoon. We more than doubled our popular vote in the country; and instead of electing only eight members, as we did in 1940, we elected twenty-eight. We were particularly pleased that the men and women who fought victoriously against fascism and nazism overseas gave our candidates a majority of their votes cast in the overseas regions over any other party. May I say that I think this was a fitting rebuke to those well-financed propagandists who did their best to vilify us and, by inference, those who share our views throughout the British commonwealth and the democratic world.

I think the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) this afternoon was incorrect when he stated that the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) referred to "national" socialism. I think he left the word "national" out and he spoke of the people of Canada not wishing socialism and, as he put it, regimentation. Well, Mr. Speaker, all I can say is this, that throughout the British commonwealth of nations, a group of nations which have always stood for the ultimate in democracy, to-day there are labour and socialist governments in Australia, New Zealand, and now lately in Great Britain, whereas in the same commonwealth only one government remains in power

which dares to admit that it is Conservative, and that government can be found in the province of Ontario.

During the election campaign we placed our ideas and proposals squarely before the people. They differed fundamentally from those of all other parties seeking the support of the country, and we are certain that time will demonstrate that our programme and policies are sound, offering the intelligent solution to the many grave problems which confront this country and, indeed, the world, problems which will have to be faced by all of us in the not far distant future.

I want to remind the government this afternoon that they have made specific and well understood promises regarding full employment, homes and social security. We do not believe that those promises can be realized without public enterprise and public national planning, and the nation will not forget those promises, even if the posters have disappeared from the billboards. On those billboards, let us remember, one word stood out above all others. You remember it? The word was j-o-b-s—jobs. But the government and all other parties except the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation proclaimed the view that capitalist free enterprise can and will provide the jobs. Well, it did not do so before the war, when hundreds of thousands of Canadians were unemployed and on relief. Then our hon. friend the new leader of the opposition was in power in Manitoba and his present friends were in power in Canada, to be followed by the right hon. gentleman who is again Prime Minister of Canada, under both of whom many thousands continued to be unemployed for months, even after the war began. Can the system they both support do any better now? I do not think so, nor indeed does the world generally. As I said a few moments ago, in our British commonwealth of nations only one admittedly Conservative government remains in power; that is in Ontario. The democratic movement that we represent in this house is one which world-wide reaction cannot stop. Reactionaries may, in some countries remote from the physical effects of war, continue their exploitation and their economic power for a time, but the handwriting is on the wall, and the day will come, and come soon, when it will be said of them that they have been "weighed in the balance and found wanting."

"Jobs and adequate incomes for all"—that was the government's pledge to the people. We will help them to fulfil that pledge in every way we can; yes, and we will continue day by day and week by week to demand that they do fulfil it. To achieve it, new jobs must be found for more than 2,000,000 people more than were employed in war-time civilian production.

I am not saying that a semblance of prosperity may not develop during the period when world reconstruction is in progress and the pent-up buying power and demand accumulated during the war are again factors in our domestic economy. But I believe that this will be followed by a slump which only large-scale public investment and expenditure under public ownership and control, carried out in conjunction with comprehensive national economic planning, will be able to mitigate.

Meantime, as the Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition both pointed out and admitted this afternoon, we are facing immediate problems resulting from the sudden cessation of hostilities and, I believe, the unpreparedness of the government to meet them.

The Canadian people have been led to believe that the Liberal party promised full employment and well-paid jobs under decent conditions of work, and in addition, all the benefits of collective bargaining, a voice in the management of industry, plus the prospect of gradually increasing wages and gradually decreasing hours of work.

What is the present situation? True, in spite of the deepening unemployment and serious housing shortage, the gracious speech adopts a tone of official satisfaction. It says:

> . . . Canada was prepared to meet the very difficult situations which would arise when victory had been won.

Referring specifically to housing, it speaks with satisfaction of "plans already in operation."

There is, then, smug satisfaction with obviously wholly inadequate policies and, second, no indication that further action is planned. This surely adds up to peace-time unpreparedness.

Let us consider the employment situation. If families could be fed, clothed, housed and kept together by the official assurances of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) and the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) there would be no employment problem to-day. The latest of these reassurances which I have seen states that there were 124,000 jobs to be filled and only 53,000 persons looking to fill them; so then, no unemployment problem!

But what are these jobs? Many are seasonal jobs when packing, harvesting, processing demands are exceptionally heavy. But there are physical difficulties for the worker in taking such seasonal jobs. He has to get to the place where he is wanted whereas war workers are concentrated in the areas where

they now live. If he accepts, it may mean, without government help, the uprooting and breaking up of both the home and the family. This will bring about grave social as well as economic problems.

Again, the types of work being offered often fail to fit the labour available. Unskilled factory workers cannot do skilled construction work. Sedentary workers and women cannot fill the demand for heavy labour.

Last and most important is the difference in pay between war work and the work now being offered. The main lay-offs have been in shipyards, where the average weekly wage was $40.48; aircraft, weekly wage, $37.50; chemicals, weekly wage, $34.37; automotive industry, weekly wage, $40.10. But the main permanent jobs being offered now are in textiles, weekly wage, $23.90 including overtime; hosiery and knit goods, weekly wage, $21.34; retail trades, weekly wage, $24.55; and so-called service industries, weekly wage, $19.61.

These figures are from the dominion bureau of statistics report on the employment situation for June, 1945; thus they may be taken as reliable.

Workers then can draw scant comfort from statements that there are more jobs available than persons to fill them. Families whose incomes have dropped by one-third and even by one-half cannot buy shelter and food at to-day's prices, and so we demand of the government that it make good its promises; and pending the adoption of a more comprehensive plan than we see placed before the country or foreshadowed in the house, we suggest the following:

First, that there be a lay-off or severance pay to provide $25 a week for all displaced workers until they are reemployed.

Second, that discharged veterans be paid full pay and allowances until reinstatement in civilian life, with the same minimum of $25 a week—and I shall deal with that more fully in a minute.

Third, that to maintain the purchasing power of Canadian farmers, floor prices for agriculture be extended and continued.

Fourth, that we have legislation to protect workers' and farmers' equities in their homes and to prevent evictions and foreclosures. I think that is most important because many war workers, owing to the housing situation, had to buy houses and make a down payment, and they did so thinking that their wages would enable them to continue their monthly, quarterly or yearly payments. To-day they find themselves out of work and are in danger of losing these homes unless adequate protection is given them.

Fifth, that immediate action be taken to raise wages in industries frozen at substandard levels.

Sixth, an extensive public low-rental housing programme which will provide both large-scale employment and urgently needed homes. The present policy of reliance on private enterprise will produce neither jobs nor homes in adequate numbers.

Other public projects which the government should undertake should be the construction of schools, hospitals, roads, rural electrification, irrigation and the like, and the reconversion of government-owned war plants under public ownership to open up new opportunities of employment.

This country requires a really planned programme of reconversion. At present the disposal of Canada's one billion dollar's worth of capital assets is on a completely unplanned basis. The white paper tabled last session was not a plan but merely a statement of objectives and not of methods. Any plan should provide for the welfare of workers affected by cutbacks and the cancellation of war orders and for the public and cooperative operation of valuable plants to meet peace-time needs. Instead of this, ministers simply repeat that there are plenty of jobs, which is cold comfort for those who, for various reasons, cannot find suitable work at wages sufficient to meet the obligations they have undertaken.

But equal to this failure to plan for suitable employment for war workers and returned veterans is the failure to make effective plans for housing. On this point the speech reveals no new plans for the future. On the contrary, it expresses satisfaction with the present plans, stating that the "plans already in operation provide for the expansion of home construction to keep pace with the increases in the output of building material."

The housing need, we are told, is five hundred thousand new homes—new homes now—and then building for a period of years at the rate of fifty thousand more each year. These are minimum figures. Now what has the government done to date? True, we have passed several acts of parliament, but acts of parliament will not provide houses. We expected that limited dividend corporations would be formed under the provisions of the National Housing Act, but so far, as far as I can learn, none have been organized. Wartime Housing, I believe, is building ten thousand inadequate houses, and the veterans' land administration only three thousand houses. Besides this, there has been a policy of going cap in hand to the insurance companies offering them a government-guaranteed return and permitting a de-

lay of more than a year since the passing of the National Housing Act in setting up a single limited dividend corporation. The result is that no home will be completed by a limited dividend corporation for weeks, and when the homes are completed they will not have been built in accordance with community needs but on the basis of private profit.

There is no reason to believe that the insurance companies will build low-rental houses, and those are the houses we need—housing available to the masses of the people who need it. Under the National Housing Act, insurance companies can obtain government loans to build houses costing $5,000, and these will be available only to those who can pay a rental of, say, $50 a month, or the upper fifteen per cent in the income tax brackets. These houses being built under the National Housing Act, as distinct from the limited dividend corporation, are not within the reach of most people who need them. Today a modern five-roomed house will cost about $6,000, and that is low. I understand that the loan may be $5,400, but this means that the buyer must find and pay down as a cash payment $1,100 and assume a mortgage of $4,300.

Including taxes this would involve a monthly payment of at least $35. We are told authoritatively that shelter should not exceed one-fifth of the income after taxes, so that such a contract should not be undertaken by any person whose income is less than $2,100 a year after taxes. Not one out of five of those who pay income taxes can afford this type of housing accommodation on that basis. The government has apparently set its face against public housing enterprises, refusing to allow municipalities to come under the act, as we urged last year, thus refusing to profit by the experience both of Great Britain and of New Zealand.

I am told that out of hundreds of veterans who have considered building under the National Housing Act only seventy have attempted it. The rest found that they could not meet the down payments and the monthly obligations; yet the nation cries aloud for decent homes, and veterans are returning to find their families and themselves without shelter.

In view of this situation I am going to move an amendment, seconded by the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis):

That all the words of the amendment after the word "that" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

We respectively submit, however, that in the opinion of this house Your Excellency's advisers have failed to propose the fundamental social and economic changes which alone can meet the pressing needs of the peace-time era upon which we have entered, and we urge that immediate steps be taken to assure full employment, adequate purchasing power, and a large-scale building programme that will provide urgently needed homes for the Canadian people.

The intimation that the various acts and orders in council relating to veterans' problems are to be consolidated into a veterans' charter is, I think, to be welcomed generally in this house. We should as soon as possible see, too, that all social security measures are consolidated into a similar comprehensive national charter. I wish to say now that the out-of-work benefits to unemployed war workers must be extended to veterans. The present provisions for returning men and women are inadequate. This is particularly apparent in the case of veterans who have decided to go on with their educational courses; $60 a month for a single person and $80 a month for a married man. That is not enough. A married man will have to pay rent for himself and family, more if he has a child or children, of at least $30 a month for unfurnished accommodation.

Mr. MACKENZIE: There are allowances for the children, too; my hon. friend knows that.

Mr. COLDWELL: Yes, but I am taking the amount of rent likely to be paid by a childless couple. I know that accommodation for a man and his wife will amount to at least $30 a month; that is, nearly one-third of his income must go for rent. His gratuity will under present prices—and remember they are still war-time prices—be absorbed in buying furniture, pots and pans and other household equipment. You have only to price the pots and pans in the hardware stores to-day to see that they are at inflated prices. At prevailing prices the married veterans, like the unplaced war worker, requires a minimum of at least $25 a week.

It is all very well for the government to refer to the general generosity of its proposals, but let me remind them of their promises: "Jobs at decent wages and adequate standards of living." We are merely asking that these promises be fulfilled.

When mentioning some veterans' problems I should like to make a plea for the men who have suffered as prisoners of war under the Japanese. Provision was to be made, the house will remember, to make an additional allowance to service personnel who volunteered for the Pacific war. If my memory serves me correctly, that was to date from sometime in June or the first of July of this year. If this is the case, the Hong Kong veterans would be ineligible. I am asking the government, if this is the case, to reconsider the matter.

To my mind they deserve all that we can do for them, and the least we can do is to make them eligible for all special payments provided for service in the Pacific from the day they embarked on their ill-fated expedition. The dependents of any who perished should be entitled to the payments the soldier would have received had he survived. This seems to me to be simple justice.

If we are to maintain decent standards of living and enable the people to build homes and buy the goods which our factories and mines can produce, they must have purchasing power. The government made the specific promise that taxes would be reduced. That should be honoured this session by raising the tax exemptions on single persons' incomes to not less than $1,200 and on incomes of married men and persons with dependents to not less than $2,000. These are the people who must spend practically all their incomes on consumable goods and hence buy things the making of which keeps industry and agriculture running. In other words, these are the people who will buy more food, more clothes, more shelter as they have more money to spend.

At the moment and for some time to come there will be a ready market for everything the farmer can produce. Though the war has brought welcome and temporary alleviation to the farmer's position in some respect, notably through higher prices and an increased demand for his products, basically there has been no permanent change in agriculture's relation to the rest of the Canadian economy. But the future prosperity of Canada requires the fullest development of Canadian agriculture. During the war the shortage of farm help increased the trend toward power farming, and now that machinery will become more readily available this trend will, I believe, continue and perhaps become still more accelerated.

This means that provided the farmer is guaranteed a fair share of the national income and decent conditions of life, he can produce not only all that we require to improve our own nutritional standards in this country, but to produce the vast quantities of food for a starving world. We were told at San Francisco that before the war two-thirds of the world's population were permanently underfed. Under the charter of the united nations, which we believe will be approved this session, we have obligated ourselves with other nations to maintain full employment and to raise the living standards all over the world. If we are to contribute our share, we must guarantee prices for farm products that will enable the farmer to enjoy conditions of life as good as those which are enjoyed by those who live well in our cities. This means many things: rural electrification, soil conservation, educational opportunity, attractive community life and ever-widening fields of cooperative endeavour. Because we can produce in great abundance farm commodities as well as many other natural products, and manufactured goods too now, Canada is vitally interested in world trade.

During the war much of our overseas trade has been in the form of mutual aid. These gifts received the almost unanimous support of parliament and country, but they cannot be a permanent policy. If we are to dispose of our surplus food and products abroad in the future, we shall have to receive goods in payment for them. In an intelligent economy this should be welcomed, because the more goods we receive in exchange for the goods we produce the higher our standards of living should become; but it will be some time before those who eat our food will be able to send us goods in return. With them we have been engaged in a common war effort; and we must join in the world-wide task of reconstruction. No nation, I should like to say, can be allowed to sink because of the generosity of her war effort. Indeed, no nation and no people can be permitted to languish in poverty if the other nations are to remain prosperous. Thus, speaking for our party, we are prepared to support arrangements for immediate and substantial loans to Great Britain and others of our suffering allies. These loans might be made without interest and repayable in securities or goods to be arranged at later dates. Indeed, such agreements are merely an application of a policy of enlightened self-interest.

This parliament will be required, as the Prime Minister said, to deal with matters of international importance. I note that the charter of the united nations which was signed at San Francisco is to be submitted for approval. That, I am certain, will be accorded. We shall also be asked to approve a measure to provide for Canada's participation in the Bretton Woods agreement for the establishment of an international monetary fund and a bank for reconstruction and development. In view of its important and complicated proposals I suggest that this agreement be placed before parliament at the earliest possible date, and referred forthwith to the banking and commerce committee, where the expert advisers who were present at Bretton Woods may be thoroughly and properly examined. After making some study of the proposals I am inclined to think that, balancing the good features against those which appear to be less desirable, the agreement may assist international exchanges and

make more adequate provision for international credit. But before we are asked to give it final approval careful inquiry should be made into its proposals and its implications. This can scarcely be done in a debate in this house or in committee of the whole, since the opinions of expert advisers would not be available here. The agreement should be studied by the banking and commerce committee, and I am not only suggesting but asking that this should be done.

Current proposals for the rehabilitation of the world economy, the united nations' charter, with its emphasis on the maintenance of peace and the necessity for raising living standards throughout the world, reflect the desire of mankind to avoid war and to eliminate its causes. Since the united nations conference at San Francisco thoughtful people have realized that much of what we determined there became obsolete when the first atomic bomb fell on Hiroshima. If emphasis were needed, the reports of the obliteration of Nagasaki in to-day's papers would be quite sufficient. The atomic bomb marks the end of many things. The power locked up in the atom has been released. All depends now on how we use it. It can become, when applied to peaceful needs, the great emancipator of mankind; but certainly marks the end of any attempt to keep the peace by balance of power methods. The threat of sudden attack in secrecy rules out such means entirely. Big national armies and mighty national navies would seem to be powerless against even a small air force or robot planes equipped with atomic bombs. Henceforth there seems to be no sane alternative except some body of government at the international level to remove the economic and social causes of war and to bring a rule of law to the whole wide world.

I spoke of the peace-time possibilities of atomic power. They depend upon the success of scientific research. Canada has reason to be proud of the contribution made by her scientists, many of them young men, during this war; but are we going to retain their services for the development of the great potential wealth of the country now? I am told that some of our talented young scientists are being lost to our public service and to Canada because the government has no definite plans for the national research council and continues to pay salaries that by any yardstick, before the war, during the war and now, are disgracefully low. Once they are lost it will be difficult to bring them back to do the public service many of them wish to do.

The speech from the throne foreshadows the beautification of this national capital, already beautiful in many respects, and its surroundings as a suitable war memorial. That is a noble idea, particularly if it begins with the substitution of decent homes for the fire traps that one can look out upon from these very buildings. Slum clearance, however, should be undertaken not as a memorial to the heroic dead but as justice to the living. In spite of these strictures, I think Canada deserves a beautiful national capital city. In addition, I should like to see here, and in each of our provincial capitals, a real centre of Canadian culture. We should have as part of our memorial a cultural centre to include a national theatre, a national library, a national art gallery and in time, subsidized from public funds, a national opera company, a national dramatic company, a national symphony orchestra and perhaps even a national ballet. If each province undertook a similar project Canada, with its diverse peoples, might become not only the centre of North America culture but the centre of a distinctive Canadian culture, marking its nationhood by more than a new Canadian flag.

It is time Canada, as an independent partner in the British commonwealth of nations, and recognized as a leader among the middle powers, assumed her rightful place among the nations. This war has shown that we can do big things in a big way when we try. I do not want to minimize what this country has done; I do not want to detract from any credit the government should get for what this country has done during the war. The speech from the throne says that steps already have been taken to plan and develop the region around the city of Ottawa on both sides of the river. In this connection let me add a note of disappointment in that the government has seen fit to go abroad for architectural assistance. There are Canadian architects and landspace artists, talented in town planning, able to reflect the spirit of their country, who have been active in study groups and associations in Toronto, Winnipeg, Vancouver, Montreal and, indeed, in this city of Ottawa. But whatever may be done here in the way of beautification, Mr. Speaker, as a memorial to those who have suffered throughout this war, I hope and pray that Canada's living sons and daughters may yet make this land itself a fitting memorial to those who died in what we believe to be a great and just cause.

Mr. SOLON E. LOW (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, allow me first to offer you my sincere congratulations upon your election to the highest office it is within the competence of this house to bestow upon one of its members. Let me assure you, sir, of my earnest desire to make the onerous duties that go

with your high office as much lighter as careful observance of the rules of order and considerate, forthright conduct will make them. I do hope that when you have served your term as Speaker of the House of Commons you will have accumulated a rich aggregate of pleasant memories and personal friendships. The start you have made assures me that you will serve with impartiality and distinction.

I wish also to congratulate the mover and seconder of the resolution now before us upon what I consider to be two able addresses. I listened with real interest to what they had to say, moved at times by the lofty sentiments they expressed and fully appreciating the smooth, easy and clear delivery of their messages. Almost they persuaded me to be a Liberal. Both hon. members demonstrated ably that the young men of this day are well prepared to make a valuable contribution to the enrichment of our national life. Of course one would not expect these young men to parade before the house the weaknesses of the government they were elected to support. That is expected from those on this side of the house, and doubtless hon. members here will take full advantage of their opportunities.

However, I should like to make it clear, in this my first real address in parliament, that in anything I shall say now or in the future by way of criticism I shall try to be eminently fair. I do not indulge in carping criticism, nor do I hurl poisoned personal harpoons. But that does not mean to say that I shall not be outspoken when I see in the government's actions, trends which in my humble judgment may militate against the welfare of the Canadian people. I do not believe in crying "peace" where there is no peace.

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to come into the House of Commons representing the people of the constituency of Peace River, which is at once one of the largest ridings in Canada and the last great frontier in the dominion. The immense possibilities of that great inland empire are just beginning to dawn upon the Canadian people. The richness of its fertile farm lands is unsurpassed in all America, a fact attested by the records of crop yields and superior quality grains that have captured scores of top honours at the leading shows and exhibitions of the world. We all remember with pride and thanksgiving the successes of Herman Trelle and the outstanding contribution to Canadian agriculture made by him on his farms at Wembley. We now mourn his untimely passing as the result of a most regrettable accident in California just recently. My friend Trelle and the soil and climate of the country of the mighty Peace, made a combination that has lifted Canadian prestige to a high level in the agricultural world.

Nature endowed the Peace River country not only with unsurpassed soil, sunshine and rainfall resources, but also abundant timber, fur-bearing animals and, doubtless, minerals of many varieties. But her greatest pride is her people. True pioneers with a vision of empire in their souls settled the country, as a result of the policy of the federal government in the days when Ottawa alone controlled the natural resources of the prairie provinces. They carved out homes and farms, towns and villages, through application of sheer determination and stubborn courage. And in spite of their hardships, their isolation, and the fact that their country and their pressing needs have been consistently ignored by the federal government, which alone must bear the responsibility for their settlement in the north country, the people of Peace River have maintained the true spirit and hospitality and friendliness of the pioneers; their cabin doors are never locked.

I said their country and its development have been consistently ignored down the years by Ottawa. The present Liberal government has since 1935 done nothing to remove the heavy transportation handicaps they have suffered since the first settlement in that section. Their most urgent need now is a rail outlet to the west, perhaps through Pine Pass, to link up with Prince George, British Columbia. Such a rail link would obviate the necessity of the long back-haul of three hundred miles to Edmonton.

Almost as urgent is a new and equitable schedule of freight rates; for in common with other parts of Alberta, the Peace River has been placed at the very peak of a most unfair and discriminating freight rate structure that throttles its development. Added to the natural disadvantage of its geographical position, a series of discriminating practices have grown up in the Canadian railway system which have the effect of favouring both central Canada and the coast province of British Columbia at the expense of the Peace River and Alberta generally. To these two grave problems, the sympathetic support of the government can bring satisfactory solution.

The Peace River cannot fulfil her destiny as a producer of an abundance of much-needed foodstuffs for the early alleviation of short world supply unless these needs, among others, are met. For the proper development of this

last great frontier where perhaps fifty thousand more people could settle in comfort and security, the rail outlet to the western seaboard and the revised freight structure are absolutely essential. Time will not permit me to enlarge on these matters now, but I have pledged myself to work unceasingly for them, and I am prepared to raise my voice on every possible occasion and to haunt the offices of those who have it in their power to do something about them, until the needs of my peeople are satisfied.

I wish here to thank the government for finally undertaking, jointly with the province of Alberta, to build the Grimshaw-Notikewin-Hay River road. This will play a big part in the development of the north as well as in making available to the rest of Canada the vast mineral wealth of the nothern territories. But the government need not have waited until they were facing an election to announce their participation in the project. Their sincerity would have been infinitely more impressive had they consented to join with Alberta on any one of the many occasions during the past eight years when that province attempted to interest Ottawa in undertaking to build the road.

I wish to identify myself with the expression of thanksgiving in the throne speech that tragic war has ceased and that final victory has come to the united nations. Surely it must be evident from the many miraculous events of the past six years that Almighty God has sustained our efforts, and that without His divine intervention civilization might have completely destroyed itself. It is no mere scientific accident in my opinion that the secret of the atomic bomb was discovered first by the Anglo-American people.

Mr. Speaker, my thanks go out also to the people of Canada whose magnificent war effort has aroused the admiration of the world. To the fighting men in all branches of the service, we owe a debt which I sincerely trust we shall acknowledge and pay, by adequate provision for their future happiness and security, no matter what that might cost us. My sincere sympathies go out to all those bereaved families whose sons, husbands, brothers or fathers will not return. So not to break faith with them who gave their lives that we might be free to choose our way of living, let us pledge ourselves not only to do our utmost to prevent a recurrence of tragic war, but also, what is more important and pressing, to get at and root out of our national life those things which are the real causes of war.

We whipped Germany completely in a military way. In fighting her we were fighting totalitarianism, which is centralization of power maintained by force. But though the combined military might of the united nations did vanquish Germany, yet there is still grave danger that nazism—what we fought Germany for—may win. For while we have been busy fighting centralization of power maintained by force abroad, more than a vestige of the evil has crept in at our back door here at home. Its cunning subversive propaganda has found ready response in the hearts of many unsuspecting Canadians, among whom I fear we must class the Liberal government. I do not believe it has been through malevolence on their part, nor do I like to think it is through stupidity, but the fact remains that the government has been drifting into totalitarian centralization, and we now even hear much about maintaining it "by force."

Considerable space is given in the throne speech to what the government has done. Claims are made there to great progress for Canada during the war years under the leadership of the Liberal government. But splendid as Canada's war effort has been, in many ways the general situation in Canada and in the world is infinitely worse than it was in 1939.

I find widespread among the people of Canada to-day a feeling that centralization within our country as well as on a world scale is inevitable. This "inevitability" psychology has resulted from the persistent and subtle propaganda of the enemies of true democracy over the years. It planted its roots deep in the frustration of the hungry thirties and it has fed on the bitterness engendered among Canadians by that sense of futility. It has made such great inroads among our people during the war years that I feel we face a dangerous situation as a result of it. What has this Liberal party and its government done about it? It has fought valiantly against the spreading fire by throwing gasoline on the flames. It has blundered into the position actually of a tool in the hands of the enemies of democracy by adopting a policy of centralization of power, and by its actions of helping to establish firmly among Canadians the feeling of the inevitability of centralization. Social Crediters in and out of the house have repeatedly warned the government about its dangerous drift.

In the first place the Liberal government itself was a victim of the psychology of futility during the period of 1935-39. This the Prime Minister admitted in his answers to the thirty-three questions in *Maclean's* magazine last spring. When the war broke out they began seriously to flirt with the centralization idea as a result of which they called the dominion-provincial conference in January, 1941, to consider the Rowell-Sirois

report. When that conference failed, under the stress of wartime needs this government began a surreptitious attack on the provinces to force transfer of taxation powers from the provinces to the dominion. They called the attack "taxation transfer agreements", but actually the provinces were put into the position of having to accept the dominion's proposal, "or else". Many of us said at that time that we would bet our shirts there would be a serious effort made by Ottawa to render the so-called temporary arrangement a permanent one, for we recognized the centralization policy which the government was following. It was only too obvious that though the Prime Minister had given much evidence of favouring fundamental reform of the financial system he was not able to get into office a Minister of Finance to support him in his desires. Rather, each finance minister in his turn preferred to juggle taxation fields, as if that could possibly by itself make available more money with which the various governments could run their business. Surely it must have been obvious all these years that it is the same people who are taxed, whether by province or dominion alone or by both in their own spheres, and it must also have been obvious that there is a limit beyond which we cannot go in heaping tax burdens upon our people. However, in spite of all that has been said about it, we now behold another attempt by this government to arrogate to the dominion, taxation authorities which belong by right to the provinces. This is another step toward centralization of power, which if carried into effect, will topple and destroy the last remaining columns of true democracy. No wonder many people think centralization inevitable.

I need only mention such things as selective service, compulsory unemployment insurance, compulsory health insurance schemes, Dumbarton Oaks and Bretton Woods, to further impress upon the people of Canada additional evidences of the trend of this government's mental drift. And I say with all the gravity at my command that centralization is not inevitable. Centralization is the very antithesis of true democracy. There are better ways of solving our problems, ways that will preserve the individual freedom of Canadians. I come of English stock on my mother's side and of stubborn Scottish in my father's line. One of my direct ancestors was among those who dipped quills and signed with their own blood a document resisting the centralizing encroachments of King Charles I. Perhaps that explains why I am a reformer. And now every drop of the blood of my ancestors cries out in me to resist to the utmost extent of my strength the Liberal government's policy of centralization of powers. I call upon all Canadians who are determined to preserve and apply in Canada, the principles of Christian democracy to contend against this dangerous policy of totalitarian centralization and to root it out of our national life forever.

Mr. Speaker, if it is your pleasure that we should now call it six o'clock perhaps you might follow the example in reverse of Joshua.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. LOW: Mr. Speaker, when the recess was called I was dealing with the problem of centralization. I should like now to turn for just a few moments to another important matter which is closely allied with centralization and which is of grave concern to the people of this land; I refer to the matter of taxation. My search in the throne speech failed to disclose any intention of the government to set about a reduction of the tremendous tax burden under which Canadians have been staggering these past years.

Many of us had hopes that, with the cessation of hostilities and with the consequent relaxation of serious war necessities, we might expect at least a start this session in the scaling down of taxation. Our hopes were somewhat encouraged by reports from Australia of a 12½ per cent reduction in personal income taxes and in a lowering of sales tax over quite a wide range of materials. It seems evident now, however, that we cannot expect a similar move by this government, at least at an early date. I am not unmindful at all of the substantial commitments already made by the present administration to meet post-war needs. With many of these commitments I find myself in substantial agreement. But here again I fear that the government have become confirmed victims of an inevitability complex, as if there were no better and other ways of meeting their commitments than by continuing to heap intolerable burdens of taxation upon the people.

If one takes the trouble to study the history of taxation in this country as well as in all other countries operating under the same vicious system of debt financing, he will find that the tax burdens have increased consistently decade after decade, through good times and bad, and through peace times as well as war times. I would not be so much concerned

about the matter of increasing rates and varieties of taxation if I did not know that an ever-increasing percentage of the national income is being taken by governments to carry on their business, and particularly to pay the growing tribute to the merchants of debt in the form of interest on our growing obligations.

I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that the only true way of ascertaining the burden of taxation is to measure it as a percentage of the national income. An examination of the figures for the years 1923, 1939 and 1944 will yield a good deal of food for thought. I chose 1923 because it is the earliest year for which figures representing the national income of Canada appear to be available. The year 1939 was chosen, of course, because it is the last pre-war year, and, of course, 1944 as the last fiscal year.

In 1923 the national income was, in round figures, $4,200,000,000. The tax revenues to the federal government for the same year were, in round figures, $154,020,000. Those taxes represented for that year 3-7/10th per cent of the national income. In 1939 what was the picture? The total national income was, in round figures, $4,553,602,000; the tax revenues were $436,000,000, and those figures represented 9-8/10ths per cent of the national income. In 1944, admittedly a war year, and a very heavy war year, the national income was estimated at approximately $9,000 millions; the total tax revenues were $2,283,000,000. Those taxes last year represented 25-3/10ths per cent of the national income. These tables show in twenty-one years an increase in the tax burden from 3-7/10ths per cent of the national income to 25-3/10ths per cent of the national income.

These figures, too, represent only what the federal government is exacting by way of tax toll. When we add to the schedules the aggregate of provincial and municipal taxes, the percentage of the national income taxed from the people in 1944 approaches close to fifty per cent of the national income; that is, fifty cents out of every dollar of income of the Canadian people.

I wonder just where we are heading. The taxation burdens of our Canadian people are intensified tremendously by debt financing; and I suggest that every hon. member acquaint himself with the debt history of Canada. From 1867 onward the total of all government debts in our country steadily mounted. For a number of years prior to the outbreak of world war II the aggregate of dominion, provincial and municipal debts increased each year by almost exactly the total amount of the interest on those debts, indicating the utter impossibility of paying even the interest on our obligations without resorting to taxation of confiscatory proportions. It is chiefly this ever-growing interest burden which causes the debt load, as measured in terms of a percentage of the national income, also to grow ever greater and more intolerable. Debt financing has failed.

In his last report to the United States congress, President Truman announced that an overwhelming portion of allied obligations of $42,000 millions worth of American lend-lease would be cancelled. President Truman further said that to add forty-two billions to the already enormous financial obligations of the allies would disrupt political stability. These debts had to be cancelled because they represent the utter failure of the debt finance system, which if pushed to its logical conclusion would destroy the economic as well as the political stability of the whole world. That debt finance system is basically unsound. Unless and until we make a new approach to public financing in Canada, an approach which relegates debt financing to the limbo of past nightmares, the Canadian people can have little hope for tax relief, especially if we are to keep up the services to anything like the level required for social justice to our people.

I am convinced that there is a better way than debt financing. My experiences of the last twelve years have intensified that conviction. If that better way is applied to our country an immediate downward revision of taxation will be possible. My colleagues and I will continue our fight for the application of that new principle of finance, which is simple, scientific, and easy to administer; for we are convinced that taxation of the punitive intensity we now suffer not only in the end-result makes men submissive and tolerant to the nefarious doctrine of the centralization of power, both national and international, but also enslaves mankind.

I turn for just one moment, Mr. Speaker, to another matter which was raised in the speech from the throne and about which I should like to speak briefly. I wish to commend the expressed intention of the government to take over the full cost of old age pensions and to abolish the means test. That is good so far as it goes, but it does not fill the need at all adequately. The Social Credit group in this house have always felt and do now feel that it will be necessary to lower the pensionable age to sixty years and to bring up the general pension to not less than $50 a month, and that, Mr. Speaker, without the means test.

The absolute necessity of a measure of this kind will become more apparent as the problem of unemployment develops to its full intensity under the discredited system of finance which this government persists in following. It may sound like a big undertaking to pay a pension

of not less than $50 to every Canadian of sixty and over, but in the light of the colossal gifts which we made to our enemies during the war, and to our friends in the same period—and in the giving, Mr. Speaker, made ourselves prosperous—the aggregate sum required to carry out the undertaking which we recommend in connection with old age pensions becomes quite commonplace. Some of my colleagues doubtless will deal with this subject more in detail when they take part in this debate.

There are other matters arising out of the throne speech with which I should like to deal, but I shall follow the example, the good example by the way, of those who have preceded me in this debate and cut my remarks short. Just allow me to say in conclusion that I have faith in this great land of ours, a land which I believe to be choice, above all other lands. I have faith in Canada and I believe that she can take her rightful place in the world community of nations and can in that world community of nations become a great power for good. I still have faith that Canadians will awaken to the needs of this most fateful hour in world history and apply the accumulated wisdom of the ages to avert the disaster of threatened victory of totalitarianism in the peace.

Some wise man has said:

Earth might be fair and all men glad and wise
Age after age their tragic empires rise
Built while they dream; and in their dreaming weep,
Would men but wake from out their haunted sleep
Earth might be fair, and all men glad and wise.

I look forward with faith to that day when Canadians will awake.

Mr. W. A. McMASTER (High Park): Mr. Speaker, a great many people will be surprised that I should intervene at this early stage of the debate, but I can assure you that the most surprised person is myself. That would not have been the case if those who are better fitted and who perhaps should have had the honour of intervening so early had been available. It just so happens, however, that they are not available and therefore I have been given this opportunity of addressing you. I do not think I could have addressed this house were it not for the feeling of elation I have had during the few days that I have been attending these sessions. I am a new member and after meeting the other members of my own party, many members of the other parties, some members of the senate and some officials in this building, I have been so elated that I thought I could even make a speech to those assembled here to-night. Otherwise I might have assumed my ordinary attitude of indifference and indolence.

I must ask your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, because I have been a member for only a few days, having attended only two sittings, so that if I err in my manner of speaking or in anything I say while addressing hon. members, you will correct me. If you do I shall accept the correction with the best grace, hoping that as you learn the duties of your office from time to time I may take the easier course of learning mine by observing what you do in the Chair rather than by any hard work of my own.

I listened to the Prime Minister asking the indulgence of members and I recalled that this same indulgence was asked for during many years of the war. I believe that in nearly every case it was granted by those who perhaps did not entirely agree with the right hon. gentleman's method of conducting the war. During the war, however, they were willing to subordinate their own ideas in order that the war might be carried to a successful conclusion. Now that the war is over he is again asking our indulgence. May I say this to him. If at an earlier period of the war he had accepted the help of those who were just as earnest and anxious as he was to win the war, and who could give as much as he or I could, and the help of those who, in the way of actual participation in the war could have given more, his burden would not have been so great; I probably would not be here to-night, and the country as a whole, as well as history, would perhaps have placed him in a higher niche that it will because he did not seek the assistance of those who were willing to help him in the past.

The hon. member who preceded me has spoken about the Peace River district and has used, with reference to that district, words which at the beginning of the century were often spoken about Canada as a whole. In other words, he has spoken of the great material wealth and the fine population of the Peace River district. In the old days when we spoke about Canada we referred to the material wealth, the great resources, of this country, but we always emphasized more than anything else the fact that the people as a whole were the greatest asset of the dominion and that in the character of people they were, the future of Canada was wrapped up. I believe that is still so.

As I listened to the hon. member speaking of the Peace River district he referred in glowing terms to that part of the country, and although I had not originally intended to do so, I decided that I would speak of my own riding of High Park. After all, High Park is a fine constituency and it has a fine name. "Peace River" are words we would like to hear in time of war, but High Park is a good name all the time.

I represent a constituency which is a very fair cross-section of the people, as representative as any that can be found in any city constituency. I am sure that these people would not want me to deal unfairly with those engaged in other occupations. They would want me to give due consideration to those engaged in mining, lumbering, forestry work, fishing and all other activities which it is not possible to find in High Park. This I shall keep in mind and give my best assistance in any legislation dealing with matters affecting other constituencies.

Something has been said by the Prime Minister about the vote of the soldiers overseas and a considerable amount of gratification was taken because of that vote. There may be certain reasons why the vote went as it did. I have interviewed people from overseas and have found that a great deal of confusion existed. For instance, in one case a soldier said that in his particular unit on the continent half voted C.C.F. and half voted Liberal. Those who were in favour of forcing everyone to go overseas voted C.C.F. and those who were not in favour of doing so voted Liberal. So that the people overseas were not particularly well informed about what the issues were at home. In fact, I have received word from men occupying the positions of heads of units of considerable size, as well as from men in the ranks, and they all are agreed that not sufficient information was given them to decide what was best for the country. There was a certain amount of information given, however, by members of the party now in power, as I understand by one of those who have returned.

I am informed that shortly before the election of June 11, certain members of the personnel of the Canadian army were given special instructions on the operation of the Veterans' Land Act. Those instructions were sent out in a book which I hold in my hand, which is designated 50M-944, issued under the authority of T. A. Crerar, Minister of Mines and Resources. This book gives a rosy view of what returned men might expect when they get home. I should like to refer to page 5 which speaks about men coming home and going into their own business and being able to buy a house with a small holding surrounding it in the vicinity of not only cities but smaller places. The government would buy these holdings, put up the money, and in time they would throw off $2,350. The original price is set at $6,000. It goes on to say:

> These small holdings will provide a wide range of opportunities for the veteran and his family, according to their aptitude and preference, to augment outside earnings. It may be from poultry, fruit, flowers, garden truck, bees or a combination of two or more of them. Financial assistance will not be available to inexperienced veterans to undertake specialized operations on a commercial scale because of the risks to which they may be exposed, but by starting in a small way the veteran and his family can assist themselves materially in the production of wholesome foodstuffs and by experimentation decide which side-line best fits in with their particular tastes and needs. In some cases the veteran will gradually transform his holding to a point where he can safely engage in specialized production as a full-time occupation and relinquish his outside employment; in others the veteran will prefer to remain in his ordinary occupation and use his holding as a home but with room to follow some interesting hobby in a healthy atmosphere.

This booklet was passed out shortly before the election. Hon. members can see that a man would have great difficulty in deciding whether the Liberal party was offering more when he came home than another party that had been bombarding them with literature in the preceding years. Perhaps that is why in the minds of the overseas veterans there were only two parties that were offering something material. I should say it is a strange thing that our party obtained as large a vote as it did from men who were ignorant of what our party's position in regard to them was and who were being bombarded with promises from the other two parties.

I wish to call attention to what I think is one glaring defect in this land settlement act. It will be noticed that it applies only to certain people. It applies only to a man who has a business in a town or city and who is willing to live some distance away on this property which was originally to consist of two acres, but which in actual practice has been reduced to half an acre. If a veteran has an automobile or the means of getting around to find a property which answers certain specifications—a house and half an acre of land—the government will buy it and in due time throw off $2,350, giving him an interest rate of three and a half per cent in the meantime. I believe the same thing applies to fishermen and men engaged in farming. My experience has been

this: I have found men who do not want to engage in either of those occupations, and they cannot take advantage of this act.

How about the man who, whose wife while he was away by dint of saving and working herself earned enough money to buy a home, so that when the husband came back he would have a home ready to live in. It would not be paid for by any means, but there would be a considerable equity in it. That wife and veteran do not receive one iota from this land settlement act. They will have only the gratuity and the other money that is payable under the Soldiers Rehabilitation Act. I think the first essential in any legislation of this kind is that it shall apply to all veterans. If any one man overseas is entitled to $2,350 and interest of three and a half per cent, then surely all the men overseas are entitled to it. I am afraid it will be found that the men who will take advantage of this are not the men who perhaps need it most, but men who can afford to live out in the country, men who have a car and can get into town to work; whereas the ordinary, hard-working, poor infantryman, or member of some branch of the service—and by the way they were told in the last war that they should have their heads read before they went into those services—will get little or no benefit from this act. I would respectfully submit that this act should be so amended that every soldier overseas should be able to take advantage of it, not from any consideration whether he is able to live near a city and get a job, but because by his work overseas he has earned it. If there is any difference between gifts to veterans I should say that the men who in the front line bore the heat and sweat of battle should be preferred rather than those who have the ability to take advantage of certain conditions that now apply. I would respectfully submit that the amendment moved by my leader to-day in regard to the treatment of veterans is justified by the manner in which this land act has been operated by the government to date.

The Prime Minister spoke of my leader as having rather rushed things by saying that demobilization had not been sufficiently gone on with and suggested that the cessation of hostilities was only a few days past, in fact only a few hours past. Yet in almost the next breath he stated that 120,500 men had been demobilized since V-E day. We all know that V-E day was, because of the action of the government, practically the end of hostilities. We all know that just before the last election a statement was made to the press and to the people that only thirty thousand men would be used in the Pacific theatre of war with proportionate number of men from other services. Therefore, so far as the people of Canada and the members of the forces were concerned the major operation of the war was ended on V-E day. If that is the case then my leader was justified in finding fault with what the government has done, not so much in what they perhaps have said they are going to do, but rather in what they have actually done.

I come from a riding which has equalled any other in so far as enlistment of men and contribution to the war effort are concerned; and I hear complaints all the time. The men who feel they are entitled to come back are kept there, on the ground that they are needed, that they are key-men. That can be said of any man. I suppose every man above the rank of private could be called a key-man. Even a private might have some qualifications that would enable them to keep him there against his desire. There is a great feeling of discontent on the part of these men over there and their families at home. A great deal of criticism is made of the demobilization scheme so far as it affects the man overseas.

I listened to the answer that was given by the Minister of Defence (Mr. Abbott) to the question as to university students. At that time I did not know I was going to speak to-night. I did not have enough nerve, or ability to get up and ask about one phase of the question which I believe will be rectified now when I bring it to the attention of the minister. When it was stated that university men could be discharged in order to go to the university there was a rider attached to it that they must have the consent of the university to accept them. Remember it was about August 27—it might be a day or two before—that this order was promulgated. Yet most universities demand that all applications be in by September 1. I was interested in a couple of boys who were able to get into university this fall. One father told me that it was only by accident that his boy got in. I believe he was in that famous city of Hamilton, where he happened to see the commanding officer and some other official whose consent was necessary. Because of this fortunate circumstance his son was able to get into university, but he told me that his boy had received some previous university training, and that if he had been given more time, instead of getting the boy in the first year he would have been able to get him in the second year.

This is not a political question. It is important to the youth of our country; it vitally affects those who wish to go to university, those who will become our leading citizens, become members of parliament and occupy other leading positions. Something should be done to see that every boy in the forces who desires a university education is given an opportunity to acquire it. There is also the question of the boys overseas who have had perhaps one year or two years in university. I happened to come in contact with one father while looking for another boy. I found that his son, who had a year or two in university, was still overseas. When I spoke to him about seeing what could be done in regard to getting the boy home he gave me this answer, which I think is important and probably represents the opinions of many others. He said, "My boy does not want any preferred treatment; he does not want to come back before his turn." That may be true. I do not know whether university education is more important to one of these boys than a job may be to someone else, but certainly I believe these boys should receive every consideration, and that boys desiring other special instruction in other walks of life should receive similar consideration. I have been told, and I believe it to be true, that there is in operation overseas what is called a khaki college; but how can such a college provide all the courses that will be required? One boy may desire to complete a course in political science; he may have been in his second year when he entered the service. I do not see how that boy could complete his course except by going to some institution other than the khaki college, which with all due respect, I do not think can operate with one hundred per cent efficiency, and which I am told covers only a course of the first year or two at college.

Then I do not understand why a boy should not be allowed to go on and complete his secondary school education. He has to be eighteen before he can enter the army, or seventeen if he enters with the consent of his parents. Surely secondary school education is essential in connection with a great many occupations and professions, and these boys are entitled to it. In Ontario the law demands that a boy go to school until he is sixteen, whether or not he is learning anything and whether or not be desires any further education. Surely when this matter is called to the attention of the government, as I am bringing it to their attention now, they will make a special effort to see that the boys who require secondary school education are given an opportunity to acquire it.

During the course of his remarks the Prime Minister said he believed in short speeches. I believe in them also, for a very personal reason, because I could not make a long speech if I tried. So I will follow his advice in at least one respect, but I should like to mention one other matter about which I feel quite strongly, for reasons I need not go into to-night; that is, the work of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell). Something occurred in these parliament buildings to-day about which I am not particularly proud. I need not say more about that, except to say that I believe it was a direct result of the sort of thing I am now going to mention. Sometimes I go to picture shows. My wife likes to go, and so do I. Sometimes I see something instructive relating to current events. The only way I ever saw the late President Roosevelt was on the screen, and occasionally I have seen other celebrities in the same way. One thing I disliked was that while the pictures of celebrities were shown they were not shown for long enough. You saw them for a minute and they were gone, though you felt that you would like to see them for a little longer and perhaps visit with them for a while, even if only on the screen. On one occasion I attended one of the theatres in High Park, where they have good family theatres. There I saw something which rather disturbed me. It was just about at the time of the by-election in Welland. I did not agree with the stand of the government in that by-election; I thought they were going the wrong way in governing this country during those strenuous days and, as I mentioned earlier in my remarks, I thought there should be ways of getting better men into the government. On this particular evening we saw on the screen a gentleman making an eloquent speech; I wish I could make one like it. His audience was a number of men working in the war plants of Hamilton. This was not a picture which just ran across the screen and vanished; it must have lasted five or six minutes, and it showed the men in the audience all wrapped up in what was being said by the speaker, who was the Minister of Labour. He said to them, "You are doing great work in this country. Your work is just as important, yes and more important, than the work of the soldier in battle." I thought to myself that if in that audience there was a father with a son overseas he should write his son to come back, to give up the $1.10 a day and get a good job in Hamilton and be really patriotic. Perhaps, however, that

father's idea of patriotism would differ from that of the Minister of Labour. I do not blame the minister for going over to Hamilton and trying to build up the morale of the workmen by telling them they were wonderful boys. It might help them and would not harm anybody else; but I could not understand why that particular picture should be shown on the screen before an audience in which there must have been the wives, fathers and children of soldiers. That was all wrong, and now we see the result of that sort of thing. "As ye sow, so shall ye also reap."

I said I intended to speak for only a short time. I am only one of some sixty-six members in this party, one of whom has already spoken. I think I have said about one-sixty-fifth of what could be said in this debate. I am not greedy; I believe in leaving something for the other fellow to say, so that I will resume my seat.

Mr. ELIE O. BERTRAND (Prescott) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, at the end of hostilities, after six years of war, it is my wish that my first words in this parliament should be uttered in thankfulness to Divine Providence for having protected the armies of the allied nations and given us victory over our enemies. It now behooves every citizen and every nation to contribute to the triumph of righteousness over the forces of evil. May that be accomplished and may Christian charity bestow to the world a truly enduring peace.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate you heartily on having been selected to preside over the debates of this house. The post which you occupy honours both yourself and your compatriots. We are pleased that it should have gone to one so competent to fill it.

(Text): Mr. Speaker, it was most pleasant on Friday last to hear the speeches of the mover and the seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne. In his maiden speech the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Benidickson) acquitted himself well, and upon his effort I congratulate him most sincerely. When he stood in his place in the house one could recognize at once the firm hand of the wing commander.

Then, the hon. member for Gaspe (Mr. Langlois), spoke well in his sea-going fashion. We could picture the Canada he served and loved when serving as a lieutenant in the R.C.N.V.R., and also the Canada he envisages for the future. We are pleased to welcome this nation-builder to our midst.

Speaking of nation-builders may I point out that, as its leader, the Liberal party has the greatest nation-builder Canada has ever had. He has helped to make Canada autonomous, a fact we are proud to acknowledge today. Among the component parts of the British commonwealth of nations he has placed Canada on a parity in all aspects of its domestic and external affairs. Under his guidance not the party in power but parliament, of its own free will, was permitted in 1939 to declare a state of war against our enemies. This is a fact which will always stand to the credit of our nation. Who among Canadians to-day has not been proud of Canada's war effort since that fateful year?

Now Canada rates as an adult nation among the countries of the world. During all this time the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has been able to keep Canada united, a task which in this country is not easy of achievement. We know the problems we have to face in our country, with its immense expanse of land, and with the different schools of thought found within its borders. But unity has been maintained by this nation-builder, our present Prime Minister.

Perhaps I would make my point stronger if I were to state that in world war I conscription had brought this nation close to civil conflict because of Quebec's stubborn opposition to that policy. At that time the rest of Canada favoured conscription.

Then, when world war II came along, despite the measure of conscription sponsored by the King government, he retained the confidence of the Canadian people at the election on June 11. Quebec had changed its mind to the extent of sending, to stand behind this man, nearly sixty supporters.

In the speech from the throne one could find many points which might be developed at this stage. However, as I do not purpose speaking at length I shall touch upon only one or two of them. I would first direct the attention of hon. members to a subject which I believe engages the attention and interest of all hon. members, namely, that having to do with the civil service. My further remarks will be directed to the matter of taxation.

Since 1918 we have had on the statute books of Canada a chapter known as the Civil Service Act. This is a statute which has received the approval of the whole of Canada's population, including that of members of the House of Commons, despite their criticism of it. At intervals it has been under review by a special committee of the house. The last report was made by a committee having as its chairman the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Fournier), who at this time holds the portfolio of Minister of Public Works.

I believe all of us will find that the work done by the several committees has been useful, first because of the publicity the committee meetings have been given in the press and, second, because of the suggestions made in those several committees to improve the working and the administration of the Civil Service Act. The publicity given the committee meetings has had the effect of making the public better acquainted with the vast amount of work done by and the difficult problems confronting the civil service commission.

All hon. members hope, as they grow older, that other days will bring new and even better ways of understanding among all concerned. At this point may I commend the wonderful work accomplished by the civil service commission since its inception, in giving to the public that type of service expected by the vast body of taxpayers.

It is because these taxpayers are at times hard to please that I should like to bring two or three points to the attention of the house. A. What preference or what is the preference which should be given in the future to our men who were in the service of His Majesty either in world war I or world war II? To my mind their status could be made much clearer than it has been made.

Looking over the Civil Service Act one would readily find that, under the provisions of section 28, those who resigned their positions to join the service of His Majesty in either war must be taken back into the service in a position at least equivalent to the one they left upon resigning to join the military service. It will be found in another section that men who had served overseas are to receive preference in respect of positions given under the Civil Service Act.

Section 30 of the regulations in the act states:

> 30. The names of persons in the service of His Majesty placed upon eligible lists under the provisions of section 28 of the Civil Service Act, shall be placed in the order of merit above all successful candidates at the examinations—

That means above civilian candidates.

> —and above persons whose names are placed upon the eligible lists under the provisions of section 54 of the Civil Service Act.

Section 54 refers to the abolition of positions in certain sections of the civil service. Consequently it means that men who have served in the services of His Majesty will have to be given preference over them. I really think this situation should be clarified in order that there may be a better understanding of the act on the part of hon. members of the House of Commons and the public generally.

B. The amended sections 20 and 32 of the Civil Service Act provide that local positions shall be filled by those possessing a knowledge of the language of the majority. That provision is easy to understand and it has been put into practice with a great deal of satisfaction in the last few years. However, nothing is said about positions at headquarters or at important branch offices or in senior positions of the service.

C. Do we know that when a department makes a requisition for personnel to the civil service commission it stipulates that a knowledge of English or French or both is required? It would appear that the civil service commission has very little responsibility in connection with these cases.

For the reasons I have just given, and many others, and for the benefit of hon. members and of those who expect to obtain positions in the civil service, I would venture to suggest that at the earliest convenient time during this session, or during next session if this is to be a short one, a special committee should be appointed to study and review the Civil Service Act and its regulations. This is a time when many changes will have to occur in order to establish a new order in the world and there should be a clear exposition before this committee of all that is to be expected from the civil service commission under the operation of the Civil Service Act and its regulations. This would be conducive to a better understanding by all concerned.

The second question I wish to deal with is just as ticklish as the one upon which I have just touched. Probably it is more so because it affects a greater number of persons. I refer to taxation. Something of taxation was said this afternoon and I should like to deal with just one phase of this matter. As was mentioned this afternoon by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken), the speech from the throne contains a paragraph which reads as follows:

> You will be asked to make financial provision for all essential services, also to meet expenditures arising out of the war, and for the purposes of reconstruction. My ministers' proposals with respect to taxation measures will be disclosed in the budget.

I am sure that all members of the house will be ready to approve the provision of all essential services, especially those having to do with the repatriation of men who are in the services. I know they will be ready to approve all measures necessary to help in establishing these men in civil life as well as for the purpose of reconstruction. I know they will be ready to approve any measures

that will help agriculture and other primary industries. No doubt at this stage the most imperative duty of the government of Canada is to preserve the reputation that this country gained during the last war. However, to do this the battle will have to be fought more at home than anywhere else.

We shall have to assure our population of the rational development of our national resources. We must make sure that the wheels of industry are kept humming. We must assure fair revenues to our primary industries and, above all, we must assure our people of jobs, as has been so well said this afternoon by the leader of the C.C.F. (Mr. Coldwell). Above all else, we must provide that high standard of living and the necessary social protection that will make for a satisfied population.

All of this will require expenditures and I think we all realize that this parliament is ready to approve such expenditures. I should like to repeat what the speech from the throne states with regard to taxation:

> My ministers' proposals with respect to taxation measures will be disclosed in the budget.

As we all know, when the budget is announced it immediately becomes law. It is then rather late to make suggestions. I listened this afternoon to the remark of the leader of the opposition in answer to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley). I think we all must realize that with the contribution this country has made toward the winning of the war there will be a future need for taxation. It is of no use to leave the people under the impression that taxation will be greatly reduced because to do that we would be using our influence as members of parliament to mislead the people. Our problem in the future will be much more delicate than the problem we had to face during the war. After the war our problem will not be one that can be answered by expenditures; it will be a problem that must be solved through the ability of our citizens and the use of our natural resources.

Mr. ROWE: We told them that before the election.

Mr. BERTRAND (Prescott): We made an appeal to the country on that basis and were elected.

Mr. ROWE: No, you did not; you said you would reduce them.

Mr. BERTRAND (Prescott): It is true we said that we would reduce taxation, but as the Minister of Finance told the house to-day this reduction might not be just as much as the people expected.

Mr. ROWE: In other words, he changed it right after the election.

Mr. BERTRAND (Prescott): The Minister of Finance—and this will readily answer my hon. friend—told a labour delegation that tax reductions on incomes would probably be disappointing to some. Let us be very careful about the wording: "disappointing to some." It is going to be disappointing to whoever tries to scratch his own sores and does not look at the welfare of the country at large. But in spite of this, people believe, and correctly so, that there will be some tax reductions. Among these reductions there is one—

Mr. ROWE: Be careful!

Mr. BERTRAND (Prescott): That is wise advice, and I thank my hon. friend for it. I say there is one which I claim is of capital importance. It is not so much taxation; it is to a degree exemption from taxation.

In 1942, when the budget was announced and the savings portion of income tax brought into force in this country, that very savings portion—I should like my fellow members to keep this in mind—was considered as a tax, so that exemption of $150 given to a married man for his wife, and $80 exemption on the progressive tax in respect of each child, applied equally on the savings portion as well as on the fixed tax portion. In 1943 that policy was in effect for a full year, but in 1944 announcement was made of the cancellation of the savings portion of the income tax for six months of the year. This in effect has reduced the exemptions granted for wife or children in the same proportion as the cancellation of the savings portion of the tax, so that the exemption to the married man was considerably reduced, and that of the bachelor not materially affected. May I tell hon. members at once, so that they will not wonder where I stand, that I am a married man. As I said, the position of the bachelor was not materially affected. I really believe that that was not the intention of the budget of 1944, and correspondence exchanged at that time with the Minister of Finance would lead me to think so. I hope that this situation has been under review since, and will be corrected this year.

At the present time one persistent rumour would advocate the cancellation of the normal tax in the coming budget. Because of this persistent rumour I believe it should be brought to the attention of this house, because if this were done without other corrections, it would be found that the reduction in tax would again be less to the married man and to the father of a family than to the bachelor. Again, I think the Minister of Finance would

not encourage a system whereby the father of a family would be compelled to limit the number of his children who would receive college or university education because of having to pay comparatively more than his share of taxation. If that were to become law, the 7 per cent normal tax for the married man would disappear. In the case of the bachelor, 7·8 to 9 per cent would be written off. The result would be a real benefit for persons without dependents but would be unfair to taxpayers with dependents, since they would actually suffer the loss of $28 per child; consequently they would be placed in a more difficult position as compared with this other class of our population.

Of course it is very difficult to make suggestions in the matter of taxation, because in a country like ours it has so many angles. Nevertheless I would venture to suggest that the following exemptions on income taxes should be not only considered but granted in the coming budget. I am not so much concerned with the criticism that we have not reduced the Income War Tax Act to the degree that people expect, because, after all, the people do not expect a real reduction of taxation on a large scale at this time. But I believe we should give a chance to the married man. The bachelor should be granted an exemption of $750 instead of the $660 he is receiving at the present time, and this should be doubled for the married man, which would give him a tax exemption of $1,500, and for each child below eighteen years of age or who is going to college or university there should be an exemption of $400, all of these to be reduced directly from the net income of the taxpayer. These, in my opinion, would be only fair, and would go a long way to help fathers of families and married people in this country, and I venture to add, would also make our worthy Minister of Finance a far more popular minister.

Many other problems could be dealt with at this stage, but the leader of the opposition gave us an example this afternoon which I think ought to be followed by back-benchers like myself. This example given by the leader of the opposition in making a short speech was followed by the Prime Minister; also the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation was not so long—I could have listened to him a little longer—and I suppose it behooves me to follow that example of brevity.

Yes, the problems we shall have to face in this parliament, and afterwards, are many. In my opinion the leader of the opposition, forgetting that we have been at war for six years, based his criticism more on political grounds than on any others. The leader of the C.C.F. tried to popularize his party by conveying the idea that people are suffering in this country, or at least that they have suffered and will suffer in the future. I do not believe that is the proper point of view which we should adopt in the interest of the future welfare of this country. The leader of the Social Credit party (Mr. Low), although he made a good impression, at least upon me, is still a provincial. In my opinion a few years or perhaps a few months of experience in this house will broaden his outlook as compared with the views he expressed in his speech this afternoon.

In this time of transition immediately following the end of the war many problems will have to be faced, but one can well say that Canada is prepared for any eventuality. For our returned men we have on our statute books about the most advanced legislation to aid their return to civil life that can be found in any country in the world. We have a Department of Reconstruction and Rehabilitation with a minister at its head who has proven his valour during the war while leading the Department of Munitions and Supply. We have at the head of the Department of Agriculture a minister as active as any minister of that department has ever been, and if there has been any prosperity to that class of our population one can well say that Jimmy Gardiner has done his bit. We have a Minister of Finance who has held out successfully against inflation, and whether the meaning of my words at this time is rightly understood by all, I suggest that the same minister who so successfully contended against inflation during the war will place this country in a position in which it will compare favourably wth any other country in the world. That is no mean compliment to pay one man and it is due to the Minister of Finance to make that statement. I have no doubt we can trust him in making Canada a prosperous country to live in now that victory has been achieved. But, above all, we have a Prime Minister who has given the best part of his life, which is not a few years, as anyone knows who is acquainted with his past record, in an effort to raise the standard of living of our people generally and to establish better relations between labour and industry. And what is more—and these are my concluding remarks—he has made of Canada an important nation of the new world.

Mr. J. O. PROBE (Regina City): In spite of the glowing account of my hon. friend opposite, who has in his dramatic manner told us that all is well within the confines

of our country, I wish to record, at this stage of the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne, certain observations that I know my constituents of Regina look upon as dealing in paramount fashion with the well-being of our city itself and which, while carrying special weight there, are typical of urban problems right across the Dominion of Canada, my hon. friend to the contrary notwithstanding.

These topics, to which I wish to refer sketchily, are full employment and housing. As an overseas veteran recently discharged, and with some four months' activity in the Department of Veterans Affairs attempting to settle some of our comrades' problems, I feel I can speak for that large body of younger men and women who are now looking to us to reabsorb them happily and satisfactorily in the peace-time life of our country. Nor, while I am a new member of this house, am I so naive as to feel I am going to alter very greatly the crystallized ideologies or the prejudices of the more mature and expert members.

The present government has assumed office on the pledge of full employment coupled with a rising level of social security, all placed on a free-enterprise platform. In a broadcast to our Saskatchewan citizens on the eve of election the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Mackenzie King) as well as the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner), as I remember, emphasized the fact that in the Liberal party were to be found business abilities which, by inference at least, were not to be found in the C.C.F. or in other parties asking for a mandate from the people, and which are so necessary in this imminent transition period from war to peace.

And so on June 11 the Canadian citizens gave the Liberal party its somewhat shaky and uncertain order to go ahead and finish the job of making Canada a place fit for heroes to live. The best planning efforts of the Liberal party in the transition period are, I think, in the matter of veterans affairs, with some rather important exceptions. I wish to congratulate the government on the gratuity principle, on the plan for continuance of interrupted vocational or university education of veterans, and on the idea at least embodied in the term "reestablishment credit".

One very great defect in the gratuity system implemented by the government is that with the changes from time to time in the clothing grant for example, varying from as little as $35 to a high of $100, certain inequalities have been caused to veterans, depending upon the date of discharge. I feel that this should be amended to bring every veteran, regardless of date of discharge, up to the maximum receivable, and I further suggest that this maximum of $100 is far too low at present prices for clothing to fulfil its purpose, that of decently outfitting a person as a civilian.

Then there is one special group, those who were called out under G.O. 139 and then discharged in the early years of the war. They have been entirely excluded from the application of the clothing benefit. They, too, have served and deserve as careful consideration as the veterans who by chance, were discharged more recently. The amount per month allotted to veterans attending university or taking vocational training, as pointed out by our leader this afternoon, is definitely inadequate for the purpose intended. I wish to repeat his proposal of this afternoon in this regard. He stated at that time that the pay and allowances of the service veterans should be used as the basis for continuance of education benefits, with a minimum of $25 a week, instead of having the present scale of $60 monthly for a single veteran, with $20 additional for a wife, $12 for a child, and so on. The reestablishment credit, which had as its purpose, I presume, from its name, the reestablishment of the veteran in his civilian business or other self-supporting capacity, does not make it possible for a man who wishes to go into private business to start off without great financial debts. If it is the government's desire to foster free enterprise so-called, it seems to me that returning veterans have been definitely discriminated against in the practice of the reestablishment credit benefits, which do not come even close to the cost of setting up in the simplest business.

Then the provision of $30 monthly pension for the dual service pensioner is another inadequacy if it is desired to keep together more than the body and soul of the veteran who has served in both wars. Why not provide this man with a pension adequate to maintain his self-respect and make him feel that his country did appreciate his sacrifices. Since election day, as indeed before, the rumblings in our part of the country, of this stormy, halting transition with unfulfilled and unfulfillable promises of the once mighty political party, legislating planlessly or with the limited plans of its planning bodies, were evident to Regina constituency. Rumours of impending lay-offs in our largest single employer, Regina Industries, were current as soon as Germany had surrendered. With an election in the offing the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) assured the premier of

Saskatchewan on May 14 last, that there would be no large scale lay-offs at this plant until October. But by June 18, a week after the election, a weekly schedule of discharge notices was reaching the employees, and to-day this plant, which in January, 1943, had a peak staff of fifteen hundred employees, has a skeleton crew turning out obsolete Bren gun tripods for the Chinese government.

I have been informed by Mr. Wyatt, president of the Regina Industries plant union, that the record of Regina Industries production is as creditable as that of any war plant in Canada. When our plant went into the production of six-pounders it was predicted by competent experts that Regina workers could not do the job, and yet they did it on a more favourable unit cost than even the Peterborough, Ontario, plant which had at that time some sort of record for efficiency. To all intents the efficiency of our Regina workmen has no place in the Canadian industrial economy following the reconversion period. For I have now been assured that the building which produced our quota of war materials will be henceforth used as a military ordnance repair depot, and the expensive government-owned equipment scrapped or shipped east for private factory replenishment in this area.

Some of the hon. members may recently have seen a replica of the Arromanches installation on exhibition at the Chateau Laurier or elsewhere. I saw the original when I landed on the Normandy beaches last summer, and marvelled at the ingenuity of the scientists and the engineers who had conceived the daring plan and put it into effect in that great invasion. If our Liberal friends are sincere in their desire to build a greater Canada I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that they invoke the assistance of men and women like those who built "Mulberry" in the business of rebuilding Canada. The magnitude of their task for the invasion of France did not appal them. The fact that it had never been done before was no deterrent, and as they gave no thought to the dollar costs in a war emergency I feel that we have people of their ilk who can and will build and plan as wisely in the peace-time production of Canada that we now desire to employ our workers' talents to their full.

To make Ottawa a memorial, as suggested in the speech from the throne, is a worthwhile undertaking; to make every community of Canada a living memorial to the wisdom of our statesmen is still more desirable. In the city of Regina as elsewhere, families of servicemen, as of others, are in immediate danger of being with no shelter of any kind against our Saskatchewan blizzards this coming winter. One family that I know, with five children, and the father employed in a bakery at $120 a month, was evicted in June from a rented shelter, and last week this family were still living in a tent provided by the city for them at the time of their eviction. There are other cases like that in the city of Regina. Wartime Housing is rushing to completion at its best speed some two hundred houses of substandard construction. Our city council is putting up some sixty two-room pre-fabricated shacks with no plumbing or indoor water facilities. A hundred and thirty-five civilian families had no accommodation in Regina a few weeks ago; 141 service families were registered in the city as having no winter accommodation; 411 returned families had applications in for housing, and the stream of men returning from overseas is not lessening. In spite of every effort on the part of citizens' committees of our city the army and air force quarters in Regina could not be secured for temporary easement of this situation; yet to-day's press contains a statement to the effect that these buildings, or those of them which are on private land, are to be turned over to War Assets Corporation for sale, dismantlement and removal to private individuals. And this with a western winter just around the corner!

Housing in all of Canada is a national emergency. We are well over half a million houses short of meeting Canada's present housing needs under any standard one wishes to set up. The obsolescence of buildings, coupled with a marriage rate for Canada in the past six years of over a hundred thousand yearly, creating need for dwellings in which to start their newly-wed careers, with returned men and women needing homes for the first time, with sensational building costs, with no government planning apparently to meet the emergency, with no stockpiles of suitable materials, with only insurance companies to look to for funds at high interest rates, we have the most glaring example of the inadequacy of capitalist enterprise to meet national needs.

May I say that according to the reconstruction report of this government, even in old Tory Britain in the twenty years before the war public bodies there, in a country committed to private enterprise, were building dwellings in the ratio of two to one compared with private investment companies. May I suggest to the government that it meet this problem as it claims to have met the problems of the war. I ask that the government take over as a national measure all problems connected with building. Finance the entire cost by an issue by the Bank of Canada, on a revolving fund basis, for, say, $500,000,000

yearly to be used to provide housing materials and erect the houses, for the next five years. Lend this money directly to the families in need of homes on a sliding interest scale of, say, three per cent for five years, two per cent for five years and one per cent for the balance of the amortization period of twenty or twenty-five years. Waive the requirement for down payments, which is the biggest single obstacle to building at the present time; and use the interest that has been charged the owner as an unemployment insurance fund to meet the payments as they become due if and when the home owner finds himself out of work. Turn the productive activities of our craftsmen to the making of materials on a huge national emergency basis. Put a proper price ceiling on the materials created. Encourage architects and town planning engineers to lay out homes in congenial, livable communities. Build these on a modern basis for use and for enjoyment, and you will meet an immediate need; you will eliminate most of the juvenile and adult moral delinquency which has been on the increase for the last number of years, which is caused by the unspeakable conditions in which the vast majority of Canadians now live.

If the government were to do this, the Prime Minister would have a more permanent and worth-while memorial, in the well-being of all Canadians, than the beautification of Ottawa, splendid as that idea may come to be.

Hon. PAUL MARTIN (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate I wish to join with those who have congratulated the mover and the seconder on their outstanding speeches, outstanding not only because they were delivered with great ability but because they represented a point of view which I think reflects the temper of present Canadian public opinion. These two hon. gentlemen, new members of this house, have made a contribution of which they may be very proud. It is a happy circumstance to know that not only do they come here as representatives of two important constituencies, those of Kenora-Rainy River and Gaspe, but they come also, together with other returned men in this parliament, as representatives of those Canadians on whom has vested the primary responsibility of making Canada's contribution to this war so successful and so memorable.

We begin a new parliament, sir, a parliament that will be faced, as indeed the world will be faced, with great and challenging problems which will deeply affect the welfare of our people and all the peoples of the world. I think one should not hesitate, however, to survey the past six years through which this country and the other free nations of the world have had to pass; fantastic years, in which in order to achieve victory governments and peoples were compelled to resort to measures which otherwise would not have been even contemplated. The change from a peace to a war economy which took place during 1939 and 1940 causes those years to stand out in bold relief, and must be remembered when we come to appraise the task that now lies before us. The united nations have won the war against great odds. They won largely because for the time being they were prepared to suspend their differences and overlook even conflicting ideologies in order to achieve a common purpose. The war was won largely because there was a determination on the part of the united nations to bring about a spirit of unity and cooperation. In this country and in this parliament, in spite of our political differences, in spite of the fact that some sit to your right, Mr. Speaker, and some to your left, as we look back over these six years of war I believe that as a people and as a parliament we may be proud of the contribution Canada has made. Canada can walk down the avenues of the world with her head high, and say to all who would look, "We are not ashamed of the contribution we have made." I think it only fair to the membership of this house that we say to those who sit opposite that the contribution of the opposition, the contribution of the government and the contribution of the people of Canada is something of which in the over-all picture, despite any differences that may have existed, we may all be proud.

There is a standard for the future. This government, faced with the tremendous responsibilities which it is assuming, can make its contribution more complete if it has the understanding and cooperation of all groups in the country and in this house. During the war that cooperation in its essentials was not lacking, and I would simply echo the hope expressed by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) this afternoon that in the deliberations of the future we may look forward to the same understanding and the same cooperation from hon. gentlemen opposite, so that together we may give the country the lead which I know it is prepared to accept.

In that spirit, Mr. Speaker, I have risen to discuss some problems which are of more than ordinary interest to this nation at the present time. Before doing so, however, because I believe leadership in a country does mean something; because if there is not faith in the institutions of government and in the

nation's public men there is bound to result a mischievous situation, might I say that it is a matter of no ordinary significance that for the fifth time in his career the present Prime Minister of Canada is charged with the responsibility of leading the government of this nation. In the history of our country few public men have been as richly endowed with the qualities of leadership which have enabled the Prime Minister to make his contribution to the progress of Canada.

In the speech from the throne an effort is made to give to Canadians generally the feeling that we belong to no mean nation. The problems that lie ahead are not going to be resolved if there is a lack of faith in ourselves or in our country. The fact is that at the end of the war we stand as one of the important nations of the world; fourth in the production of war minerals; well up as a naval and air power, and having contributed almost a million men and women to the armed services. We have a country of which we may be proud, and it is one of our responsibilities to see that Canada emerges along the lines which her greatness warrants.

It is for this reason that in the speech from the throne the government has sought to establish in the national life certain necessary symbols—symbols which will make every boy and girl and every adult in this country proud of the fact that they belong to Canada, that they belong to this nation now more than seventy-five years old, a nation which extends from sea to sea, and has not only a heritage but a future that is undoubted and unmistaken. To that end I do not think one should overlook the decision of the government to clarify and to regularize the status of Canadian citizenship.

We should not hesitate to acknowledge our responsibility as a member of the family of nations. But at the same time we should not hesitate to recognize the contribution this country has made throughout the war, a notable contribution which has won for this nation a true certificate of nationhood. The right to be able to call ourselves citizens of Canada is one which is in keeping with our dignity, in keeping with our achievements and in keeping with our aspirations.

During the war the government has been faced with the responsibility of directing the war effort of Canada. While the war was in progress it sought to anticipate some of the problems that would face us in the period of reconversion, and in the longer post-war period. We were in no different position from that of other countries. All one has to do is to read the newspapers and the reviews to see that the problems now facing us are the problems which are facing governments in other parts of the world. The problems facing us at this time are problems which are facing other governments with different social and economic ideologies. This seems the best proof that, no matter what one's basic political and social policy may be, one does not escape the mischief of the kind of problems with which, in this day, governments have to cope.

The government's plan of social security is one which is closely related to the present situation. It was this government which brought in the scheme of old age pensions, and it was this government which only recently made a proposal to make certain extensions in the old age pensions provision.

Our family allowances scheme, accepted in this house with only one dissentient, represents a forward measure which, in terms of public investment will result in an expenditure of $250 million a year, distributed among our people, particularly to the people who need assistance. This is indeed a form of public investment which one cannot look upon as only an idle gesture, but rather as one which has a definite relationship to some of the programmes upon which hon. members who have taken part thus far in the debate have suggested we must enter.

Unemployment insurance, introduced by the present government in 1941, at a time when the nations on our side were not certain of victory, when the problems of war were extremely difficult and hazardous, has resulted in the creation of a fund of a little less than $300 million. This was not offered as a means to cure, but as a means of relieving those who found themselves unemployed. Despite what one may think as to its adequacy, it is a measure which has gained an important function in our current situation.

The whole problem of reconversion, not without its difficulties, and not without creating its surpluses of man-power here and there—and I prefer to approach the problem squarely and factually—has had a real measure of success. In the language of the *Economist* of only two weeks ago our reconversion plans have been stamped by those associated with that responsible publication as being among the foremost and most responsible of those of any of the united nations.

While the war was on, in many plants we tapered off gradually to meet the problems which now face us. It should be remembered that difficulties attend other countries, as well as our own; and the fact that we have now in a number of localities a surplus of labour

is perhaps not all that one might desire. But in the light of the transfer from a war-time to a peace-time economy, no man in his right senses, attributing to governments all the frailties of human nature could expect that the situation would be basically at the moment otherwise. The fact is that this situation is true of other countries in the world. One has but to read the figures respecting reconversion in the Soviet Union, in Great Britain and in the United States, to realize that fact. I mention this, not to criticize their government, but to indicate the immensity and universal seriousness of the problem.

The government has not proceeded planlessly. The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), in his excellent contribution to the debate to-day, spoke about the desirability of planning. Well, planning in the sense of trying to be able to create a formula which will meet every situation, may be possible; but that kind of plan, in my judgment, would compromise something in which I know the hon. member is as much interested as I am, namely, man's most treasured right to human liberty.

The government to-day must, of course, plan. Planning, in the sense of preparation, planning in the sense of spending hours of study, hours of research, hours of blue-printing and all that sort of thing, are necessary to-day. That sort of thing, sir, is going on and has been going on in this country. One has only to examine the briefs submitted by this government at the preliminary conference held a short time ago between the dominion and the provincial governments to obtain evidence of the fact. I venture to suggest that the voluminous reports which are in the nature of briefs presented by this government to the provincial governments for their consideration, have, perhaps because of their voluminous character, not yet fully impressed themselves upon the membership of the house.

Those who have studied these briefs, those who have written about them—and I am not referring to anything of a partisan nature—have referred to them as perhaps the most important and significant proposals made by any country of the united nations since the end of the war.

Those proposals, in the provisions they make for social security, and in the provision they set up for adjustment of the relationships between the dominion and the provincial governments, along with the plans to meet the objective of high employment, are significant and represent the effort of this government to prepare and to plan for the challenging period that lies ahead. It does not help the situation very much to suggest that the government has no plan. The government has plans and a large part of those plans is embodied in the dominion-provincial proposals about which I would want to say something to-night in a general way.

The government states that when it confirmed by its signature the declaration of Philadelphia, when it gave expression to the Atlantic charter, when it went to San Francisco, when it joined with the other nations in urging a programme of high employment, the government meant to do that very thing. Its whole plans are designed for that very purpose. This government is determined that it be given a chance to implement these plans. This government is determined to implement these plans.

In the first instance the government affirms that its plans represent aims in the post-war period no less conclusive than in war. It is the aims of the government through these proposals to adapt the functions of the provincial and federal governments to the most practical considerations in order to achieve a high level of employment. One is constantly faced with the suggestion that while the government has waged a war diligently, while it has worked long hours and the like, it has brought no vigour to the kind of problem and to the situation now facing us in the world and at home.

At the civil service level, a civil service of which this country has every reason to be proud, there has been a painstaking effort along this very line. At the parliamentary level, through the reconstruction committees, many of the proposals of which are embodied in the government's programme, consideration has been given to the planning of this period of reconstruction and post-war. Then at the government level—as one member of this house who has recently joined the government I can say this—the head of this government is prepared to resort to those measures that will achieve the purpose. There is an abandoning of reaction. The administration is prepared to go boldly ahead. I was never more convinced of that than I have been since I have been a member of the government.

The government believes at the moment that the bulk of employment can be provided by giving private initiative an opportunity of providing that employment. In the period of the slack it is believed that the job can best be done through a system of public investment, to be implemented at the most opportune time to put the plan into effect with the best possible results.

There are certain circumstances and certain considerations that must be borne in mind. We must give to industry—by industry I do not mean only the factory; I mean agriculture as well—every opportunity to provide outlets for the goods and services produced. Every effort must be made to see that we recover our former markets among the nations of the world. This country, dependent as she is to the extent of thirty-five per cent of her national income on what she sells to other nations of the world, is dependent more than ever upon collaboration between nations, is dependent more than ever upon a satisfactory measure of commercial relations with other countries. During the war we had an expanded war production, and this places upon all of us the responsibility of seeing that there is afforded an opportunity of an increased output, for both domestic and export purposes, with a resulting increase in personal income for all Canadians.

Because of our dependence upon the export market the government is compelled, perhaps as it never has been compelled, to seek to have the most satisfactory relations with other countries of the world. To that end it is part of the policy of this government—perhaps no part of its endeavour is as important—to make sure that it does its bit in removing from commercial intercourse with other nations those needless trade barriers that have so often in the past proven to be provocative of friction and of trouble between nations. I think we cannot overlook the fact that this government has provided, along with only one other country of the world, Mutual Aid, as we call it, and has thereby created employment at home as well as provided assistance to our allies. This government will shortly embark on a programme of extensions of credit to other countries. This will have a two-fold objective. First, it will provide work at home and, at the same time, it will fulfil our humanitarian obligations to other nations.

When the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) —I hope I am not anticipating what he may say—brings down his programme of international credits there will be a more vivid realization of what this means in providing employment. We shall then realize the number of countries in the world that have often been extolled in this house as models, and who are now asking for credit to tide them over during the difficult period of the present and the immediate future. One will be amazed, first of all, at the extent of the requests made for financial help, and, second, that we have been expected and are able to meet these requests.

The relation of this to the securing of a high level of employment is that in providing these extensions of credit in amounts that are of very large proportions we are thereby furnishing an opportunity to our people to obtain a living for themselves and for their families through the work that will thus be created. As the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) has suggested to-day, and as the leader of the C.C.F. (Mr. Coldwell) has indicated, the government must be prepared to state in bold terms what it intends to do to meet this objective of a high level of employment. These objectives are to be found in the proposals of the government which were laid before the provinces.

This dominion-provincial conference, the preparatory stage of which has been set, at which the provinces were given an opportunity of learning what the federal government had in mind, will finally be resolved at a later date. It demonstrated a remarkable measure of understanding and cooperation between the ten governments of this country. This objective of a high level of employment the government proposed to meet, first, by facilitating private initiative in the production of employment; second, by promoting bold action by the state in those fields in which the public interest calls for public enterprise in national development; third, by providing through public investment employment for our human and physical resources when international and other conditions adversely affect employment and, fourth, by providing against age and uncertain individual risks, against such hazards and disabilities as unemployment, sickness and old age.

That statement which characterizes the government's programme is a statement which upon analysis will be found to be the kind of thing that has been suggested by several hon. members to-day. There is no effort to meet the problem by clinging to old labels or to old ideals. The government is determined, with its sense of responsibility in this situation, to resort to those measures, whether through public or private investment, which will provide our people with the kind of heritage and security which we all in this house, regardless of party, know they are entitled to and toward which we must aim. So it does not help to suggest that any one group has any exclusive panacea for many of these gigantic problems. Whether or not other parties in this house are prepared to resort to measures which are said to be unorthodox, to achieve these purposes, this government in its statement of policy laid before the dominion-provincial conference a course of action which, in the

language of one of the commentators, is as bold as any government in the united nations since the war has been prepared to embark upon.

Many of these problems which we face will not be solved without understanding and cooperation. They will not be solved by pitting one group against another, by creating needless suspicion or hate. The government believes that labour, which properly is looking for opportunities of income, is an important group in the community and in the nation. No man need apologize for the attitude of the Prime Minister in the whole period of his public life as to his attitude toward labour. No prime minister of this country has had a more sympathetic understanding of the right of the workers to protect themselves and to do so by means of organization. And I believe that no government has done more than the government under his direction to extend to that great body of Canadian citizens those rights which the trade union organization of this country has persisted over the years in trying to obtain, and which in its broad essentials has now obtained.

During the war the government recognized the desirability of cooperation between labour and management—between labour, management and the government in the prosecution of the common endeavour. At the beginning of the war it said to employers, "We recognize the desirability of employers entering into collective bargaining arrangements with the workers." A few years after the war began, recognizing that there were sources of friction between management and labour, in the adoption of P.C. 1003 it did something which labour leaders, including the president of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, the heads of the Canadian Congress of Labour, and other groups, recognized as having provided labour at long last, on a national basis, with a charter in which there was adequate recognition of labour's rights as well as its responsibilities. With the extension of that principle through labour-management production committees, industrial councils and the like there was reflected the determination of the government during war and peace to give industry direction and leadership whereby it hoped that labour, management and capital would be able to work along lines of common endeavour instead of at cross-purposes.

Labour has made great gains during the war. The trades union membership of 300,000 in 1939 has risen to a little over 700,000 at the end of the war. These are gains which should not frighten anybody. A strong trade union movement is a good thing for Canada, and the government believes that it can achieve for labour and, indeed, for Canada gains which are legitimately theirs. In its plan of reconversion and other post-war measures the government proposes to encourage the same cooperation between labour and management which it has sought to achieve with the help of labour itself during the war. Without this understanding there will be no solution of the kind of problems which face us in this debate and during these days.

The Minister of Supply and Reconstruction (Mr. Howe), under whose direction Canada's war production attained tremendous proportions, has instituted the principle of industrial councils. To some, the progress resulting from this endeavour may not seem as great as was anticipated. A problem remains to be faced. Perhaps more can be accomplished through the agency of conciliation and persuasion than by any other method. The satisfactory relations between employers and workers in Great Britain and in other older countries have resulted from a policy of persuasion and conciliation. In the opinion of this government the problems which fifty years ago attended labour and management in Britain, and which now face our newer country, can be dealt with in the same measure and through the same agency. In meeting this problem, as a member of this government, I say to this house, as the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) will say when he comes to speak, this government is determined to exert its utmost power to see that the gains of labour are not lost, that labour shall not be compelled to forfeit its right to bargain, to protect itself through its own organization along designated lines, and if existing legislation does not seem always to be adequate to the occasion, upon the presentation of suggestions for improvement the fullest consideration is given to them by the departments concerned. This was revealed in the statement of the Minister of Labour as to proposals laid before the provinces in the recent conference, proposals embodying changes in labour legislation which will depend upon the attitude not only of this government and of labour, but of the provinces themselves, to whom under our constitution is reserved the important field of labour legislation.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, taking the cue from the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar, that you cannot have a satisfactory solution of the problems of reconversion unless there is a proper relationship between the government and labour and between management and labour. I take the cue and say that this

government is determined to do everything within its power to see that these relations are satisfactory and are maintained. It wishes to guarantee to labour the right to organize; it wishes to give labour an opportunity of sitting down with government and with industry, of being informed of its problems, its purposes and its intentions. It means to make labour a partner in the great effort which now faces this country.

I say these things because they are basic in a successful handling of the tremendous problems which face us at the moment and in the months that lie immediately ahead.

The Prime Minister, with representatives of the party led by the leader of the opposition and the party of which the C.C.F. leader is the head, went to San Francisco a few months ago to make a contribution, with the other free nations of the world, to a mechanism to maintain order among the nations of the world. In a debate like this, where the government's general policies are being outlined, is it amiss to rise in one's place and say that we have reason to be proud of the part which that delegation played at San Francisco? The contribution made by the Prime Minister, the contribution made by every other member of the delegation, including the former acting leader of the Progressive Conservative party, and the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation were notable. And if that organization, the united nations charter, does not emerge with success, none of these problems that we have discussed here will succeed. For never in the history of the world were we so dependent for security at home as we are to-day upon the measure of collaboration which must persist between ourselves and other countries of the world. That is why basically in the government's post-war plans, in the government's reconversion plans, is its policy of collaboration with the other nations of the world so integral.

I would call the attention of the house particularly to the contribution made by Canada to the framework of the social and economic council, a social and economic council designed by the nations to provide on an international level for those policies which will give opportunity to the various countries to furnish high levels of employment and to make provision for social security. In the language of Mr. Evatt, no country made a greater contribution to the important work of the social and economic council than did Canada. In fact, in the present provisions of the social and economic council dealing with measures for high employment, dealing with measures for better working hours, dealing with measures for better health, nutrition and so on, Canada was responsible practically for rewriting the whole Dumbarton Oaks proposals which were presented to the San Francisco conference and now form a part of that charter which was intended by article 5 of the Atlantic charter to be given to the masses of the world. Therefore, in considering this post-war policy, in considering this policy of reconversion, one should not hesitate to mention the contribution made by Canada to the social and economic council.

My final word is this—and it is where I began. The problems of the war were met in this country by a united people. Apart from our differences in this house, the contribution of parliament itself during the war was on a high level. Let each of us dedicate himself anew to the new task that lies ahead, in the same spirit of understanding, in the same spirit of cooperation. That guaranteed, we can go on to levels that will place us first among the nations of the world.

On motion of Mr. Lalonde the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the house adjourned at 10.17 p.m.

Tuesday, September 11, 1945.

The house met at three o'clock.

PRIVILEGE—MR. COLDWELL

REFUSAL OF ACCESS TO PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS BY CITIZENS SEEKING TO INTERVIEW MEMBERS

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) rose yesterday afternoon at three o'clock to refer to a matter affecting the privileges of parliament and of himself as a member of parliament. I informed the hon. member that I would confer with the Clerk of the house and the Sergeant-at-Arms and that I would give him an answer as soon as possible. I have received the following memorandum from the Clerk of the House of Commons:

With regard to the admission of labour delegates and other persons in the parliament building yesterday, I have inquired from the R.C.M.P. and the house's protective staff and I have the honour to report as follows:

As we expected a large crowd yesterday and only had four constables on duty, I asked Commissioner Wood to send in a few men to help our protective staff. It is well known that the R.C.M.P. is assigned to parliament hill but the interior of the building is under the control of the protective staffs of the Senate and House of Commons.

About eleven o'clock a.m. Messrs. Murdock and Morrow, representing the delegates, called at my office and asked if they could hold a meeting in the railway committee room. I explained to

them that if a member of the house desired to meet them in any committee room I would instruct the Sergeant-at-Arms to make the necessary preparations for the meeting to be held. They said they desired to see certain members and I directed them to the main entrance where they would be helped to see these members. They did this and Constables Groulx and Gauthier, not acting as policemen but in the capacity of guides, went with them and four other delegates, including a lady, to Mr. Coldwell's room. The men left them in Mr. Coldwell's secretary's office and returned to the main entrance. Some of the other delegates who had remained downstairs insisted on seeing the leaders of the C.C.F. party but were told that the party was in caucus, and our staff never interfered with such meetings. Two delegates asked that their names be sent in to Mr. MacInnis, which was immediately granted, and the hon. member for Vancouver East came out and saw them.

Hon. Mr. Douglas, Prime Minister of Saskatchewan, told me last night that he was not prevented from coming inside the building. When he arrived at the entrance he was asked who he was and after he had given his name he was immediately allowed to go in.

I am informed by the Commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police that, according to reports he has received, none of his men stopped anybody from going inside the building.

As to the protective staff of the House of Commons, it had not been given any order by me or the Sergeant-at-Arms to keep anybody out of the building. There was some confusion when the crowd pushed in and dispersed all over the main corridor. In order to slow up this rush, the outside doors were closed, but not locked, for about half an hour.

It has been said in the press that "parliamentary police bar delegates from the house until members of parliament guaranteed their conduct inside." No such practice has ever existed in the parliament building. The reason why members have to be asked if they wan to see visitors is that they cannot be importuned when attending to their correspondence or other parliamentary duties. If they cannot be seen, the visitor may withdraw or sit in the corridor and wait until there is a sufficient number of visitors to be taken through the building by a guide.

You will realize, Mr. Speaker, that some precaution has to be taken in the parliament building, but our practice in this regard is very broad. The best evidence that no severity was shown yesterday is that apart from the three hundred delegates, six hundred and twenty-two other persons visited the building in addition to the five hundred who followed the debates from the galleries.

Arthur Beauchesne,
Clerk of the House of Commons.

Mr. COLDWELL: May I say a word, Mr. Speaker? I was not particularly inquiring into what took place within the building. I thought I made that quite clear yesterday. But I want to know by whose authority and instructions people were stopped from entering this building to see members of parliament, or were questioned prior to their entry into this building. I have no complaint regarding the protection that is given hon. members against interruption and so forth; but what I requested yesterday was an explanation of why people were prevented from entering the building. I may say that even members of the press gallery who have been in and out of this building for a long time were stopped and questioned as to their business before they entered this building yesterday morning. That is what I am interested in.

Mr. HOMUTH: That might be an idea.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand from the report which I just read that nobody was prevented from coming in but some of the visitors who presented themselves at the door were asked for identification; therefore I consider the incident closed.

Mr. REID: Then Douglas was not prevented; the statement was not true.

PRIVILEGE—MR. HEON

ARTICLE PUBLISHED IN THE NEWSPAPER "LE CANADA"

Mr. GEORGES H. HEON (Argenteuil) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I desire, subject of course to your kindness, to raise a question of privilege in accordance with paragraphs 140, 170 and 183 of Beauchesne's "Parliamentary Rules and Forms".

It has been brought to my attention, this morning, that the newspaper *Le Canada* published on the first page of its issue of Friday, September 7, 1945, an article entitled "First changes noticed in the Commons". The article reads in part as follows:

> The only French-speaking members who sit on the opposition side are: Mr. Georges Héon, Conservative member for Argenteuil, who has been relegated by his party to the last seat of the last row occupied by the Conservatives, in the background of the house and next to the C.C.F. members.

I regret to say, Mr. Speaker, that such a statement is untrue and that if the writer of those lines wanted to attempt an insinuation, the latter is malevolent; if he wanted to play a joke, it is in bad taste. No one but myself bears any responsibility in connection with the particular place where I sit in this house. I say that I occupy my present seat because I did request the distinguished clerk of this house to let me have it.

The leader and all the hon. members of the Progressive Conservative party having shown me every courtesy and regard since my arrival in this house, I could, if I had so desired, use my right of seniority to occupy a seat farther in front.

However, no person of intelligence and good faith should attach importance to the row where the seat of a member of this house may be. All of us are here in the same capacity.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask the hon. member to resume his seat. I think I have been generous enough toward the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Héon). A question must always be quite brief and to the point. I permitted him to give explanations; he did so and I believe that is sufficient.

Mr. HEON: Mr. Speaker, will you permit me to ask the writer of the aforesaid article —I have not the honour to know him—to be so kind as to correct the impression he gave regarding me, because it is unfair.

Mr. SPEAKER: I repeat that this does not concern the House of Commons.

Mr. HEON: Very well, I shall soon take up the matter again.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PROCEDURE IN QUESTIONS ON THE ORDERS OF THE DAY

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to draw the attention of hon. members to paragraph 297, page 121 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, third edition.

A certain number of oral questions are permitted in practice by members, without notice, before the orders of the day are called; but these are merely allowed by courtesy in connection with the business of the house or with very urgent and important matters of public concern. They are always brief, no debate being permitted, and the replies are as concise as possible. The minister interrogated may reply at once or may direct that the usual notice be given (B. 315). Such questions are governed by the same rules of order as questions of which notice has been given. (M. 245, n.4.)

Hon. members will notice that the rules say that questions are allowed by courtesy in connection with the business of the house, or with very urgent and important matters of public concern. I would like to call for the cooperation of every member and ask them not to put oral questions when they are not very urgent. It would be preferable for the dispatch of business that questions be placed on the order paper.

READING OF SPEECHES

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the orders of the day are called I wish to draw the attention of hon. members to a practice in debate which is contrary to the rules of the house. I refer to the reading of speeches. Standing order No. 41 provides for decorum in debate. I would refer hon. members to Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, third edition, page 102, paragraphs 238 and 239, which states:

Besides the prohibition contained in this standing order, it has been sanctioned by usage both in England and in Canada, that a member, while speaking must not (a) read from a written previously prepared speech.

This rule was adopted in 1927, but as long ago as April 19, 1886, a resolution was adopted by the house which I should like to read. It was as follows:

That the growing practice in the Canadian House of Commons of delivering speeches of great length, having the character of carefully and elaborately prepared written essays, and indulging in voluminous and often irrelevant extracts, is destructive of legitimate and pertinent debate upon public questions, is a waste of valuable time, unreasonably lengthens the sessions of parliament, threatens by increased bulk and cost to lead to the abolition of the official report of the debates, encourages a discursive and diffuse, rather than an incisive and concise style of public speaking, is a marked contrast to the practice in regard to debate that prevails in the British House of Commons, and tends to repel the public from a careful and intelligent consideration of the proceedings of parliament.

No doubt it is very comforting that the written word should be before a speaker while he is addressing the house, more especially in the case of a new member, and there are many new members in the house. However, it is my duty to call the attention of hon. members of the house to the practice of reading speeches. I believe a reference to the rule in this formal and general manner will forestall any objections from the house or from the Chair in the coming debates.

WAR AND DEMOBILIZATION

PROVISION FOR INTERIM APPROPRIATION OF $400,000,000 FOR WAR PURPOSES, DEMOBILIZATION, PROMOTION OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY, ETC.

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide that a sum not exceeding $400,000,000 be granted to His Majesty towards defraying any expenses or making any advances or loans that may be incurred or granted by or under the authority of the governor in council during the year ending the thirty-first day of March, 1946, for the purposes and subject to the terms, conditions and limitations set out in the resolution on the orders of the day to provide that sums not exceeding $1,365,000,000 be granted to His Majesty.

He said: The first item under government notices of motion relates to an interim vote for purposes of war and demobilization. Ordinarily at this stage I would move that the house go into committee of the whole on the resolution at the next sitting, but since it is necessary to have this money voted immediately, and since the subject matter has been discussed with the leaders of the other parties, with the consent of the house I am moving that the house go into committee of the whole to-day on the first resolution appearing on the order paper under government notices of motion.

I may say that His Excellency the Governor General has been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution and has been pleased to recommend it to the consideration of the house.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do I understand the minister desires that the house go into committee to-day?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. This is money that will have to be voted. It is part of a larger amount which will be covered in due course by our war expenditure and demobilization bill which I propose to introduce within a day or two after the debate on the address is concluded. It is on that bill that the accounting will be given of the expenditures that have been made in the past, and the explanations of the intentions of the government with regard to expenditures during the remainder of the fiscal year will be gone into fully at that time. This is merely an interim vote designed to cover approximately two months of war expenditure, to give us some time in case there is a little delay in getting the war expenditure and demobilization measure enacted. I believe the procedure being adopted adequately protects the rights of the house in every way, together with the assurance now being given that there will be the fullest opportunity for discussion on the main bill which will be introduced following the passing of the next resolution, which I do not propose to move forward to-day.

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): It seems to me that this procedure deals only with interim supply as it relates to the war expenditure and demobilization bill which the minister will move later. It does not appear to cover a proportion of the civil estimates. Is that correct?

Mr. ILSLEY: That is correct; it does not.

Mr. BRACKEN: What does the minister propose to do about those?

Mr. ILSLEY: After we finish with this measure, with the consent of the house I shall ask for one-twelfth of the main estimates by way of interim supply. That will come under item No. 2 on government orders; and with the consent of the house I must take up that matter before the orders of the day are called, before the special order and after we finish with this item.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Mayhew in the chair.

Mr. FRASER: This will not prevent us from debating these matters later on, will it?

Mr. ILSLEY: No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BRACKEN: I wonder if the minister would not give us a more complete explanation than he has given so far. For instance, how does he arrive at this figure of $1,365,000,000? I think we should have a little information about that.

Mr. ILSLEY: The general picture is something like this. The amount covered by the war appropriation measure last year was $3,650,000,000, and the amount provided for Mutual Aid was $800,000,000, making a total of $4,450,000,000. Those are the amounts which were voted for the fiscal year 1944-45. Then for the fiscal year 1945-46 we have already voted two billion dollars. This was done at the last session.

It is estimated that an additional sum of $1,365 million will be required to meet the same class of expenditures as were covered by the votes totalling $4,450 million for the fiscal year 1944-45. There will be no Mutual Aid appropriation at this session of parliament. None will be proposed by the government. The two billions of dollars voted at the last session could be used either for ordinary war purposes or for Mutual Aid. Mutual Aid has ended, and it will not be necessary for us to have any further Mutual Aid appropriation. So that the amount of $1,365 million which is covered by the second resolution found on the order paper under government notices of motions will be for ordinary, war and demobilization purposes. I think it can be said that the expenditures are those necessarily made as a result of the war.

When the resolution and bill voting $1,365 million come before the house opportunities for debate will be given, as they have been in the past. To-day I am asking the house for only $400 million.

Mr. BRACKEN: I wish to thank the minister for the information he has given. As he has said, and as the Prime Minister explained the other day, leaders on this side of the house met him, and the procedure now

being followed was generally approved. We approved the granting of interim supply on the civil estimates for one month.

Mr. ILSLEY: Correct.

Mr. BRACKEN: And the equivalent of about two months in respect of war expenditures and demobilization requirements.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. BRACKEN: We did that on the understanding of the need for so doing at the present moment. We are now in the sixth month of the fiscal year. Five months' supply was granted last session, but within the next few days the government will be running out of money. Money will be required, and if we were to follow the ordinary procedure of the house we would not have it in time for immediate requirements.

Mr. ILSLEY: Correct.

Mr. BRACKEN: On those grounds I am sure all hon. members will approve the granting of an extra month's interim supply of the civil estimates. That is not before us now but I understand it will be later.

Then, with respect to the war expenditures and demobilization supply—

Mr. ILSLEY: It will be known as the War Expenditures and Demobilization Act.

Mr. BRACKEN: It is my understanding that it will replace what was known last year as the war appropriation bill.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes, that is correct.

Mr. BRACKEN: The minister is asking that we grant him the right to spend what he anticipates will be required for two months.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. BRACKEN: Without going through the ordinary procedure in the house.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. BRACKEN: And without taking the time to examine the whole of the estimates in detail.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. BRACKEN: That, too, was approved. I think, Mr. Chairman, that new members particularly should understand what we are doing. We are approving completely what has been requested by the government. In other words we are granting the government the money necessary to carry on one month's civil requirements and two month's war expenditures requirements, without our exercising our privileges of debate and discussion, because of the possibility that such debate and discussion might take too long to have the money voted soon enough. This procedure will make the money available in time.

Mr. ILSLEY: That is correct.

Mr. BRACKEN: And that was readily granted. However, all members understand clearly that there will be no limitation of debate later on, that there will be opportunity for discussion in detail, in respect of both the civil estimates and the war expenditures.

Mr. ILSLEY: Correct.

Mr. BRACKEN: That will be the position, following this procedure to-day.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes; I give that assurance without equivocation.

Mr. BRACKEN: The only practical question is this: We are now in the sixth month of the fiscal year. I understand five months' requirements under these estimates were granted last session, without full examination by members of the house. Now we are granting further requirements, and six months of our fiscal year will pass without our having considered the details in respect of these expenditures. Not only has that money been voted and spent without our consideration, but some of the assets bought with it are now being sold. The practical result of this procedure is the only point with which we are immediately concerned.

We meet here late in the year. Before many more months the year will have expired and another session of parliament will be called. After granting interim supply we do not wish to be placed in the position of having to rush through the consideration of a supply bill in respect of either of these items. That is the practical position in which the official opposition finds itself. What I ask from the minister, or from the government, is a declaration that there will be no delay in the consideration of the estimates under both these measures, and in the bringing down of the budget. Under other circumstances, toward the end of the session we would be limited and cramped in our consideration of these matters. I hope the minister appreciates my point.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes. First, with respect to the War Expenditures and Demobilization Act, I have already given an assurance that the bill will be introduced within a day or two, as I have put it, after the debate on the address in reply is completed. In the normal course of events it will be considered by the house over a period of weeks thereafter. Then the main estimates will be considered from time to time as occasion seems to warrant or make convenient. The house has the safeguard that

the government is being granted only one month's supply. If hon. members are dissatisfied with the course the government takes in bringing forward its main estimates, it will have an opportunity of saying so at an early day, because we have to come back before that month is over for another month's supply under the main estimates. That is a safeguard which I think should be pointed out. When I make these statements I do not mean that there is any intention whatsoever of holding back the main estimates. However, it is something upon which one cannot give a definite commitment which would mean anything.

The third matter touched upon by the leader of the opposition was that of the budget. The date of its introduction will be announced as soon as it is finally decided upon; it will not be unduly delayed.

Mr. CHURCH: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish for one moment to ask for a postponement of the proposed resolution. I have no doubt it has been considered by the Minister of Finance, with whom, because of the position in which he has been placed as a result of the election, I have great sympathy. Might I point out, however, that I believe it is the rule in British parliamentary practice for the chancellor of the exchequer to give a somewhat more detailed explanation on interim supply, now that the war is over, than was given last Friday on the introduction of the resolution. As you know, Mr. Chairman, there is an insistent demand all over the country that the government should make some declaration of policy regarding control bodies and bureaucratic expenditures which are being made over the head of parliament by certain bodies which have been set up. I will refer to this matter for only two or three minutes. For years past we have been told, by Mr. Churchill in the British House of Commons, and more or less by our own Prime Minister here, I believe, that once the war ceased these controls and other war expenditures would cease and we would regain what we, the high court of parliament, surrendered when the war broke out, namely control of expenditures. At the present time we have virtually no control. All kinds of bodies, over the head of parliament, are spending money like water. Every principle for which the British nation struggled in the old land since the seventeenth century has been surrendered to the political caucuses. Parliament itself, which came into being to ensure that taxes shall be voted only by those who have to pay them, has become the institution through which those who do not pay them impose them on others.

I want to emphasize to the committee that powers of legislation older even than the right of taxpayers to determine the national expenditure have been surrendered, and if we are to continue this sort of thing the power of parliament will be gone forever. Whole spheres of activity, involving the livelihood of every man, woman and child in this country, have been removed from the jurisdiction of the law and of parliament and reserved for the determination of tribunals, irresponsible, irremovable, governed by no control and subject to no appeal. I do object, now that the war is over, to the way that business is being conducted over the head of parliament. We are told that parliament is supreme. That is only a myth. If parliament is supreme, why has it not now control over these outside bodies and their expenditures and in the result we will only hold a post mortem as the money is spent.

I come from a very large taxpaying city. The working class have to pay a twelve per cent sales tax and the burden of taxation is very heavy upon them and upon business firms in the district. Some small business men have been put out of business altogether. As I go along the streets in the large city from which I come I get numerous complaints as to the way these war-time organizations have been carrying on. I protest against the continuation of these irksome controls. I wish to assert the supremacy of parliament over these outside bodies. A large number of them have not contributed a snap of the fingers to the winning of the war, yet they continue to spend hundreds of millions of dollars. As one goes around the country one sees how the money is being wasted. There is no retrenchment, no economy, no peace yet. We do not know even that the war is over yet. We did not know, thanks to our new status, that the war had started until ten days after it did, but the Canadians who were on board the *Athenia* on September 5, 1939, when it was sunk, found out that Canada was at war.

One might as well drop the theory that parliament is supreme. We are not supreme, or we would have control. What I should like to see is a reform of parliament whereby members of all groups would get together and decide what is best to be done for the taxpayers. We have put up with the present conditions in war time for long enough, dear knows.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Ilsley thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 3, for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for national defence and demobilization.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first and second times and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Mayhew in the chair.

On section 1—Short title.

Mr. CHURCH: I would like to ask the Minister of Finance one question: If we pass this bill this afternoon, is the war over or is it not over? We as a people should know that. The war is over at Washington, it is over at London, it is over everywhere else, and how does it come about that we are asked to pass a bill like this? Would the minister be kind enough to answer?

Mr. ILSLEY: Mr. Chairman, the passing of this bill is in no way an assertion that the war is not over or that the war is over. The bill follows the precedent of the bill passed in 1919, called the Demobilization Appropriation Act, 1919. We thought it more proper to call this the War Expenditure and Demobilization Appropriation Act because many of the expenditures that have to be met out of the money to be provided under this bill—I am speaking not just of the interim bill now before the house but of the bill covering the larger sum of $1,365,000,000—will be in every sense of the word war expenditures; that is, they will be expenditures incident to the maintenance of troops overseas, occupation forces, forces in Great Britain and elsewhere, gratuities and expenditures necessarily incurred by various departments of government as a result of the war.

Mr. CHURCH: It was contended by the Canadian Bar Association that when Britain was at war Canada was at war and that when Britain was not at war Canada was not at war. Has the Minister of Finance consulted the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) on the question whether the war is over and the War Measures Act at an end and annulled? Would he consider a reference to the Supreme Court of Canada under the Supreme Court Act of the question whether this parliament has the right to pass this measure? Because we are part and parcel of the British empire, and when Britain is at war Canada is at war. I contend that we have no power to pass this legislation, and I should like to see a reference to the supreme court, which the minister can order by order in council under the Supreme Court Act on whether the War Measures Act is annulled.

Mr. ILSLEY: It is the opinion of the Minister of Justice that it is within the constitutional power of this parliament to pass this bill. Moreover, this bill, as I say, follows the precedent of the Demobilization Appropriation Act passed in June of 1919.

Mr. CHURCH: I asked the late Minister of Justice, the Hon. Mr. Lapointe, a very respected minister, before this war began whether the War Measures Act of 1914 was still in force if war came. He said, "I think it was not." I contended that it was. Will the present Minister of Justice, in view of what was said by the Canadian Bar Association, not consider submitting to the Supreme Court of Canada the question whether we have power to pass this act, as the war is over, and with it the War Measures Act; and when Britain is no longer at war Canada is no longer at war. When Britain is at war Canada is at war, but no longer.

Mr. BRACKEN: Would the Minister of Finance mind answering a few questions on details for purpose of clarification?

Mr. ILSLEY: That is all right.

Mr. BRACKEN: This bill replaces what in the last fiscal year was called the war appropriation bill?

Mr. ILSLEY: Is the leader of the opposition referring to this interim bill or to the main bill?

Mr. BRACKEN: The main bill.

Mr. ILSLEY: It does, yes.

Mr. BRACKEN: And the war appropriation bill of last year provided for a total expenditure of what amount?

Mr. ILSLEY: For the fiscal year 1944-45 it provided for an expenditure of $3,650,000,000.

Mr. BRACKEN: That was aside from Mutual Aid?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. BRACKEN: Which amounted to?

Mr. ILSLEY: $800,000,000.

Mr. BRACKEN: And this bill, which you call the War Expenditure and Demobilization Appropriation Act, provides for an expenditure of $1,365,000,000, on top of the $2,000,000,000 appropriated at the last session of parliament?

Mr. ILSLEY: That is correct.

Mr. BRACKEN: That means a total for this fiscal year of $3,365,000,000?

Mr. ILSLEY: That is correct.

Mr. BRACKEN: As compared with what amount last year?

Mr. ILSLEY: $4,450,000,000. And the $3,365,000,000 includes a lot of Mutual Aid, which was provided for in the two bills.

Mr. BRACKEN: I am trying to get at a comparison of the expenditures of last year with those of this year.

Mr. ILSLEY: The estimates, the total estimates, last year were $4,450,000,000.

Mr. BRACKEN: And the total this year?

Mr. ILSLEY: $3,365,000,000. Those are estimates.

Mr. BRACKEN: And you are asking now for $400,000,000, to cover two months' requirements, and that is on top of the five months' appropriations already voted?

Mr. ILSLEY: That is roughly so. The $2,000,000,000 was not exactly for five months, but it was substantially that.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

INTERIM SUPPLY BILL

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee of supply.

Motion agreed to and the the house went into committee of supply, Mr. Mayhew in the chair.

Mr. ILSLEY moved:

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding $29,769,000.11, being one-twelfth of the amount of each of the several items to be voted, as set forth in the estimates for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1946, laid before the House of Commons at the present session of parliament, be granted to His Majesty, on account, for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1946.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in.

WAYS AND MEANS

INTERIM SUPPLY

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee of ways and means.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Mayhew in the chair.

Mr. ILSLEY: I move:

Resolved, that towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1946, the sum of $29,769,000.11 be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Ilsley thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 4, for granting tc His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending 31st March, 1946.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first and second times and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Mayhew in the chair.

On section 1—Short title.

Mr. BRACKEN: What was the total of the estimates for this fiscal year?

Mr. ILSLEY: It was tabled at the beginning. It is about a billion or eleven hundred million; I cannot remember exactly.

Mr. BRACKEN: Will the minister explain how he arrives at this figure of $29,769,000.11? One twelfth of a billion would be more than that.

Mr. ILSLEY: In the billion figure are a number of statutory items which do not have to be voted. This figure of $29 million is one-twelfth of the items that have to be voted. If the leader of the opposition will look at the main estimates he will find that after many of the items there appears the letter "S", which means that they are statutory and do not have to be voted.

Mr. BRACKEN: You do not recall the total of the main estimates?

Mr. ILSLEY: No, but I can get it in a minute.

Mr. COLDWELL: Is it not $702,000,000?

Mr. GRAYDON: The total estimates this year are $1,022,000,000.

Mr. ILSLEY: I accept that. That is what I thought it was.

Mr. BRACKEN: More than half of the estimates are statutory and do not have to go through the ordinary process of being voted.

Mr. ILSLEY: That is the way it works out.

Mr. ADAMSON: Now that we are passing interim supply it would be advantageous to the house to know when we may expect the main estimates to come up for debate. When shall we have a full dress debate on the pressing question of taxation in this country. When does the minister expect to bring down the budget?

Mr. ILSLEY: Those are two entirely different matters. The main estimates are one thing and the budget is another. A few minutes ago I told the house that the estimates which are now before us will be brought forward for discussion as opportunity affords and convenience warrants. I pointed out to the leader of the opposition that the house has this safeguard against any undue delay, namely, that the government must come back before very long for more money. As regards the budget, I also covered that point. I said that the date of presentation would be announced as soon as possible and that it would not be unduly delayed.

Mr. SENN: Will further estimates be brought down in the form of supplementaries?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes; there will be supplementary estimates.

Mr. SENN: Is there one-twelfth of those supplementaries in this appropriation?

Mr. ILSLEY: No; there is not.

Mr. COCKRAM: I suggest that the estimates produced last session be presented to us in this house so that we may know what we are talking about.

Mr. ILSLEY: They were laid on the table last Friday or Thursday.

Section agreed to.

Sections 2 and 3 agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

WAR AND DEMOBILIZATION

PROVISION FOR APPROPRIATION OF $1,365,000,000 FOR WAR PURPOSES, DEMOBILIZATION, PROMOTION OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY, ETC.

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide, *inter alia*,

1. That sums not exceeding $1,365,000,000 be granted to His Majesty towards defraying any expenses or making any advances or loans that may be incurred or granted by or under the authority of the governor in council during the year ending March 31, 1946, for—

(a) the security, defence, peace, order and welfare of Canada;

(b) the conduct of naval, military and air operations in or beyond Canada;

(c) the expeditious demobilization of the Canadian armed forces;

(d) promoting the continuance of trade, industry and business communications, whether by means of insurance or indemnity against war risk or in any other manner whatsoever; and

(e) the carrying out of any measure deemed necessary or advisable by the governor in council in consequence of the war.

2. That the governor in council be empowered to raise by way of loan under the provisions of the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, 1931, such sum or sums of money, not exceeding in the whole the sum of $1,365,000,000 as may be required for the purpose of defraying such expenses or making such advances or loans, the principal and interest of any such loan to be a charge upon and payable out of the consolidated revenue fund.

3. That the governor in council be empowered to reexpend, advance or loan moneys that may be received by way of refund or repayment of advances, loans or expenditure under the War Appropriation Acts of 1939 (second session), 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944 and 1945.

[Mr. Ilsley.]

He said: His Excellency the Governor General, having been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the consideration of the house.

Mr. GRAYDON: If my understanding is correct, this motion should not be agreed to now. We should like to have the privilege, and to reserve the right, to debate if necessary, while the Speaker is in the chair, various matters relating to the war appropriation bill. If this motion were carried it would deprive us of that privilege.

Mr. ILSLEY: No; it is for consideration at the next sitting.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This just brings it to the orders of the day.

Mr. ILSLEY: It is only notice.

Motion agreed to.

PRISONERS OF WAR

ELIGIBILITY OF RELEASED HONG KONG PRISONERS FOR PACIFIC STAR

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of National Defence. An announcement reputed to be from National Defence headquarters as quoted in yesterday's papers states what seems to be a rather harsh decision, namely, that released Hong Kong prisoners of war are not eligible for the Pacific star. Would the minister tell the house why these released prisoners, who were the first Canadians to serve in the Pacific theatre and who have suffered so much in their service, should be denied this right?

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of National Defence): I thank my hon. friend for bringing the matter up. When I saw the announcement it seemed to me unusual that our gallant lads who fought at Hong Kong should not be eligible for this particular star. On making inquiries I find that the regulations which govern the issue of this star, as well as a number of other stars, do not permit their being so included. On being advised of that I asked that the whole situation be reviewed.

As my hon. friend will realize, the regulations governing the award of this star, as well as the Burma star, the Africa star, and one or two others, are uniform for all countries of the commonwealth, and liberated prisoners of war at Hong Kong, British, Australian, and other commonwealth services, if there are any, are likewise not eligible under the regu-

lations as they stand. But I think we can safely say that these regulations will be amended.

Mr. ADAMSON: May I ask a supplementary question? Would the minister consider having a special decoration struck for the Hong Kong expeditionary force?

Mr. ABBOTT: I will give it consideration. It seems to me as one who served in the last war that we only had two service ribbons, or possibly three. We are accumulating quite a few now. In any event I am glad to have the suggestion.

Mr. COLDWELL: Will the minister permit a supplementary question on something I mentioned yesterday? Will these men be eligible for additional pay and allowances that were to be granted to men who volunteered to fight in the Pacific war?

Mr. ABBOTT: I am not in a position to answer that question now. I will take the matter up and give my hon. friend an answer to-morrow.

Mr. COLDWELL: I think that is more important than decorations.

Mr. BRACKEN: I want to thank the minister for his suggestion that the matter will be reconsidered.

Mr. ABBOTT: The leader of the opposition realizes that it is not a matter that lies solely within the discretion of the Canadian government. I think perhaps the Canadian government might take action if nothing is done by the others.

Mr. BRACKEN: I am led to understand the Canadian government is a very important government and probably would have quite an influence.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: It is now.

DAYLIGHT SAVING

REVERSION TO STANDARD TIME

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): In view of the wide objection to the continuance of daylight saving, I would like to ask the Secretary of State what consideration the government has given to the transfer from daylight saving to standard time, and what decision has been arrived at?

Hon. PAUL MARTIN (Secretary of State): I thank the leader of the opposition for kindly giving me notice of his question, to which I would reply by saying that not only has the government given consideration to this matter but it is proposed to revert from daylight saving to standard time at a date shortly to be announced. The hon. leader of the opposition will understand that in the United States the matter is being considered. There is on our part a great desire to synchronize our railway time-tables with theirs to avoid unnecessary difficulty; but having in mind that situation and the convenience of our public generally I hope to be in a position within a very short time to make an announcement as to the date of the transfer.

CADET CORPS

REQUEST FOR TRANSFER OF TECHNICAL EQUIPMENT FOR TRAINING PURPOSES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. F. E. LENNARD (Wentworth): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Munitions and Supply. Will the government consider turning over to the Sea Cadet corps, Army Cadet corps and Air Force Cadet corps of Canada such technical equipment as is necessary for their training before it is released to War Assets Corporation?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Wentworth was kind enough to give me notice of the question; however, I really think the question is directed to the wrong minister. The Sea Cadet corps is the ward of the Department of Naval Affairs; the Army Cadet corps of the Department of National Defence, and the Air Force Cadet corps of the Department of National Defence for Air. The equipment owned by these departments is at the disposal of the respective ministers unless they are declared surplus to the requirements of the department. The only case wherein this might arise is with regard to some equipment that does not originate within the department concerned. In that instance we shall be glad to make the arrangements suggested.

Mr. LENNARD: May I direct the question to the Minister of National Defence for his consideration?

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of National Defence for Naval Services): Yes. That matter has actually received consideration, I think. I do not know just what equipment the hon. member has in mind, but a good deal of the necessary equipment used by the Sea Cadet corps is made available by the Department of Naval Services.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Monday, September 10, consideration of the motion of Mr. W. M. Benidickson for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Bracken, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Mr. MAURICE LALONDE (Labelle) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, following the example given by those who spoke in this debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne, I promise to confine myself to a few very brief remarks. First, Mr. Speaker, I wish to tender you my congratulations, which you deserve because we are all sure that, with your deep understanding of men and things, with your parliamentary experience, it will be easy for you to preserve the traditions of dignity and impartiality which the House of Commons has known under your predecessors. The honour which has been conferred on you, is reflected on your compatriots and on the province which you represent. I am sure that Canada as a whole, and more especially the province of Quebec, is grateful to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and to the house for having selected you as Speaker.

May I also compliment the mover and the seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne. While newcomers in this house, our two fellow-members have shown a self-assurance and a judgment which do them honour and bode well for their political career which I hope will be long and fruitful both for themselves and for the electors who have made such a happy choice in sending them to this house as the representatives of the fine constituencies of Kenora-Rainy River and Gaspe. Incidentally, I also congratulate our colleague from Gaspe on having won his election, thereby adding one more constituency to those held by the Liberal party.

On June 11 last, the Canadian people gave a clear, unequivocal and definite verdict whereby the hon. members of this house were given a clear-cut mandate. That victory of the Liberal party led by the Right Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King, was won in this country through the prestige of its leader and also because of the quality of the policies he advocates. Congratulations must be directed to our political leader for the manner in which he conducted that election which put the Liberal party again in power. It is mainly because of his administration of the last ten years that the Right Hon. the Prime Minister was able to achieve that victory. His administration, especially since we entered war alongside the United Nations, has placed our country, from an international as well as a national standpoint in the rank it deserves. His attendance, and that of the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) at the San Francisco conference, the presence of Canadian delegates at the Bretton Woods conference, and other events in the international field, have put our country in a position such that we can to-day claim that it is one of the great powers of the world and that it can, because of the sacrifices of its children, claim the privileges of an autonomous and free nation among the free countries of the world.

The San Francisco conference, especially, has commanded the attention of the Canadian people because the delegates who represented us there accomplished splendid work. By way of digression, may I be permitted to thank, in behalf of myself and my electors, the Right Hon. the Prime Minister of Canada and his distinguished colleague from the province of Quebec, the honourable Minister of Justice, for having caused the French language to be recognized as official in the discussions of the San Francisco conference. One thing which must also be emphasized is the stand they took at that time when they defended vigorously and successfully the rights of minor nations. Small nations, Mr. Speaker, are not unlike small men. They are sometimes overwhelmed by the physical stature of those who surround them. Thanks to the intervention of Canada's representatives at the San Francisco conference, the preponderant voices of small nations have been recognized and today our country and others of equal rank are empowered to claim their rights in such conferences.

The administration of the Prime Minister, in sending ambassadors to certain countries of the world, has done something which had the direct consequence of making felt in the whole world the influence and the genius of Canada. On this account, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister and his government deserve commendation.

In some quarters the present government is charged with not giving our country all the attention it deserves in the field of international emancipation. Mr. Speaker, Canada is gradually being emancipated thanks to our government's policy, although, as far as I can see, the Quebec nationalist publications have refrained from congratulating those who are courageously bringing about the change; true, these men do not seek the limelight, but they

work with an effectiveness which remains unparalleled by any government since the days of confederation.

Mr. Speaker, in the national sphere, as is indicated in the throne speech, our government has promoted peace and order, it has profoundly stimulated our national life, which achievement deserves recognition. Indeed, recent events may have surprised some people, and in order to be understood by my English-speaking colleagues, may I say this to them:

(Text): Certain sections of the Canadian electorate were quite surprised at the way the province of Quebec voted in the federal election on June 11 last. Many of our compatriots in the western provinces, and I may add in the central and maritime provinces as well, really felt that we would embrace extreme nationalism. This was the argument used against us on the hustings and in the newspapers of our opponents throughout the whole dominion. Such extremists as Reverend Mr. Shields even invoked the spectre of Roman domination by Quebec over the rest of Canada. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, the whole province of Quebec remained faithful to its traditions of order and peace. It voted for the Liberal party because this party, more than any other, offered what I might call the ideal of social and moral security, by applying merely the formula of common sense. In spite of what our good friends opposite may think, the province of Quebec has remained the fortress of political traditions because in those traditions, strengthened by the teachings of the past, are to be found the elements of political economy and social stability. We did not pay heed to calls of integral Toryism, which we believed inspired by doubtful political aims. We discarded the spectre of socialism of the C.C.F. party, whose theories cannot be adapted to the demands of our scholastic doctrines—and I say that in all sincerity to my hon. friends opposite. We remained firmly set in the Canadian federation. We understood the true and only vocation of the French-Canadian people who obeyed the act of Providence, understood and realized that the future of this country is always directly dependent upon the maintenance of the confederation link under the protection of a revived constitution. And all those who believed that we wanted political revolution in order to foster the shameful ambitions of separatism did not understand and have not understood the real and true mentality of my compatriots from Quebec.

We never asked for arbitrary privileges. We are convinced that no progress is possible for Canada without the sincere cooperation of all the racial elements which make up the Canadian nation. National salvation cannot be attained by imposing excessive and humiliating formulae or by taking arrogant and rigid attitudes. Brutal realism teaches us that our problems can always be solved if we tackle them with a broad understanding of the legitimate aspirations of the sections concerned.

Exclusivism and fanaticism have never produced progressive measures either for the oppressed minorities or for the majorities abusing their rights or their strength. A sincere mutual understanding is the source of all honourable agreements. The unjust demands of a majority, and the violent denunciations of a noisy minority, cannot create the right atmosphere necessary to the acceptance of the mutual agreements required for the progress of the nation. Peace is engendered by mutual sacrifices freely accepted. This is what my compatriots understood when once more they endorsed the King-St. Laurent government. I am convinced that they will not be deceived.

(Translation): Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, an extremely important event took place in Ottawa. I refer to the federal-provincial conference attended by the premiers of all the provinces of the dominion. The foundations were set for a revision of the confederation pact and subjects of discussion were chosen for the next few months.

I do not intend to take up too much of your time, but I am convinced that a serious study of the preliminary discussions will convince us that the various parties are agreed on the necessity of amending the British North America Act. I am not a sponsor of centralization and I am ready to put up an energetic fight against any useless centralization; however, all constitutional measures, as well as all positive human legislation remain, to my mind, open to evolution and progress. Indeed, by stubbornly refusing to amend the British North America Act for reasons of petty politics would constitute a negation of all progress.

It has become imperative that our constitutional instrument be amended and revised to conform to present needs. It behooves us to open our eyes and forget for a moment, if I may be allowed to say so, those people who are concerned with their exclusive interests and inspired by petty political considerations alone, to apply our minds to promoting the welfare of the community. Such a progressive object will ever remain unobtainable in our country if we rely on a constitutional pact which is obsolete and has become inadequate to solve the problems which face us to-day.

Some of our opponents claim that the fact of amending the constitutional act would constitute an infringement of racial and religious rights. Members of the Bloc Populaire are present in this house and I would say to them that the real defenders of constitution in parliament were never the Quebec nationalists but rather the representatives of the government presently in power who have succeeded in safeguarding the rights of my race and religion in the province of Quebec.

Arguments to the effect that our province has been denied the constitutional privileges it enjoys have been too often expounded in this house and outside of it. I trust that, under the wise guidance of the present federal government, if an amendment to our constitution be enacted, the interests of minorities and dissident groups will be fully safeguarded.

Mr. Speaker, now that the war is ended, we must turn our attention to the economic and social reconstruction of our country. Tremendous sums have been spent to eradicate evil and to bring truth out of chaos. I do not regret the tragic lessons of history or the tragic teachings of the war which has just ended, but I am convinced that the events of recent years have opened widely the eyes of some of the extremists of my province and that they shall accept henceforth the brutal reality of the responsibilities which lie upon the shoulders of a self-respecting nation.

(Text): The awful nightmare of war has disappeared. We are entering an era of peaceful reconstruction. Our mandate strictly compels us to forget our political differences in order to think only of Canada's interests. I do not doubt that every hon. member shares my view in this matter. We therefore turn our eyes toward the horizon of peace. The task is immense and difficult. To direct Canada toward its final destiny in a world that is still labouring under wounds left by the war and to maintain it in its proper rank among the union of free nations will be the noble and magnificent work of this Canadian parliament, and all the members of the house.

We will set our whole heart and all our strength upon this task, Mr. Speaker, during the years to come. We will work without respite in order that all our compatriots, from the highest rank to the humblest labourer, can assert, when we appear before the tribunal of public opinion, "This man has deserved well of his country".

Mr. G. R. PEARKES (Nanaimo): Mr. Speaker, I trust it will not be considered presumption on the part of one who has been in this house for so short a time to rise thus early in the debate on the speech from the throne; but I do so because of my intense interest in the welfare of those old comrades of mine who served in this war and in the first world war—an interest which I believe is shared by all hon. members.

I know that you will realize that a new member standing on his feet for the first time in the House of Commons is under considerable strain. I remember the great men who have sat in these seats before me for many years, and I hope that their wisdom, their courage and their ability will nerve me to do the task which I see before me, to-day and in the months to come.

I represent, sir, the most westerly of all constituencies, that of Nanaimo, on the southern portion of Vancouver island. It is a paradise, but I would not like anybody to feel that it is by any means an old man's home, because there are great industries in that constituency, and great natural resources to be developed which will give employment for our returning service men.

Amongst those industries I would like to refer for a moment to the logging industry. We have a climate which combines bright sunshine and a good deal of moisture; this enables trees to grow to immense height and great girth. That logging industry has been an essential industry during these war years, and will be during the years of reconstruction. It is on the very threshhold of great and new developments, such as the production of plywoods and plastics and the utilization of the various waste products of the forest. Conditions in the camps are infinitely better than they were a few years ago, and they offer to returning men a clean, wholesome and out-of-door life which I am sure will be attractive to a great many of our soldiers, sailors and airmen. New machinery has been introduced. The industry needs outside help, because the men connected with it have been struggling during these war years. The actual loggers, the employees, the members of the I.W.A., have adhered most rigidly during all these years to their non-strike pledge. The operational branches of the industry have not always been able to select the best timber from their point of view for cutting, but have answered nobly to the request of the government to turn out every foot of lumber that they possibly could. The companies and the loggers themselves have paid large amounts into the dominion treasury by virtue of their income taxes and excess profit returns. Might I suggest that, in order to sustain the yield, the government might see fit to encourage

that industry and to help in some measure to remove or lessen the danger of the great bugbear of the logging industry, which is the forest fire. If we can have a sustained yield we can give employment to many returned men.

Another industry I should like to mention is that of our commercial and sporting fisheries. The harvest of our ocean consists of many varieties of fish—salmon, cod, halibut, tuna, pilchards; even the dogfish, for the sake of its liver; the oyster; also the seaweed—all opening up grand opportunities for returning men to follow that particular kind of work. Never before have the fishermen of British Columbia had such fine floating equipment as they have to-day. Science has come to the help of the fisherman by giving him means of locating shoals of fish, of improving the system of transporting to the markets the fish which have been caught, and of presenting them in better condition than ever before.

These fishermen do not congregate and live in the big cities; they prefer to have their families scattered among a number of small towns throughout Vancouver island. But while their floating equipment is better now than ever before, they need protection during the winter storms for that floating equipment. Before the war that industry was largely in the hands of the Japanese, and the Japanese drove many of our white fishermen off our Canadian waters. The money they made they sent back to a foreign land. To-day our white fishermen have captured that trade and are spending their money in Canada. Never again must Japanese be allowed to capture the fishing industry of British Columbia.

I have not time this afternoon to go into any great detail regarding the mining industry and the agriculture of British Columbia. I would like to say one word about the great number of people who cater to the visitors who come to our island. They are in all kinds of little private enterprises, such as the corner grocery store, the wayside garage, the hotel, the tourist camp. Those people have been struggling during this war because, due to restrictions on gasoline and difficulties of transportation, the number of visitors has not been as great as in pre-war days. The younger men from those families have in the main joined the armed services and gone overseas. Their parents have shown commendable courage in keeping homes together during these years and in struggling to earn their livelihood. Their great hopes are that their sons and daughters will soon return from the duties they have undertaken in the defence of their country, and that the burden of taxation will be relieved so as to enable them to establish gainful business for those sons and daughters when they return.

When V-E Day was declared in Europe it was announced that the Canadian army would be required to provide an occupational force for Germany, also a Far Eastern Force for war against Japan, and that surplus personnel would be returned to their homes as soon as they could be spared, it being recognized that some would have to remain on in essential positions. The men who volunteered for the Far Eastern Force and for the occupational army were in the main younger men who had not seen quite so much service, had not been subjected to the toils and brunt of battle quite so much as those who had gone overseas either with the 1st or 2nd Canadian division in 1939 and 1940.

It was announced that the surplus which very largely consisted of those men who had borne the brunt of battle for the longest time, would be returned upon a point system, and the points were announced as being two points for every month of service in Canada, three points for every month of service in a theatre of war, and a bonus if a man was married. It was generally believed that the policy of first-in, first-out, would be followed as closely as it was practical for the authorities to adhere to that policy. Everybody realized that it was not possible to adhere rigidly to the first-in, first-out policy but that exceptions would have to be made of some key personnel who would have to be retained overseas, as well as releasing some to industry and other walks of life, of men for higher education, special training and so forth. But the country believed, and the constituents of Nanaimo believed, that so far as possible, the policy would be adhered to of returning first those men who had served the longest so that they might have the first opportunity of becoming reestablished and fitting themselves into civilian life.

Gradually that policy has been whittled down, and I have prepared a list of exceptions which have been made which I should like to give to the house because I think it will show to hon. members that that policy has been departed from far more than the people of this country ever expected it would be.

This is the list of exceptions. First of all, all men who were on compassionate leave on V-E day, provided they were on compassionate leave on V-J day, would be granted their discharge. This and the following exceptions all apply to the army in Canada. So far as the army overseas was concerned we were told that the men were to be brought back on a

point-score system, and as an example of how they would be brought back, the official pamphlet gave these figures:

If 20,000 were to be sent back during one of the early months of demobilization, 5,000 would have a point-score of between 225 and 250, 5,000 between 200 and 225, and 10,000 between 175 and 200. I want hon. members to notice the points which an overseas man was required to have in order to expect early demobilization.

To come back to the list, those men of the army in Canada who were on compassionate leave on V-E day, provided they were on compassionate leave on V-J day, may be discharged. The same thing applies to those who were on compassionate farm leave, and to men who desired to go to college or university provided they had a written acceptance from the university officials. They also may be discharged. Men on account of what may be considered their age or low pulhem profile, even though that pulhem profile is not so low as to render them physically unfit, and for whom no employment could be found in the army, may be discharged. Any man who on March 31 of this year had a point-score of 130 may be discharged if he is in Canada. Any man who is returned wounded, any repatriated prisoner of war; any man who served during the war of 1914-18; any man who has reached the age of forty-two; any man, no matter how short a time he has served in the army in Canada, provided he held a job at the time of his enlistment, no matter for how short a time, if only for one day, may be discharged if he has a score of 105 points. If he has not 105 points, he may receive long-term leave so that he may, I presume, get thoroughly reestablished in that job before a man with a higher point-score comes back from overseas. Any lad who had not reached his nineteenth birthday; young men, who I suggest might well benefit by a few months in the Canadian army where they could relieve a long-term service man; any man who is still retained at the district depot and has not been passed on to the training camp established at Vernon; any man who can claim to be going to employment of national importance—any man who is illiterate; any man who is unable to speak English or French sufficiently to receive training—all these may be discharged. This Mr. Speaker, is throwing the gates wide open. A soldier may go up to the sergeant-major, and if he cannot speak French, all he has to do is to shrug his shoulders and say, "Me no speak English" and he is out—out to go and seek a job before the long-service men come back from overseas.

[Mr. Pearkes.]

Mr. ABBOTT: I have never heard of any such regulation, but perhaps my hon. friend has better information.

Mr. PEARKES: Any man who is considered by his commanding officer as untrainable because he may be considered unreliable, and any man can pose as being unreliable; any man who is indifferent to service; in other words, any man who does not want to be a soldier, any man who will not respond to discipline—these are the men that you are letting out to go and seek jobs which the men who have been bearing the brunt of this war cannot come back and seek.

I realize that shipping is a difficulty and they cannot come back all at once. But why is any man who is serving in Canada now able to go out and take the jobs which are now available and which are growing fewer and fewer as the weeks and months go by?

It is for these reasons that I charge that the government is demobilizing our service forces to the detriment of the men who have fought the longest. Thirty or forty years ago Mr. Rudyard Kipling wrote a poem which I quote in part:

> A man o' four-an'-twenty that 'asn't learned of a trade—
> Beside "Reserve" agin' his name—'e'd better never been made.

These men who are overseas went over four or five years ago at the age of nineteen, twenty or twenty-one. They have reached their twenty-fourth birthday and they will find it increasingly difficult to find jobs in which they may learn a trade. Perhaps it is because of that that last week it was announced in the papers that there was to be a continuing army in Canada, a continuing army because of the uncertain condition in the world, because we could not foresee what dangers might arise. Nobody will take exception to that. Service in that continuing army was however restricted to those men who are in the active army or who have recently left the active army and would like to come back again. But there was one condition set, namely, that they must be prepared to serve wherever Canada required them to serve—a reasonable condition. At the same time we are continuing another or second continuing army, a continuing army of fine young men of good physique who have had months of training and who are not eligible for the first continuing army because they are not prepared to go and serve wherever Canada wants them to serve should an emergency arise.

I have not the up-to-date figures, but the last figures which were published showed that there were some 16,000 of these N.R.M.A. soldiers still in Canada who were fit for the infantry and some twelve or fourteen thousand who were fit for the other arms of the service. Some of these men will desire to get out of the army, but there are a great many of them who like the security of the Canadian army in Canada. They are provided with three meals a day. They have comfortable lodgings in hutments. They have hot and cold water laid on. They have officers who will endeavour to make their training as interesting as possible. They are provided with free picture shows and all types of recreation. Only two weeks ago a sports meeting was held in Victoria where men of this type were brought in at the country's expense from all over British Columbia in order that they might show their physical prowess.

These men like to serve in the Canadian army provided they are not ordered to go wherever Canada may require them. You may say that if an emergency comes they will then be ordered to go. If an emergency comes it may come quickly and we shall want trained men. But an army is not made up purely and solely of trained men. It is made up of trained units which have been welded together; and I tell you, speaking as an old soldier, that the veteran and the shirker will not work in harness together during that period of training in Canada. Therefore efficiency is lost, and all the time additional taxation is required in order to maintain this second continuing army.

The Secretary of State yesterday referred in glowing terms to the contributions Canada had made to this war. We were all proud to hear of that effort. But, sir, I claim that there is one blot on that escutcheon and it is now time to remove it. We should no longer have this bifocal army through which one class of men see it as their duty to go wherever their country calls them while the other class see their duty as lying only in so far as the shores of Canada restrict their activities.

I said that we have in Nanaimo opportunities for absorbing the men who come back from overseas in the reconstruction and in the development of our industries and national resources. I said that the people of my constituency urgently require their boys back from overseas. They desire relief from taxation. It is because, as I have shown to-day, the demobilization as now being carried out is working to the serious disadvantage of our men overseas that I support the amendment which has been put forward by our leader, and I believe that every returned man in this house, irrespective of the party to which he belongs, should support that amendment for that reason. Furthermore, I believe that the maintenance, the continuation of this futile two-army system should cease immediately.

Mr. F. S. ZAPLITNY (Dauphin): Several hon. members who have spoken to-day have taken this opportunity to refer to their constituencies. I hope, Mr. Speaker, you will not mind if I take some little time to refer to the constituency which I have the honour to represent here. The constituency of Dauphin has in tradition and in its geographical position certain distinctions. First of all I should like to bring to the attention of hon. members, as many of them will remember, the fact that a former Speaker of this house who occupied the chair that is now occupied by His hon. the Speaker was a member who represented the constituency of Dauphin. I refer, of course, to the Hon. J. L. Bowman, who has now retired from active politics.

I also wish to say that we have, geographically speaking, some distinguished neighbours. To the south of the constituency of Dauphin we have the constituency of Neepawa which is represented here by the leader of the opposition. Immediately to the west of that we have the constituency of Marquette, which is represented by a more recent Speaker of the house, the present Minister of Mines and Resources. Therefore, as I said, in both geographical position and in tradition the constituency that I represent has some distinction, and I hope that in the months to come I may be able to carry out my responsibilities in such a way that it will continue to have some distinction. Before leaving that I should like to say that on the western side of the constituency of Dauphin lies the province of Saskatchewan, which in more ways than one is pioneering the west.

I should also like to make some reference to the people who live in the constituency of Dauphin. I make no apology for speaking about a single constituency because to speak of Dauphin is to speak of Canada. In that constituency we have a pretty fair cross-section of the population of this country. It is made up of many different racial origins, people who have settled in this country and have adopted this Canada as theirs. They come from many different parts of the world; and I am proud to say, Mr. Speaker, that in my experience I have found that these people of different racial origins and religion get along very well together. They have cooperated in both their political and economic life, and during the course of the war

that has just ended have worked together to make their contribution to the war effort. I think it is only fair to the people of my constituency to say here on my first opportunity that a great deal of credit is due and should be given to the people who have done their bit in the war effort, in the various Red Cross drives, in victory loan campaigns and all through the course of the war.

While I am on that subject I should like to commend the government for two things which appear in the speech from the throne, and the forecasts that are made there. I refer to the provision that is to be made for a distinct Canadian nationality and a Canadian flag. It is all the more a pleasure to commend the government with regard to these two items since hon. members will recollect that the members of the party with whom I have the pleasure to be associated have advocated these things for a number of years. I hope that when this legislation passes it will be a little more than just a statute on paper. I hope that when we have established a Canadian nationality, something with which I believe all hon. members agree, and when we have adopted a Canadian flag, we shall go farther and give a certain amount of spirit to the fact. I hope that in the future anyone who has adopted Canadian citizenship either by birth or naturalization will be regarded by his compatriots as a full-fledged Canadian with all the rights, privileges and responsibilities that are inherent in that position.

I hope that the government will take into consideration in the near future the question of an immigration policy. As I said a few moments ago, the people in the districts surrounding Dauphin—and I am sure this is general throughout western Canada—are of mixed racial origin. They have made their contribution to the war effort; they have done what Canadians have been expected to do; they are now to be given the status of full-fledged Canadians. I hope that in the setting of immigration quotas the government will take into consideration the fact that there are people in European countries of the same racial origin as these people to whom I refer who are desirous of entering Canada and who would like to take up Canadian citizenship. It is not that I want to plead the case of any special group, although I think hon. members will agree with me that one part of central Europe which has been devastated more than any other part is that area generally known as the Ukraine. It is not at the present time an independent country, but it is on the map and hon. members can find where it is. That part of Europe has been devastated far more than many other places because when the wars between the German armies and the Soviet armies were going on it was the battlefield of Europe for a period of several years. The war went on first towards the east, and then back to the west; it seesawed in that particular area. The people there have found themselves without homes, in many cases without any resources whatsoever; and many of them have found themselves in other parts of Europe, some by their own choice and some by force of circumstances. They are desirous of entering this country. I hope that the government will take that into consideration and will make it possible for these people to enter Canada and add their contribution to the future life of the country. I want to repeat that I am not pleading the case of any one particular class or nationality in this house; but as I said before, this is a case where hon. members will agree that a certain section of Europe has been devastated beyond all comparison with any other place, and some consideration should be given to that fact.

I hope, as I intimated earlier, that our Canadian nationality and our Canadian flag will be both in spirit as well as in fact a symbol of equal treatment of all.

I should like to refer now to the general picture in this country. In order to discuss it in an understandable way I think it will be necessary to divide it into three parts, namely, the years between 1930 and 1939; the years from 1940 to 1945, and then from 1945 into the future. From 1930 to 1939, as hon. members will remember, we had in this Dominion what was termed a depression; we had a time of economic stress in which there were thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands of young men and women without employment, a time in which there was general distress and poverty, and yet no one was able to say that it was due to the fact that we had either a crop failure or some other misfortune which made it impossible to produce wealth. It is true that there were sporadic cases of drought here and there, but that was not the reason why the people in this country were poor. I think it will be generally recognized that the reason why the people were suffering during those ten years approximately was that there was something wrong with the economic system we were trying to operate. We found that out in 1940. Unfortunately, it took a war to introduce some new ideas into the economy of Canada. From 1940 to 1945 we discovered that there were many things that we could do which we thought previously could not be done in this Dominion. We found that it was possible to expand the economy of this country to a far greater

extent than any one had ever dreamed before, and to do it through the funds of the public, in other words, through public enterprise. Up to the time of 1940 the governments which were then in power, first one and then the other, had been pretty well agreed upon the principle of private enterprise and had never attempted to try anything else. The economic and, I might say, the military necessity that faced us from 1940 on made the government move in the direction of public enterprise, to a certain extent, and we discovered over a period of years that in spite of the fact that we were sending food, ammunition and other commodities overseas in large quantities, much of it being destroyed, still what was left in this country was sufficient to clothe, feed and shelter the Canadian people better than ever before.

This gives us food for thought. Surely, people say, if at a time when you are exporting for destruction about half the total production of this country you can still keep the people in better physical condition than before, there must be something wrong with the way we were doing things from 1930 to 1939; and I would commend that idea to hon. members in all parts of this house. Regardless of what our immediate political views may be, I think we can agree that from now on we shall have to be prepared to accept a greater degree of public enterprise than ever before. Something of this I believe was intimated in the speech last evening by the Secretary of State (Mr. Martin), who admitted that it would be necessary to use a certain amount of public enterprise. Naturally we do not think the government are prepared to go far enough, but I think at least they should be prepared to agree to this: If private enterprise, which has been given a good opportunity over a long period of years, both in time of peace and in time of war, from now on fails to provide the food, clothing and shelter necessary for the people of this country, we must be prepared to throw aside our political prejudices, go into public enterprise and produce these things, so that it will not be necessary for labour delegations to come and lay their case before members of the house in times like these.

As a new member of this house I was impressed with the tremendous problem that was posed to us by hon. gentlemen opposite yesterday in connection with reconversion. I want to say quite frankly and sincerely that we realize the difficulties facing the government, and we do not take the position that these difficulties confront the government only. We as a group and as individual members are willing to do what we can to facilitate the solution of these problems. As I say, I was impressed with the magnitude of what someone called the gigantic problem of reconversion. It is a gigantic problem; but let us make sure when we attempt to solve it that we apply the proper principles, because if we are not careful we can waste a great deal of time and effort and probably get very poor results. The problem of reconversion must be solved by following a certain principle. It must be either the principle of production for use or the principle of production for profit. We in this group, and probably some hon. members who are not in this group, believe that production for profit is not enough, that in future the principle must be established of production for use. I make that statement because during the course of this war we have found it possible, by applying the labour, the skills and the equipment to be found in this country, to the natural resources of the country, to produce wealth beyond anything we ever dreamed of before. In other words, we have discovered the immense productive possibilities of this dominion. We have found that if we need something badly enough, such as materials for war, we can go to work and get them. Necessity has driven us to realize how rich we are, to put it plainly. In future we shall have to decide whether we are to continue the system we followed up to 1940, which was the private enterprise system of production for profit, or whether from now on we are to turn to the principle of production for use.

There is a tremendous difference between those principles, and I believe that if we adopted the principle of production for use we would have no difficulty whatever in the post-war years in providing homes, food and clothing for all the people of Canada. I do not think anyone will argue with that statement. We are able to do that. We have the man-power; we have the natural wealth, and we have the skills and equipment necessary. If, on the other hand, we capitulate to the propaganda now being loosed upon us to go back to private enterprise, then I am afraid we shall be up against the same difficulties that confronted us before. The government may think it strange for a new member to be giving them so much advice all at once, but in all sincerity I say that if the government capitulates to the pressure now being exerted upon it by private interests to go back to private enterprise in its entirety, we are going to reach a time when we shall be faced with other problems just as gigantic as that which

has been posed to us in this house. I believe in future this government, and all governments, will have to decide whether they are to serve the needs of the people, having regard to the fact that we have so much wealth, so much skill and so much man-power that we can provide good living for all, or whether they are to cater to special interests because it may be good politics to do so. I am sure that on the benches opposite there must be men with sufficiently broad vision to realize that if we follow the course of capitulating to special privilege, some time in the future we are bound to be confronted with difficulties that are perhaps not unforeseeable.

During the course of this war men and women who have been working in war and other allied industries have been paid better and have enjoyed a material standard of living higher than ever before. They have had the knowledge that a very great effort was being made to produce goods for war. In other words, they are beginning to realize the wealth of this country, and no longer will they take no for an answer. We saw what happened here yesterday when the labour delegation arrived. That shows the attitude the working people are going to take. It will be a militant attitude. They will ask the government why we are not able to produce the goods we need in peace time when we were able to produce them in such large quantities and so easily during war time; and the government will have to be prepared to answer that question. So I think it would be far more reasonable for the government to take such steps as will make it unnecessary for labour to go on strike, to stage demonstrations or to send delegates to the capital. To me that would seem the reasonable thing to do.

I should like to refer now for a little time to the speech from the throne. Perhaps the thing that stands out more than anything else is that which is missing; that is, the fact that no fundamental change is being proposed. I am reminded of the boy in uniform who, having stood in line in front of the paymaster's office for some time, turned and said to his comrades, "Never have so many waited so long for so little." I think that is the case here. We expected a great deal from the government in its first pronouncement in peace time. During the years of the war, when things looked a great deal darker than they have looked in recent years, we were told that we were building a new social order. In fact, during the election campaign, if I may refer to it, we saw great placards prominently displayed on billboards carrying the slogan, "Building a new social order." That slogan was endorsed by candidates supporting the party opposite, and I am sure there must have been thousands and perhaps hundreds of thousands of people who voted for the Liberal party in the belief that they were building a new social order. After carefully reading the speech from the throne—and I have read it several times, as I am sure other hon. members have—I have failed to discover wherein they are proposing anything that even looks like a new social order. There are some commendable things in the speech from the throne, but all I am able to find in this connection is some nibbling attempt to try to do something to tide us over the time of reconversion, so that we can the more quickly go back to the good old private enterprise system and the right to be robbed. If we are to build a new social order there will have to be more imagination on the part of the government and more willingness to put into practice that which the people have been promised. The government has been elected on a programme of full employment and social security for all the people, and during the campaign government supporters also made a great many other very fine promises. With all due respect to hon. members opposite, I say now that unless they are able to produce the goods—and very soon—the people who voted for them are going to ask some most embarrassing questions.

I should like now to refer particularly to a few items which I believe to be of special interest to many hon. members. First of all, we know the government has made some pronouncement with respect to increasing old age pensions and an effort to provide for those who are not of pensionable age at the present time, namely those from sixty-five to sixty-nine years of age.

In proposing a pension of $30 a month with no means test for those seventy years of age, and over it is to be commended. But while making that proposal the government has at the same time proposed a means test for those in the age group from sixty-five to sixty-nine years because, as I remember it, it has been stated that payments will be made to these people only if they are in need. In other words, under the government's proposal there will be a means test for those from sixty-five to sixty-nine years.

I say that, having thrown away the wormy apple, there is no use in introducing a new worm to the other apple. If we are to have old age pensions without a means test, then let us have them without a means test, and let us have them between the ages of sixty and sixty-five years on a decent scale. Let

us not go only half-way, because that would not fool anyone and would be only a sort of window-dressing people would easily see through. I see no reason at the present time why people cannot ask, and with justification, for a pension at the age of sixty years and on a decent scale. It is not only a matter of justice, but also one of good common sense.

We are going to find in the next few years, what is beginning to appear already on the horizon, a condition of unemployment. People who are very close to the age of seventy years are now engaged in work. Between the ages of sixty-five and seventy years there is a large group of people who are now doing active work. It would seem to me only fair and sensible to make provision that they receive pensions at the age of sixty years, so that they might retire on a decent pension, live during the rest of their lives in peace, and let young people who are more able step into their places to carry on in the work of the country. I suggest it would be wise for the government to reconsider its position in respect of old age pensions, and to make a real job of it while they are at it.

I should like also to draw the attention of the government to the situation in connection with hog production. Yesterday an hon. member to my left asked a question of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) respecting the production of hogs. In my view the answer he received was satisfactory neither to himself nor to anyone else interested in the matter, because it did not touch upon the policy concerning which we wanted information. Hon. members realize that it is not a question of a meat shortage in Canada, but rather one of hog production. As I understand it, we have at the present time a system of meat rationing, for which there must be some reason. If there were not a good reason for it we would not have it. Canada has made certain commitments, in that it has undertaken to make shipments overseas. If we are to live up to those commitments we must have hog production.

I have before me a letter from the Dauphin Co-operative Live Stock Producers, over the signature of Mr. W. T. Volkers, the president of that organization. In this communication he sets out information respecting hog shipments at that particular point, and what he has said I believe illustrates what is happening across Canada. At this shipping point in the months from January to June, 1944, a total of 4,295 hogs were shipped. During the same months in 1945 a total of only 2,494 hogs were shipped, or a drop of 1,801 hogs at one shipping point. When one sees such a drastic drop in shipments of hogs from one point, a condition which is quite general throughout western Canada, he is led to believe that there must be some reason for it. I suggest the Minister of Agriculture would do well to make some statement to the house in the near future, giving us some idea of what he proposes to do to keep hog production at the level it should be.

While on the subject of agriculture I would also draw the attention of the minister to something which I am sure, is in the minds of many hon. members in whose constituencies there has been hail damage. In certain sections of western Canada we have suffered serious damage from hail, and we have expected and hoped that these people who have suffered from hail loss would be included in some measure under the provisions of the Prairie Farm Assistance Act. I understand, from a communication received some time ago from the minister that, in all probability, the government will declare this an emergency year, so that people suffereing hail damage will be eligible, if they meet the other requirements, for prairie farm assistance.

I should hope that the minister would be in a position in the near future to make an announcement in the house in respect of these questions, because many people are writing and asking questions. Naturally they are anxious to get all the assistance they can get.

I also make a suggestion to the government respecting industry in western Canada. We have found in Dauphin—and I am sure this is a condition found generally in other towns throughout western Canada—that the town to a great extent must depend upon the farming community around it. In other words, many of those towns in western Canada, some of which are large, have nothing but the support of the farming community for the maintenance of their business.

In the last four years, because of income greater than that received on the farms in former years business has increased considerably. But if it should happen that the farm incomes in those surrounding areas are drastically cut, many of those towns will find themselves in a bad position. Not only the business sections, but the labourers now employed in jobs in those towns would be seriously affected.

I should think it advisable for the government to take into consideration the establishment of industries in western Canada, in order to make some sort of back-log or cushion in the event of a depression, so that the labourers and small business men in those towns would have something in addition to the surrounding farming areas to lean upon. In that connec-

tion there are new discoveries in the field of chemurgy, in the making of synthetic substances, including plastics and the like, which might well be investigated by the government, and the possibilities of which could be thoroughly canvassed.

There is another reason why increased industry in the west would be desirable. We are finding that in the large cities of eastern Canada a great deal of congestion has taken place. Tremendous numbers of people have moved from western Canada to the east to take part in war jobs. In many instances those people are asked to make up their minds as to whether they will stay in the east permanently or return to the west. If there is nothing to which they can return, naturally they will stay here.

For the welfare of the remainder of the country I believe it would be well to extend industry in the west, so that we can keep a certain portion of our population who would normally drift to the east. I do not believe it is a good thing for the country to have all the labouring people concentrated in one particular area. On the contrary it would be much better to have the industrial area stretched fairly and evenly between east and west.

I should like also to make reference to another matter upon which I hope the government will take action. I refer to the disposal of the airports which have been established across Canada. In the neighbourhood of Dauphin we have two first-class airports which are now closed down. The people of that town and district are anxious to know what is going to happen to the buildings, and to the equipment and other materials left there. They would like to know if the government has any plans for the use of the buildings and equipment, and if they are to be put to some useful purpose. We are a little bit apprehensive, because of what we have read in the newspapers about the destruction of war material, that much of this equipment, which has been paid for by the people, and paid for very heavily, is to be destroyed or disposed of in some way which will bring no value to the people concerned. We therefore hope that the government will make some use of these airports in order that they shall be of some value to the community. As a suggestion I might say that, with establishments such as we have near Dauphin, it would be easy to provide an agricultural school, a convalescent hospital or a sanatorium. Instead of allowing these buildings to deteriorate and go to ruin it would be well to put them to some proper use.

I should like to touch on one more point, and then I shall live up to the example which has been given to us here of making speeches brief. The point which I think is so important that I shall not leave it out is that of federal aid to education. I believe hon. members from all the provinces will have experienced the fact that the education which has been handled so far by the provinces has had a pretty tough time financially for a long period of years. I know that in my own province of Manitoba, the schools, especially the rural schools, have been running on a deficit for years and years. We are finding that while the people are demanding, and rightly so, the extension of educational facilities, while the government itself is expecting and exacting higher standards from the young people in the way of education, no financial provision is being made to extend educational opportunities, especially in the rural areas. I suggest that there should be a federal grant to the provinces for the purposes of education, without interfering with administration, which could be left to the provinces, that would help to ease the financial condition in which many school districts find themselves. There is another reason for that which I would like to bring forward for your consideration. Many people are conscious that Canada has now reached what may be called the adult stage. We have definitely become a nation, but to become a nation in its full right there should be, I believe, a little more national responsibility for the education of the children of this country. I do not think money could be better spent than by providing for the children across Canada greater opportunities, especially vocational and technical schools, which to-day are badly needed.

I should also like to see federal grants made in order that students of ability who have not the financial resources would get the opportunity to go to the higher schools and universities. Let me interject a personal note: I have taught school for twelve years and therefore know this at first hand. I have seen a great many young men and women with a tremendous amount of talent and ability who, having reached a certain stage of their education, because they had not the financial resources with which to go ahead, stayed at home, and all that ability and talent were lost. I think that is the greatest loss which can be suffered, because the talents and abilities of our young people are among our greatest national resources. I suggest that a little more money spent on a national scale to assist these young people to go through the universities or to enter the vocations for which they are specially suited would pay big dividends in the future.

With that I conclude my remarks, except to say in closing that I hope it will be possible for us who are members of this house, regardless of what political group we happen to

belong to at the present time, to cooperate in the future helping to solve the problems which are before us. I invite all hon. members to join with us in what I consider to be the greatest political objective of all, the building of a better Canada.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I believe that all parties and groups should aid recovery and all of us should be ready to act together as far as we can. I have no quarrel or complaint with any faction or party in the house.

I welcome to this chamber the leader of our party (Mr. Bracken), a gentleman who is very much respected all over Canada for his sincerity of purpose, charity and friendliness, and for his fine life of public effort for the benefit of the country.

I believe that the House of Commons should be as far as possible a gentlemen's club. We come from all parts of the country and unfortunately we cannot all have the same views; but I have found that the average member of the House of Commons is a sincere man, as he must be if he is to represent the people of such a great country as Canada.

We on this side of the house are fortunate in representing a party which has pursued a most consistent policy since the days of Sir John A Macdonald as to our policy regarding our relations with the mother country and other matters affecting the empire and the dominions.

I think it must be admitted that one of the mistakes made by the fathers of confederation was the creation of provincial legislatures. There should not have been any provincial legislatures at all; it may be said that they were created for political and not for economic purposes. Great Britain does not have them; New Zealand or Australia did not have them until recently. What has resulted from them, Mr. Speaker, is the system of over-government and over-taxation which we have in this country.

I have always contended in this house, on my several substantive motions debated here, that one of our main and unsolved problems is that of parliamentary, constitutional, cabinet and law reform. These matters came up in the mother of parliament fifteen or twenty years ago, and as a result many improvements were made for the benefit of the working classes of the country.

I need not apologize for being a Progressive Conservative. I have always had the support of labour in the city from which I come. I was born in that city; I was head of the city in taking over the street railway from private ownership and for single fares, for starting and finishing the harbour improvements, for giving a better deal to the average taxpayer, for the system of municipal buses, for the removal of all the light, power and transportation franchises in our city and three adjacent counties into a civic system at cost, and for other public municipal services.

I was glad that our leader referred yesterday to two or three matters in which I have been much interested. Coming from a soldier city, I am greatly concerned about bringing back home those boys who have been away for five or six years. All hon. members are just as sincere as I am, and I believe they are doing what they can, but I fear this will become one of our greatest scandals. We have not risen to the situation on land, sea and air as we should have done, and many of our soldiers who are overseas should have been brought back long ago. I made some suggestions to the government as long ago as July 17, and recommended that they should utilize the merchant marine—which was a forgotten agency in this house for two or three years—as well as grain carriers, aircraft and other means of transport. I referred to this on July 17, the day after the war closed, and made some suggestions, which were reported in the Toronto *Globe*. I am glad to see that some improvement has been made by use of aircraft and grain carriers.

I do not like to see ships of British registry carrying back far more United States than Canadian soldiers. I have never raised this question in the house before because I believe it is of the utmost importance that we should maintain the most friendly relations with the great country to the south, which has done so much for us and Great Britain in so many ways and which upholds the same principles of freedom. I believe it is the general opinion of the people of this country that the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) has worked very hard and done a very good job in many ways, but a few days after we declared war I called the attention of the government to the fact that they should be able to get some ships from Washington, and they did appoint an agency in Washington to get ships for Canada and Great Britain and charter parties. Why not some more to bring our troops home? They did get many old ships as well as some others. The United States presented fifty old destroyers to Great Britain, but in return Britain gave them a ninety-nine year lease of valuable naval bases all the way from Newfoundland to British Guiana. When the government in war time can do a thing like that, why cannot they do something similar in peace time—get these United States ships to bring the boys back home?

Only on Sunday last I was talking to a woman in Toronto who lost her husband in the last war. Her son had been killed and was buried in France in this war. The chaplain who conducted the service was Mr. Appleyard of the Royal Regiment of Canada. This woman lives in my constituency. She asks now for the return of her last son. She has a son-in-law in hospital over there yet. There is hardly a street in my constituency where people are not expecting their boys home from overseas. It is a workingman's district, peopled mainly by those who have come from the mother country, and it has always been a strong soldier district. Soldiers went forth from my district in the days of the Fenian raid, in the South African war, and in the two great wars in our generation. In almost every street in my constituency there is some home in mourning for a soldier who did not come back. This poor woman who lost her boy in France has a son-in-law over there, badly wounded in hospital. I know, of course, that similar cases might be cited all over the country, but I would urge the government and the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie), who, I know, is working very hard for the soldiers, to see if something further can not be done to speed the return of our boys from overseas, so that they will not have to spend a sixth Christmas over there. I believe and I hope that something further can be done. I referred to this matter on July 17, in a letter to the press, although I said that it was a most complex matter, urging that nothing be left undone to speed the return of our soldiers and sailors and airmen to Canada.

The first in, first out principle is a good one, but it is not working out too well. We should be using United States ships and the liners of our other allies to help bring our own boys back home. Why have these French ships been given back to the French? We could have used them for a short time to bring our boys back home, but I understand that three of them have been returned to France. Why not release them for demobilization purposes? You, Mr. Speaker, represent a large district, the constituency of St. Mary, and I am sure that you would have been glad to see many of these ships being used to bring our Canadian boys back home.

There is another matter. We have a large number of new members in this house. Many of them have served in the municipalities, which is the best school of public service to begin in, right in the district where you live and people know all about you. I believe that is a good principle, and I have found that many of those who have given municipal service have more knowledge of public affairs than some others.

There are certain reforms which we should have. I wish to say something about the Gallup poll, which seems in elections to be an agency of the government. I do not know whether the hon. member for Vancouver Centre has a vote in the Gallup poll. I doubt, Mr. Speaker, whether you have a vote in the Gallup poll, or the able and popular Clerk of the House, who has contributed so much to the efficiency of parliament since I was first elected twenty-four years ago. I do not know whether the Clerk of the House has a vote in the Gallup poll, or any member of the opposition or the C.C.F. It is all Gallup, and no poll, and most of the galloping is done for the government, which seems to have a great influence with the managers of the poll. I once asked for a list of the voters in the Gallup poll, and I was told I could not get one but that I could be introduced to Doctor Gallup the next time I was in New York. I replied that I had not been there recently, that the only people I knew there on the gallop were members of the Giants and the New York Americans, and people like that who do a lot of galloping of another kind. I do not know whether you have ever seen any voters in the Gallup poll, Mr. Speaker, in your riding of St. Mary?

The Gallup poll even quoted the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Mitchell) as wanting to dump national selective service down the sewers. It would not hurt a bit if it were dumped down the sewers. They also had a poll on daylight saving, a most irksome control—let there be light, and there was light. The light shineth in darkness but the darkness comprehendeth it not.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. CHURCH: I shall continue for a few minutes this evening the remarks I was making when the house took recess at six o'clock, and first of all I wish to contgratulate certain members on this side of the house who do not happen to be in the chamber at the moment. The hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Pearkes) I knew very well in the last war. I remember the day he came home to our city. I was at the head of the city at that time and we gave him quite a reception. I would refer also to his colleague the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. Merritt), another Victoria Cross

holder, who comes of an old family very much respected in our city.

May I also congratulate our leader on the speech he delivered yesterday and particularly on what he said with regard to housing and meat rationing. The Progressive Conservative party have had a sound doctrine about housing. I remember when I first brought the matter before the house in the session of 1935, when our then leader, now Lord Bennett, appointed a committee on housing and reconstruction on my resolution to study the state of affairs in connection with a building and reconstruction programme. We had a reconstruction and housing policy which provided for releasing labour materials and the necessary priorities in connection with the scheme and a committee was appointed to investigate all aspects of the problem, urban, suburban and rural. We went into the matter and made a report to the high court of parliament, but that report was not adopted because an election was brought on in the fall of 1935 and our party was defeated. The incoming government, I admit, did do something to adopt our report about the matter. I contended, as the mover of the resolution on the subject, that instead of having a large housing department assembled in Ottawa, with clerks and all sorts of employees, it would be better for the government to guarantee the banks up to twenty-five per cent.

As a result of the policy that was put into force $85 million was spent on housing and there was hardly a dollar lost. I do not believe that one-eighth of one per cent of the money was lost. I congratulate our leader in that connection because there is no doubt that tens of thousands of houses will be needed. I have travelled extensively, particularly in the county of York, and I have seen some of the hovels in which returned soldiers are living. We sat here for months during the war and simply abrogated all our rights and privileges, handing them over to outsiders, with the result that practically no housing was constructed.

I wish to pay my tribute to the Minister of Munitions for the work he did during the war. It is true that then the war was paramount, but housing was neglected. That is a situation which cannot exist forever. There are other matters that I would refer to here, such as the question of a national fuel supply. That is something I have brought to the attention of the house before in 1922, 1923 and 1924. We are going to have cold weather very shortly We have cold weather in Canada for eight or nine months of the year and we should have a national fuel policy to meet our conditions. I proposed in 1922 a national fuel policy, that all coal which we require be mined under the British flag, whether it comes from Wales or the maritime provinces or Alberta. The government across the way adopted that policy, though rather belatedly, five years later, and nearly a million tons have been moved from the maritimes to the head of the lakes. Not enough, however, has been moved. This is likely to be a serious problem in the coming winter. I do not know how the people will get through the winter and I can only hope that it will be a mild one.

I would ask the ministers in charge of the forces to hand back all exhibition grounds to the people who own them. The various fall fairs that are held and the Canadian national exhibition will do more than anything else I know of to build up the morale of the people, important among whom are the small business men of the country. In Toronto we have the Canadian national exhibition, in which, ground, buildings and permanent exhibits, the city has an investment of $25 million and also the Royal winter fair there. A deputation came to see the government in this regard, but the government did not see fit to hand back the buildings to these people. The air force left the exhibition grounds months ago, moving to Trenton, and the navy is building a large barracks behind Fleet street, while the army is using a lot of buildings as the demobilization depot. I contend that two-thirds of these buildings should be given right back to their owners, the city, at once for these two fairs. That would do more for the farmers and the city people as well as anything I can think of. In this connection I would mention Lansdowne park in this city. These exhibitions across Canada have done a great deal in the past for the morale of the people.

I am sorry the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) is not in his place to-night because I should like to discuss for a moment the question of prison reform; I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; I see he is here. Now that the war is over I hope he will do something about prison reform and the royal commission's report. I find that the Toronto gaol has been housing returned soldiers. It was condemned years ago as being unfit for civilians, but it is housing soldiers who are convicted of breaches of military and other regulations. The Borstal system should be started at once. A committee should be appointed to visit these places. The time has come when the whole system should be reformed and overhauled.

I hope the minister will reply to the remarks of the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) with regard to the riots in Halifax, and at the same time he should extend his attention to Aldershot and assure

the house that the government will come across for any damage done there. There should also be a general review of these courts martial. I know something about courts martial and I suggest that there should have been publicity about them long ago. Some of the gentlemen filling the position of judge advocate have been to the front, but some have not and I believe the time has come for a general review of these whole court procedures. In our military districts the jobs of press and liaison officers should all be held by men back from overseas and not by former hockey and turf people who have never been out of the province, yet wear uniforms.

I wish to say a word by way of tribute to the transportation employees of Canada, whether they serve on land, at sea or in the air. I was talking the other day to a conductor on a train who told me he had been working 18 hours a day continuously. These employees have made a magnificent record in this war and should receive ample compensation and reward and all other allowances for a fine work well performed.

Another matter to which I would refer is that of controls. I referred to it this afternoon. I am sorry I had no time to prepare my speech, but the fact is that my remarks to-night are impromptu. We have heard a good deal about controls and what they are doing. Who are these controllers? They are mostly senior civil servants. There is no country in the world which is better served by its public servants than Canada was before and during the war. We have an admirable civil service; it is incorrupt, respected and able, and has done wonderful work for the country at very small pay. The large majority of civil servants are able men working for small salaries, but when you ask them to do something else for which they are not fitted, such as the bureaucratic control of war work and all that kind of thing, that is another matter. It puts me in mind of the game they used to play; I do not know whether they play it around the House of Commons. It was a sort of game known as "winding and unwinding". I do not know whether the ministers in the front benches ever had anything to do with that kind of game, winding and unwinding. Let me tell you about the game. It consists in making verbal lists of things and repeating them backwards. It calls for a good memory—I do not know whether I have a retentive memory—and close attention to the matter in hand.

I saw my young friend the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) come in here to-night. I welcome him over there to the midst of the elite again now that peace has come.

[Mr. Church.]

I see His Majesty's ministers over there, all pleasant looking gentlemen, each in his own department again. His Majesty's ministers have, each in his own department, to accomplish something of the kind if we are ever to be free to use our lives again as we desire, bound as we are by war regulations in an almost solid cocoon of red tape. And the ministers will have a harder task than the players of the old winding and unwinding game, for they have created armies of officials, all of whom are by now honestly persuaded that we cannot live without them, not even the C.C.F., and who are certain to make a hard fight to maintain their control over us.

These controllers or bureaucrats are sincerely convinced that they can order our lives better than the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) and the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell). They can even tell the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) what he can wear and what he cannot wear. Some of these control fellows are sincerely convinced that they can order our lives and spend our money much better than we can. They think they know what is good for us and for the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie) and for the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) in that brave new world from the cradle to the grave which lies ahead of us, which can only be created by hordes of officials, miles of restrictions, gallons of official ink, red and black, and armies of clerks and stenographers.

I commend this winding and unwinding game to the hon. members of this house. We now have sixty-five over here, forty-eight from Ontario. I commend this game to those who think we are sitting around here wasting our time, because that is what we have been doing very largely in six years of war. All our privileges have been handed over to Donald Gordon. It is stated in the British North America Act that parliament consists of the Goveror General, the Senate and the House of Commons. We now have an addition, the Governor General, the Senate, the House of Commons, and the House of Donald Gordon. They are going to tell you what you can do and what you cannot do. One day I saw sitting in front of one of the ministers opposite, I think the Minister of National Revenue or the Minister of Finance, when I asked who was to control beef and butter. 'Who are these gentlemen who are in charge of butter and beef? Have they ever had any training in the dairy industry or the live stock industry? Where did they start?" Well, we found that one of them was a graduate of a Canadian university who never was in any industrial calling. He should have

been a police commissioner regulating theatres. I remember when Colonel Dennison, the late Judge Winchester and I were on a police commission that had something to do with the regulation and inspection of theatres. A committee of forty appeared, objecting to the scanty costumes in theatres, like the underwear which these controls allow in war time. I asked, "Who are these gentlemen in charge of butter and beef? Have they any training in competitive business like dairy or live stock?" The answer was, "No". I said to the minister, "All that they know about beef and butter is what they consume themselves."

Mr. MACKENZIE: You were elected on butter once.

Mr. CHURCH: Not me. What is the situation in private business to-day? I referred to this the other day. Business men are conscious of the heavy task that awaits them in reconversion so that Canada may recover quickly. Industry and labour in Canada have worked wonders in war, and can in peace also. Canada needs stability to speed the delivery of all classes of goods and meet market demands so as to aid peace-time economy in employment, supply civilian needs and restore as soon as possible living standards and defeat inflation and black markets. It should be, with the lessons industry learned in Canada in war, much easier to work out reconversion. All irksome controls must go and we must remove shackles from industry large and small.

Private enterprise must have a clear right of way unfettered by a small standing army of inspectors, examiners, supervisors, card-filing clerks of a worn, out-of-date system of control, most of whom contributed nothing to the winning of the war. Business must have freedom once again to succeed by free enterprise, and we should see an end of government controls by blue-prints and a horde of useless officials, many of whom have never had any training in any competitive business they seek to control. Demobilization should be speeded for these reasons.

We have recently embarked on a programme of employment. There is no such thing as full employment. There is no use in people promising things like that; it cannot be done. If you consult the health statistics of this country you will find a great many people not fit for work. The reconversion policy of the government has been a flat failure and has never been anything else since it started. I will give the government of Canada credit for one thing, namely, the establishment in the city of Ottawa of a great basic industry known as the "ambassador cure for unemployment." They started embassies all over the seven seas. We had one ambassador who went to Australia. He did not stay there very long. He then went to Newfoundland. Dear knows where he is now. He comes from Halifax. I read of his wanderings around the world. The Emperor Hadrian never travelled around the way he did. By these useless embassies we are making ourselves ridiculous as a unit in this empire. I believe the Minister of External Affairs for Australia is right. America is giving too much appeasement to Japan. The Emperor of Japan should be proceeded against as one of the worst war criminals in the world. He is responsible for all over there and the cannibalism. I remember making a speech in this house on the Pacific question in June, 1937. At that time I wanted rearmament because I felt and said and predicted the coming war between Japan and the United States. I wanted to know what we were going to do about the Pacific question. The result was that parliament reduced the estimates and nothing was done.

Now the ambassadors have been holding forth at a place called San Francisco. It was called the other day by a great man in the British House of Commons, "Sham Fiasco." That is exactly what it is. It was never intended to do anything at San Francisco. The future of the world was settled at Yalta by three men, Mr. Churchill, President Roosevelt and Mr. Stalin. Two of them were great leaders of the English speaking people. The result was that the whole situation of the world was settled there and then at Yalta. The establishing of another league will not amount to anything. Washington does not believe in it. Read the speech of President Truman; read the speeches made in congress. France was not admitted to the charmed circle of the three. Why? Because she had no military strength. I believe in the old policy that might plus right is right. It has always been so. We shall always have nations. The peace of the world depends on the United States, Britain and Russia working together in peace as they have done so admirably in this war. The more you examine the whole situation—it will be up again in the house—the more you will find that this so-called league of nations will fail. It has failed over the years.

As Lord Milner said in 1919, speaking at Oxford, it was a most strange anomaly to hear that the self-governing parts of the British empire should be joining a league, binding themselves by a formal tie to a number of foreign nations when they had heretofore been unwilling to enter similar obligations with one another. I appreciate what the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has

done in connection with foreign affairs and many social matters. He has been a pioneer in connection with many of these social problems. I suggest, however, as Mr. Churchill has said, that the peace of the world in future depends on power politics and on sea power and a union with the United States, Russia and France. Power politics and Britain's command of the sea kept this world free from war from the battle of Waterloo to the outbreak of the first great war in Belgium in 1914; it gave us one hundred years of peace. Our great hope lies in the cooperation that we may achieve in peace as so well in war with our beloved allies. I named Russia and the United States, and I hope that France will be admitted to the big three as soon as her military strength is sufficient. The institution of parliament has not changed much since the day of Edmund Burke; our functions have not altered greatly.

There will be other opportunities to deal with the other matters which are before us for consideration, but let me say in closing that I hope we may some time have a union of all parties and groups in the house to work well together in order to do the best we can for the taxpayers back home in the constituencies.

Mrs. GLADYS STRUM (Qu'Appelle): At the outset, Mr. Speaker, I must express regret at your ruling this afternoon. I had prepared what has been referred to by the press as an essay, of which they said we had had several read yesterday. The result may be that I shall have three speeches, the one I had prepared, the one I am about to give and the one I shall wish to-morrow I had given.

In my first words I want to state that I appreciate more than I can say the responsibility that devolves upon me as the only representative of my sex in this house. Mine is a rural constituency which runs from the boundary of Manitoba to the city of Regina, including an urban section; and I shall keep in mind the electors of my constituency as well as the members of the armed forces, who gave me a larger total vote than they gave my combined opponents. I shall remember, too, that I am the only spokesman for my sex, but more than all this, I shall always keep in mind that I am a citizen of Canada.

Not only have we, the people of Canada, a common destiny; we have a common historical background. I refer now to chapter 2, page 66, of volume 1 of the Sirois report, which tells us clearly that following the birth of Canada as a nation, through the process of confederation—

> For twenty-five years the new nation had languished. . . . A vast and sudden transformation was wrought by the magic of wheat.

[Mr. Church.]

The wheat boom brought a flood of settlers into the west and created two new and flourishing provinces. It precipitated a new era of railway development and spurred on the industrialization of central Canada. Immense capital expenditures were necessary to equip the west and the growing urban and metropolitan areas of the east. Wheat worked a new integration of economic life and linked together the fortunes of the different regions.

On page 68 of the report the growth of population is dealt with. In a period of seventeen years—

> Between 1896 and 1913 one million people moved into the prairie provinces and the population increased from 7 to 20 per cent of the total population of the Dominion of Canada.

To quote the report, this resulted in Canada beginning to grow as a nation. As a result of the industry of her people and the ease with which the prairie soil could be brought under cultivation, vast quantities of wheat were produced and on this grain was built the great financial and industrial structure of central Canada. To quote the report briefly:

> The construction of the railways, the deepening of the canals, and the improvement of the harbours necessary to transport the increasing volume of western grain over Canadian routes stimulated economic activity in the east and gave it a large share in the moving of western products to the markets of the world. The building of towns and cities on the prairies, the equipment of the farms and the consumption demands of the population required a large quantity of manufactured goods. The protective tariff enabled Canadian manufacturers to capture the greater share of the new market, thus giving a tremendous impetus to industrialization in Ontario and Quebec, to the coal and steel industries of Nova Scotia and to the lumber industry of British Columbia.

So you see in our background Canada has been united in its economic and financial development. Our war effort, of which we are all so proud, has proved again that through the utilization of human skill, raw materials, processing plants, financial machinery and transportation Canada has almost unlimited production potentials. We have demonstrated, too, that raw materials plus the application of power and human resources add up to actual wealth. We in this house have seen proved the proposition advanced by the first elected members of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, that Canada need not stagnate in a bog of unemployment, under-production and want when we have in our own country all these basic requirements for the production and distribution of goods and services in unlimited quantities. The factories of Canada need not close or slow down as long as there are in this country families still needing homes, electrical equipment, plumbing, house furnishings, food, clothing and transportation. In many areas Canada is still in the first primitive

stages of development. Indeed, science and chemistry may very well remake our world if we shall but let them.

Before our farmers and workers can buy their share of goods and services, however, we must establish marketing boards, parity prices and crop insurance at reasonable levels for agriculture; and for workers, adequate labour and wage codes.

If our aged people are to establish their claim to our abundance they must have much more than $30 a month. Indeed, a floor under family income, below which no person would be allowed to fall, would be a just and reasonable national safeguard, because no modern industrial nation can afford the luxury of poverty.

It was fascinating, the day of the opening, for me as a new member to observe the pageantry and take part in the practices that have grown up around our tradition of government. I was interested to hear the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) remind us of the customs of Westminster. I submit that all of us in this house will watch with equal interest the actions of the new parliament recently elected there, as they write a new page of history, history in terms of social ownership and human advancement. We in the group I have the honour to represent look forward to the day, not far distant, when Canada will follow the example of the mother of parliaments and instal in office the Canadian counterpart of the British Labour party, the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation.

Mr. HOMUTH: That will never happen.

Mrs. STRUM: It is a good thing to make of our capital city a beautiful memorial, fitting to honour the memory of those who died that we might live. Books will be written and in song and story we shall record their valour. Deeds, not words, will be the measure of our gratitude. People yet unborn will, in some far off day, scan our old age pension schedules, our slum clearance plans, our widowed mothers' allowances, our infant mortality rates, and we shall answer at the bar of history.

We must here take full responsibility not only for our utterances in this house, but for the conditions of our homes, the level of family income in town, city and country, and the health, education and well-being of our communities.

"It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here" to the building of a new day in Canada and a new era of peace, brotherhood and abundance for all mankind.

Mr. DONALD M. FLEMING (Eglinton): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in this chamber for the first time I join the company of former classmates. The class of 1928 at Osgoode Hall law school, Toronto, boasts two members in the government in the persons of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Chevrier) and the Secretary of State (Mr. Martin). That class also boasts a colleague on this side of the house, the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Boucher), and in the press gallery, Mr. Francis Flaherty. I make the fifth and express my pleasure upon joining them in this chamber.

I come from a city which I am assured by all is, without doubt, the most popular in Canada. I can assure hon. members that the point of view I bring to the chamber and the attitude I hope to exhibit in all discussions in which I may take part is no narrow or sectional one. I come here as a coast-to-coast Canadian. While I have had occasion to criticize what seemed to be a sectional point of view in other parts of Canada, it is my promise to the house that it will be my endeavour and determination not to indicate any degree of sectionalism in any points of view to which I may give expression.

We meet, Mr. Speaker, following a great victory, a great deliverance. I say it becomes all of us, and in this I speak only as a new member, to acknowledge the debt which hon. members in this chamber, yes, and all people in Canada, owe to those who have stood between us and our enemies on the field of battle.

Democracy has come through. The benefits we enjoy we owe to others, and it is in a sense of consecration that I, for one, intend to approach my duties as a member of this chamber.

I believe it is fair to say that the hopes of the people of Canada concerning this new parliament are high hopes. As the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) reminded us, in one of his earliest utterances this session, the problems which will face parliament during the years immediately before us will perhaps be the most difficult which have confronted any parliament in the history of our land.

I believe it is correct to say that the judgment which will be applied to the actions of parliament and the policy of the government will be an exacting judgment. We have a great opportunity to make good for Canada, a great opportunity to build here in Canada a land worthy of the sacrifice of those who have stood in our place on the fighting line.

That does not mean that we have come here in any submissive attitude, or that the attitude we propose to adopt in respect of

government measures is one of mere acquiescence. On the contrary, I think the attitude of all hon. members in this part of the house will be the one enunciated so clearly yesterday by our leader, namely, one of constructive criticism.

I am sorry that in what I have to say tonight I find more of criticism in respect of government policy that I had hoped would be the case in my first utterance in the House of Commons.

I think the first duty to which parliament must address itself is the recovery of the prerogatives and powers which have been yielded up to the government by the last two parliaments.

It may be that legally a state of war continues with both Germany and Japan. Hostilities actually have ceased, and with them any need for exercising the extraordinary powers the government has enjoyed during war time. There must be an end and an end at once, to government by order in council. There must be an end to bureaucracy.

It is disconcerting therefore, to say the least, to find that even on the eve of the convening of parliament the government continued to exercise its extraordinary powers. The use which has been made of the War Measures Act under these circumstances amounts, in my submission, to an abuse of those powers. In fact, what the government is doing to-day amounts to turning the War Measures Act of Canada into the political war measures act of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh. Oh!

Mr. HOMUTH: That is so and you know it.

Mr. MACKENZIE: What do you know about it?

Mr. FLEMING: On the very eve of the meeting of this parliament the government announced by order in council it had effected some amendments to the National Housing Act. With the text of those amendments I do not propose to deal this evening. They may be good or they may be bad; I do not make any comment in that respect. But I do say that the house is entitled to a clear explanation as to why amendments were so urgently required to a statute which had been in effect and on the statute books for fifteen months that they could not wait and be presented in parliament, and that they had to be dealt with at an earlier date.

Another example which surprised some of us was the government's action in connection with hauling down the union jack the day parliament met. We are told in the speech from the throne that we are to have a committee to go into the question of a design of a distinctive flag for this country. At the moment I am not discussing the question of a distinctive flag. I am saying that the action of the government in hauling down one flag and putting up another, while going through the form of saying that parliament will deal with the matter was high-handed. If they can pull down one flag and put up another, they can pull down the second flag and put up a third and so on. When is this to stop? I say it was a high-handed action, and coming as it did on the day parliament opened it amounted to a flouting of parliament.

There are some lessons which can well be drawn from experience of recent days—yes, from the election itself. Even though my leader is not Prime Minister of this country to-day as I had hoped and expected he would be, I am proud to be his follower. He fought a good fight for a worthy cause and there was nothing he said or did of which he has any cause to be ashamed. I am proud to follow him. I believe that the time will come when our good compatriots in the province of Quebec will come to know John Bracken and will appreciate his sincerity, his honesty of purpose, and will accord to him their support.

During the course of the debate we have heard some suggestions—perhaps they are more than suggestions—that the party which sits to your right, Mr. Speaker, has the unqualified support of organized labour throughout the Dominion of Canada. In the light of the facts such a suggestion creates a certain amount of amusement. In the first place we are told about the Prime Minister's profound sympathy for labour and about his profound knowledge of the problems of labour.

I suggest that it is worth remembering that when a dominion-provincial conference was called in the fall of 1943 to evolve a national labour code which would assure to labour in all parts of the country its right of collective bargaining, unfortunately that profound sympathy did not grasp the opportunity to put into effect a labour code which would apply to all industry throughout Canada. Eight provinces out of the nine asked the dominion to do it; but because one province said "no", the government, notwithstanding its alleged profound sympathy for labour, said, "We will just confine it to war industry". A great opportunity was lost. I hope a similar opportunity will present itself, but I repeat that a great opportunity was lost and an injustice done to labour. I think it is worth while recalling also what happened on parliament hill yesterday. If there are those on

the other side of the house who feel secure in the support of organized labour, I suggest to them that in my humble opinion it is a good thing for them that the election is past and that they are not facing it again.

We have been told from the government side of the house about the partnership which the government entered into during war time with labour and industry. That may be the government's idea, but it certainly is not the idea of organized labour. Organized labour feels that its offer of cooperation with the government in meeting problems which could be met only by the united action of government, labour and industry in war time was not accepted by the government or used as it might have been.

There is one further observation I should like to make about something that we have read in the papers of recent date. I refer to the reported remarks of the leader of the C.C.F. group (Mr. Coldwell) in the newspapers of last week. He is reported to have intimated that the party which he leads will be the only real opposition to the government in this house. It must have been a very dull evening that required such an extraordinary pleasantry from the leader of that group in order to enliven the hours. If anyone has any doubt about the position of those of us who stand under the Progressive Conservative banner with respect to opposition to government policy and government action they will find an effective answer in the statesmanlike utterances delivered by our leader yesterday afternoon.

Political memory may be short but it is well to remember what happened in Ontario between June 4 and June 11. There are some hon. members opposite who well remember what happened between those dates. There was a shift of support by many thousands of C.C.F. voters to government candidates. In other words, there are at least a dozen members on the other side of this house who owe their seats in this chamber to C.C.F. support which swung the tide in their favour. When we are asked to consider some other group as being the real effective opposition to this government it is well to remember that those twelve seats are essential to the continuance of this government in office. We should not forget where that support came from on that occasion.

It is well also to remember some of the events of last November. It will not be forgotten that in the momentous days in this house in November last it remained for the C.C.F. group to agree sufficiently with the government in connection with meeting the needs of man-power to unite with them by passing an effective amendment which called forth an expression of appreciation on the part of the Prime Minister. I do not think there is any doubt as to where the real opposition is to be found. The answer is that the real opposition lies right here, and it will be a constructive opposition.

The decade of the thirties surely taught Canada some lessons. One lesson which we ought to have learned is that if we are to avoid great industrial and economic dislocations we must make ample preparation in advance. There is no use in waiting until these great dislocations are upon us to begin to plan measures to cope with them. I have sat in this chamber for only four days and I have followed the proceedings with no little interest. Perhaps the impressions of a newcomer to this chamber are fresh and vivid, but one impression that has been borne upon my mind is the amazing vagueness of the statements emanating from the government with reference to the whole problem of reconversion.

The leader of the opposition made some direct criticisms in his remarks yesterday, and I fully expected that we would have from the Prime Minister or other members of the government—at least one other member has spoken—some clear exposition in concrete form of the programme offered by the government to meet this great national emergency which is upon us. But instead of that we have had only vague and general statements; there has been nothing concrete.

Obviously the government has been taken unawares; obviously the government has been caught unprepared. The Secretary of State (Mr. Martin) is reported in the press as having said in Port Hope on September 3 that the government had not been in a position to foresee that the atomic bomb would have brought the war to such a speedy conclusion and that its plans for economic post-war stabilization would have been more effective had there been more time to put them into effect. Then we have the Premier of Manitoba speaking in the legislature of that province and being reported as saying on September 4:

> Premier Garson told the legislature, sitting as a committee of the whole on post-war plans, that all-important negotiations between the dominion government and the provinces were many months away from conclusion. "Instead of just now starting negotiations, we should be in a position to start work," he said.

The only suggestion I have heard from any member of the government that they have a programme for this period of reconversion was a reference to the dominion-provincial conference and the proposals there made to the

governments of the provinces. That was a conference held in Ottawa in August last, and it will convene again in December. Apparently we are asked to infer that action on the part of the government must await decisions emanating from that conference. If in the view of the government action must await the conclusion of that conference, why on earth, Mr. Speaker, was that conference not called long ago? There was no reason given to the conference for the delay that has occurred in calling it together. The government of Ontario, from the time it came into office in August, 1943, begged and clamoured for a dominion-provincial conference with this very objective in mind, that the governments of all the provinces and the government of the dominion might sit down together and plan jointly so that this period of conversion might be bridged without loss of employment and without complete dislocation. That request went begging. For two years the provinces have waited, and when finally they were brought together it was on the eve of the conclusion of hostilities with Japan. If the government's plans are dependent on the conclusion of the negotiations with the provincial governments, then this government stands condemned for its long delay, a delay of at least two years, in summoning that essential conference. They should have had their plans complete long ago. They knew that the war was going to end some time and that it would be too late then to start planning. Why not at least get plans well under way beforehand, so that when the war did end, regardless of whether is was sooner or later, the plans would be ready and work could proceed?

There is no problem before this house that is more urgent than the problem of housing. It has two aspects which cannot be dissociated from one another—the emergency aspect, and the long-term approach to the problem.

In the first place it is admitted on all sides that an acute housing emergency exists, the worst of its kind in the history of the country. There never has been a time when Canada faced a housing problem nearly as acute as the present one. It is worth examining into the causes of the problem.

What are the causes? Sad to say, Mr. Speaker, some chickens are coming home to roost. The reason why this country is not better provided with skilled labour and building materials essential to the construction of homes is largely attributable to the failure of the government to apply a courageous and effective man-power policy during the war. The fact that tens of thousands of men were kept in enforced idleness or at least were removed from productive enterprise and were not being used where they were required in the country's service is directly the cause of the fact that we have this acute shortage of materials and this acute shortage of skilled labour. Lumber production was allowed to fall seriously below the figure at which it should have been maintained. Five billion feet was the production of four years ago, and that figure should and could have been maintained if an effective man-power policy had been applied by the government. Unless the discharges from active service are speeded up and men are available at once not only in the construction industry but in the primary production of the essentials of building materials it will be too late for this winter's production in the seasonal producing areas. Internal production restrictions should be removed at once, and serious consideration must be given by the government to the curtailment of our substantial export of lumber to the United States.

During all this period there has been a government agency called Wartime Housing Limited, which has been used by the government in certain ways. It was used by the government in wartime to build semi-permanent houses to house certain industrial workers and it is now being used in certain localities to build what are called permanent houses.

Of the operations of Wartime Housing Limited I say only this at the present time: If the government had given private builders the same opportunities to obtain materials and labour that Wartime Housing Limited enjoyed they could and would have done better work more quickly and at far less cost.

The methods of that government housing agency were on many occasions high-handed. We had some experience of that in Toronto. We asked them to come to the assistance of the city, where a critical problem has existed now for a long time, and when they finally consented to come in, it was on the basis of the city giving up to them its best sites. They were not satisfied with anything but the best. Their attitude was: Wartime Housing must not lose a cent. Their attitude was not: There has been a tremendous influx of workers into your city, some 75,000, and we will provide the housing that is required. No; the attitude of Wartime Housing was: We are not going to lose one cent on this proposition and we must have your best sites. Even the health by-laws of Toronto had to be suspended to enable Wartime Housing Limited to go ahead. That was their high-handed and dictatorial attitude.

With this same control-complex this government agency has prevented private builders from making their most effective contribution to meeting the need for housing.

We cannot separate the failure of the government to act courageously in this wartime

housing problem from its failure to bring to the whole housing problem in Canada a sensible, comprehensive, courageous and long-term view.

This house has been told that the National Housing Act of 1944 was the government's answer to the housing problem. Let us remember in the first place that that measure is administered by the Department of Finance. Let us remember also that Wartime Housing Limited and the so-called emergency measures taken by the government in war time come under the administration of the Department of Munitions and Supply. And now we have the Department of Veterans Affairs coming into the picture and becoming involved in the housing problem. What is needed is not a few more departments involving themselves in this problem. What the situation requires is an active housing policy from this government. We can keep on adding to the departments becoming involved in the problem, but that does not give us a policy; it simply adds to the confusion already existing. It is time that the government grappled with the problem courageously and realized once and for all that more departments and further inter-departmental competition will not build more houses for the people of Canada.

I offer these observations, Mr. Speaker. First there has been a complete inadequacy of planning on the part of this government. Just outside Toronto at the present time Wartime Housing Limited is building, at the instance of the Department of Veterans Affairs, six hundred houses for returning veterans—six hundred houses in a city that sent overseas tens of thousands of men who are now coming back! That apparently is the answer of the government to the housing problem in that great city. My leader yesterday used the expression "too little and too late" as applied to the government's action in this respect. If I may use his language I would go a step further and say that the government's action is far too little and far too late.

In the next place, the government has been doing far too much talking about what it intended to do in the realm of housing, leading the people of Canada to expect great things. The fact of the matter is that, unless they have something which they have not yet shown this chamber, they cannot possibly hope to fulfil the promises they made to the people, and many thousands of people, disappointed Canadians, are going to be living under conditions of great hardship this winter because of the failure of the government to make good and fulfil its undertakings to the Canadian people.

Next, in regard to the government's approach to this problem, particularly as evidenced in the National Housing Act, I say that the approach has been financial rather than social. This housing problem is a social problem. The government has not approached it as such but has treated it simply as a financial problem, and we shall not have a sympathetic and effective approach to the housing problem in this country unless it is seen as a social and not merely as a financial problem.

Here is this National Housing Act of 1944. It is an enabling statute. Consider these terms as found, for example, in section 4: "The minister may enter into contracts"; section 6: "The minister may by agreement" do thus and so; section 7: The minister may make loans; section 8: The minister may make loans; section 9: The minister may make loans to certain institutions; section 10: The governor in council may do certain things. And so on all through the act. It is an enabling statute; and therefore the approach of the administration to that act, and the spirit in which it undertakes to carry out parliament's expectations in respect of that statute, are all-important, and I say that on the record of the government in the fifteen months that statute has been on the statute books of the country the government has shown itself unwilling to deal with or at least indifferent to the immensity of the problem. It has not taken this statute in hand and sought to give a sympathetic application to it or to make its provisions workable and available to all Canadians.

For example, the government has refused the request of certain municipalities for permission to set up low-dividend housing corporations. In some places, for instance in Ontario, the provincial government offered to share half of the public ten per cent contribution to low rental projects, sharing that cost with the city of Toronto. That seemed a reasonable proposition, where you get a provincial government coming forward hand in hand with a great city and offering to share half the public contribution of ten per cent to a low rental housing project.

What happened? The Department of Finance, administering the statute, simply turned them down, and there has not been a zealous, sympathetic application of the provisions of this statute to meet the housing needs of the country. Far more use could be made of the provisions of this statute than has been made.

The approach that those of us on this side of the house in the Progressive Conservative party make to this housing programme can

best be summed up in this sentence. We regard it as a social problem which must be approached along with our approach to other social problems, and in working out for Canadians a sensible and comprehensive programme of social security we say that this must have its due place. We bring to this problem certain convictions. In the first place, we say that in any of these social security measures you must first of all avoid duplication of facilities, because that only breeds waste and competition, and I for one have not yet seen the necessity for the dominion going ahead and setting up machinery to administer social measures such as family allowances, while the governments of the provinces have trained staffs fitted to handle social and welfare problems, which staffs have been sidetracked in that matter.

We are all Canadians, whether as members of parliament or of legislatures, whether as members of the federal government or members of provincial governments, and surely to goodness it ought to be possible in these social measures to find some common ground and make a non-political and constructive approach having regard to the needs of the people of Canada, instead of setting up duplication by way of competitive methods of administration. This is wasteful and it breeds chaos in matters of administration.

In the second place, we say that in matters of social security there is never any excuse for hiding costs. In my experience of some years in the city council of Toronto, where we had many housing problems, and socialists and communists from time to time sat in the council, I always observed this with the socialists and communists in their approach to housing problems as in regard to any other social problems, that they preferred not to see the cost segregated and made known. Where it came to municipal assistance to any housing projects the idea always was to cover it up in terms of some low fixed assessment or some low fixed tax. Our obligation to the people to whom we are responsible is to see that they understand what these measures cost. The people wish to know these things, and it is our duty to give them this information. Let us know what the cost is. Do not let us endeavour at any time to hide these costs under cover. Hidden subsidies have no place in any approach to housing. In advocating subsidies in certain cases let us know what they are; let us make them known.

In the third place, we ought to make sure that the benefits of projects which are undertaken by parliament are assured to those for whom they are intended and not provide measures which admit at any time of these benefits not being passed on to those for whom they are meant. In matters of that kind as in all matters, but particularly in that respect, it is desirable that the local governments be used in connection with administration. We shall get the most efficient, the most effective, yes, and the most understanding administration of these measures if they are carried out by the local authorities who know the local situation and the local needs.

In the fourth place, all these social measures ought to be designed to help people to help themselves. That is the view of people who are experienced in social work and parliament ought to have due regard to that view. In whatever measures we undertake we ought to seek to avoid the discouragement of thrift and enterprise.

Having said that, what is our view in regard to the necessity for a comprehensive and long-range approach to the problem of housing? In the first place it must be comprehensive. There must be no piecemeal approach to the question of social security. We have suffered too long from competition between governments and between sections of the country in matters of social security. There must be a comprehensive plan rather than a piecemeal, political approach.

In the next place, having regard to the constitutional difficulties, whereas the great sources of taxation are placed within the power of parliament, the responsibility and jurisdiction with respect to social measures have been placed in the provinces. This inverted relationship must be corrected by constitutional action or agreement particularly in facing up to the problem of making a contribution or subsidy available to provide housing for those who otherwise are condemned to live in sub-standard dwellings.

We must not forget the constructive benefits on the credit side of the ledger. Bad housing is a source of delinquency, bad health, yes, and even crime. In eliminating bad housing, with the assistance of a dominion government subsidy, we are eliminating this costly source of social ills.

I do not need to take up the time of the house in arguing for recognition of the claims of those in the lowest income brackets who ought not to expend more than twenty per cent of their income on housing, because that class and their need have been recognized by the National Housing Act itself. Section 2, subsection 11, recognizes that class of people who ought not to be expending more than twenty per cent of their income on housing,

because if they spend more than that amount they will be doing so at the expense of proper diet and proper clothing.

These citizens in the low income brackets must have more consideration from parliament than the 1944 act will ever give them. That act was largely brought about by the report of the Curtis committee, an eminent committee. Their recommendations were largely adopted by the government with one outstanding exception. That outstanding exception was the provision for subsidizing housing for those in the lowest income brackets. That committee stated:

> For the purpose of meeting the low-rental character of the project, i.e., the essential point that its costs cannot be solely met from rental revenues, an annual subsidy is considered the best and most practicable system. It has the merit of being flexible and subject to variation if circumstances or experience demand. It is straightforward in effect, and understandable as a rent reduction fund applied to a clear-cut social welfare purpose. It seems unquestionable that a substantial part of this subsidy should come from the dominion government.

I would conclude with this observation: In this country we have lagged far behind. There is need for an improvement in this legislation, and it must be made. We ought to follow the example of the United Kingdom. They have been subsidizing housing ever since the last war. We are years behind them. We ought to follow the example of the United States which has had a comprehensive measure of this kind since 1937. There are three hundred thousand substandard dwellings occupied in the Dominion of Canada to-day, as found by the Curtis committee. A hundred and twenty-five thousand of these units are in the larger cities, fifty thousand in the smaller cities and a hundred and twenty-five thousand on farms. If parliament and the government do not grapple immediately, courageously and effectively with this problem they will be called to account by the people of Canada. If we grapple with the problem effectively and with determination we shall earn the thanks of a grateful people.

Mr. L. E. BAKER (Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare): I am a new member in this house. I had not intended to speak so soon in this parliament as I am doing. However, I have heard a lot of remarks made regarding service men. I do not like to use the first person pronoun more often than necessary, but if I do so to-night I ask the house to excuse me. I was overseas and have been in the army for six years. I have fought in two different theatres of war. I was flown back to Canada to contest the election with a fellow member of parliament, the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. Merritt) across the way, for whom I have the greatest admiration. Everything was very democratic about the whole thing. In the one plane there were four C.C.F., two Liberal and one Progressive Conservative supporter. Of these four C.C.Fs., three were candidates for the federal house and one was for the Ontario provincial house. As we flew over the Atlantic eventually we had to increase our altitude due to cumulus clouds and we reached a height of fifteen thousand feet. At that time, I thought that was the height of democracy.

I have no intention of being acrimonious or bitter in any of my remarks. I am not a politician; I am a soldier; therefore I do not want anybody to take any personal exception to anything that I may say. First of all, I represent the constituency of Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare, which is pretty much the extreme east end of Canada and on the Atlantic seaboard. Some of my problems are the same as those of the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Pearkes), particularly fishing. Therefore both ends of Canada have been represented in speeches in this house this afternoon and evening.

The reason I came back to contest the federal election when I was overseas, and it was after V-E day, was just this and simply this, that I had confidence that the government which had carried us victoriously through the European war would be the government which would carry us through to a successful peace.

May I say here, Mr. Speaker, that the British empire has won many wars. That is why we are all here to-night; but something that is even greater than winning wars is the winning of everlasting peace, which has never been done. I maintain that this Liberal government with its trained leaders is the government which can help to take us through to a satisfactory and lasting peace. Possibly some of the hon. members of the opposition are a little too impatient. We did not work up our magnificent navy, army and air force into the fine and efficient fighting machine that it eventually turned out to be in a matter of two weeks. The war has been over for slightly over two weeks. Perhaps we have not admitted that in the house, but that is so, and therefore we have not had very much time in which to convert ourselves from war-time efficiency to peace-time efficiency. But we have these plans made and I maintain that by being patient we worked out our fine fighting machine and that if we shall only have a bit of patience and not draw red herrings across the trail and turn small issues into main issues we shall have a successful

peace and our men will eventually be properly rehabilitated, and that we shall sit at the peace table and make a satisfactory world peace, or at any rate share in it.

Regarding the war memorial in the form of beautifying a larger Ottawa, I am heartily in sympathy with it. There have been hon. members on the opposition side of the house who have been partly in sympathy with it; but they say: "How about wartime housing, and how about various other matters?"

With regard to people who are in distress, I am thoroughly in sympathy with them too, but I believe that both matters can be taken care of, and I believe that the memorial we should have should be a memorial in the capital of Canada, something in which each province of Canada and the territory may feel that they have an equal part and that we shall have a capital of which we shall be proud.

When I was a small boy I visited the city of Washington. As I walked around that beautiful city I thought to myself it must be wonderful to be an American and have a capital like that, because I feel that a beautiful capital impresses people from all parts of the country. In the city of Edinburgh, Scotland, there is a little bit of earth from Nova Scotia, the province from which I am pleased to say I come. So I maintain that each province in Canada might well send some of its earth to this city, and that certain parts of the city might be allotted as representing the various provinces.

I believe the principal thing we must realize is that we must get together from coast to coast; the hon. member for Nanaimo and I, as the member for Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare must get together and work for the general good of Canada. We must not confuse the vast main issues at stake by merely bringing up small, controversial programmes. There is no such thing as a utopia. Though we may try to bring about that condition, we shall probably never succeed. However, we will do our best and come as close to it as possible. One thing I would ask hon. members of the opposition is that they have patience. We have not had very long in which to work. This is not the day of the laws of the Medes and Persians. Laws can be changed if it is found that they do not work to the satisfaction of all concerned, and I believe the government which I support will be prepared to make any necessary changes at the proper time.

Mr. FERNAND VIAU (St. Boniface) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, it is the first time since its creation that the constituency of St. Boniface has elected a member able to address the House of Commons in your mother tongue. It is with a real pleasure that I congratulate you on your appointment as Speaker of the House of Commons.

I am still a young man and it is the first time that I take a seat in this assembly. However, for several years, and even while I attended college and the University of Manitoba, I studied politics not only of my country but of all the provinces and especially the province of Quebec. When the Right Hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) suggested your appointment as speaker of the House of Commons, I already knew the political background of your family and your forefathers, not only in the province of Quebec but throughout Canada. I had known for several years the names of Gouin, Mercier and Fauteux.

I am very happy to have been chosen to represent the historical constituency of St. Boniface which has been set up twenty-one years ago and which formerly was part of the constituency of Provencher.

I may assure you that I am proud to address you in my mother tongue, for not only does it enable me to express clearly and intelligently all my thoughts, but it permits me to pay tribute to the missionaries, to the pioneers and to the explorers of the confluent of the Red and Assiniboine rivers where the history of Western Canada was written over a century ago. In using this language I shall constantly honour the memory of those pioneers.

(Text): Many times yesterday and to-day, Mr. Speaker, we have heard the expression "I am a new member of this House of Commons." Yes, this new parliament has brought quite a number of new faces, including a great many young men, of whom I am proud to be one. I was elected in the constituency of St. Boniface as a supporter of a government which for many years gave the country peace and prosperity by its sound administration. Though I was still on active service when called upon to contest the convention to choose a Liberal candidate for my constituency, I thought I should comply with the requests of my friends and accept the honour of being chosen as a candidate in support of the present government, because I felt that the government which had administered the affairs of the country so well during the six years of war should be able to manage them equally well in the post-war period.

It so happened that the war with Japan ended abruptly, and we were all glad that our armed forces would be able to return home

and enjoy the peace for which they fought so bravely. Various members of the opposition, however, have insisted that the government's peace-time programme is not adequate, and that it was not prepared for the period of transition from war to peace. As I stated a short time ago, the return of the Right Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and his government in the last election was a token of appreciation on the part of the Canadian people for the good work done during the war. On June 11 last the Prime Minister was able to go back to the electorate of Canada and request another mandate for the next five years without having to set aside his faithful old lieutenants, and without having to change the name of his party. That was one reason I was happy when selected as the candidate for the Liberal party in the constituency of St. Boniface. For many years I had known and watched the present leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken); but I felt that a man should always remain true to his ideals.

In the speech from the throne the government has laid down its programme for this session. The first part of the speech, which contains a tribute to our armed forces, is of great importance. In that connection, however, I should like to pay a tribute to the nursing sisters in the Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps who have followed our troops to the battlefields. Many of them have given their lives; many have been wounded. Most of them will be returning to Canada wearing ribbons certifying to the service they have given in many theatres of war. This applies also to the women's divisions of the Canadian army, air force and navy who are still doing a great work to assure Canada peace and prosperity for the years to come. To these women we owe a great tribute.

During the period of peace time I feel that Canada should maintain a permanent force, right here in Canada. The training of young men, be it for one year or two years, will make of them better citizens. It was noticeable in the early days of the war, when in 1939 we had so much difficulty in obtaining volunteers to join the colours for the defence of Canada and the allied nations. One of the chief causes was that this country never had a complete and full military set-up for the army.

If the government will implement this programme and assure the house that one or two years of military training will be given, we shall have better citizens, and we shall not witness those incidents which took place in the House of Commons when some members from Quebec, those ultra-nationalists, were ready to betray their country when it was at war and the enemy almost at its shores, and insisted that we take no part whatsoever in a war which was then in progress. That attitude in the House of Commons will remain a blot on the history of our country. As a Canadian of French descent, who has lived in western Canada, I say that attitude was sorely felt and will never be forgotten.

In respect of that other part in the speech from the throne which dealt with the housing programme, I demand of the government to take immediate action to assure that our veterans immediately upon their return from overseas will be assured of good housing quarters. The programme is already in force, but more immediate action should be taken. That is one point upon which I would insist.

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of National Defence and Minister of National Defence for Naval Services): Mr. Speaker, before the vote is taken on the motion, perhaps I should say a few words about the government's demobilization policy, particularly in view of the fact that it has been made the subject of criticism in the amendment moved by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) and in view of the remarks this afternoon of the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Pearkes).

I must confess that, after listening with attention both to the leader of the opposition and to the hon. member for Nanaimo I was unable to ascertain exactly on what grounds they criticized the government's policy. However, that is no doubt due to a defect in my own make-up, rather than to the powers of exposition those hon. members possess.

Perhaps, however, it might be well for me to review briefly the basis upon which we are proceeding with our policy of demobilizing our armed forces. I am sure hon. members will agree with me that that policy must be fair and that it should be as expeditious and as orderly as possible.

As announced some time ago, the basic principle upon which demobilization is based is that of first-in first-out, the principle that the man with the longest and hardest service should be the first discharged. The hon. member for Nanaimo stated very properly this afternoon that that principle must be subject to some variation, and that one cannot adopt a hard and fast first-in, first-out rule and expect that the thing will work properly or fairly. The hon. member then proceeded to enumerate —and pretty accurately, I think—those various instances in which we depart from that principle.

The first was on compassionate grounds. As an old professional soldier he knows that that has always been a ground for discharging

men from the armed services. I take it, therefore, that he does not criticize the government's policy in that particular.

The second ground on which exception, apparently, is made to the basic principle is that where a man has been recommended for early release by the industrial release and selection boards which have been set up under the direction of the Department of Labour, with a view to allowing employers to make application for the early discharge of employees who, they submit, are so-called key men, and for whom it is asked that discharges be granted ahead of their turn. In the cases where recommendation is received from that board the military, naval and, I imagine, the air authorities, will either discharge a man or grant him extended leave. If he is granted extended leave the time during which he engages in civilian occupation prior to his final discharge does not count for gratuity or for rehabilitation grants. The hon. member for Nanaimo did not express his preference one way or the other, as to whether we should abandon that principle. I am sorry he did not say whether we should or not; but I can only assume that, since he did not object to it, he deems it is a proper procedure to follow. That is the second ground upon which a man may be repatriated and discharged, or put on extended leave ahead of his turn.

The third and last ground upon which a man may be returned from overseas other than upon the principle of first-in, first-out is, of course, the obvious one of medical grounds. That is one which has always existed, so far as I know, in all the armed services.

We now come to the men in Canada. As hon. members will appreciate, a week or ten days ago we announced certain extensions to the three points I have mentioned. The first is to allow those who can establish that they have been accepted for admission to a recognized university or educational institution to obtain their discharge ahead of their turn. Again the hon. member for Nanaimo did not indicate whether or not he objected to that procedure. However, I would say to him that, judging by the number of requests I have had from supporters of his party, the great majority of them are in favour of that exception.

The second ground is that a man may be discharged or put upon extended leave ahead of his turn if he is to go to agriculture. Again the hon. member did not object. I have not had a written objection from any hon. member to that procedure. If there is objection I hope hon. members will rise in their places and say that it is wrong. They have not done so yet, and no one has made objection to me as Minister of National Defence.

[Mr. Abbott.]

The third group is the one to which the hon. member referred—and here, may I say, not quite accurately. I do not for a moment suggest that he did so purposely. His reference was to the discharging or to the putting of men on extended leave to certain essential occupations.

The situation is this, that in certain occupations designated as essential by the Minister of Labour, including the building industry and the packing house industry, the army will discharge men in Canada, or will release them on extended leave in order to go into those industries. That is policed, if I may use that term, by the ministry of labour. We do not any longer detail any men for civilian work, with the exception of farm labour.

Then there was the final group he mentioned, comprised of men who are discharged as unsuitable for training. That has always been the case so far as I know in every army, and no one should know it better than my hon. friend. He made a plea for reduced taxation, but I do not know whether he feels we should continue at the taxpayers' expense to train unsuitable men in the army. However, if he does I wish he would say so.

Mr. HOMUTH: You have done it for five years.

Mr. ABBOTT: He did not say what he wanted done, but he suggested something should be done with the N.R.M.A. personnel other than what is now being done, that is to keep them in the army to perform essential military duties in Canada. He may have intended to say that they should be sent somewhere else, but so far as I know none of his party made that statement before the election.

Mr. PEARKES: I said distinctly that they should be welded into one army.

Mr. ABBOTT: My hon. friend says that they should be welded into one army, but I do not know what particular distinction he would make in the men. He did not suggest that they should be discharged and he did not suggest in specific terms that they should be sent over to Germany as an army of occupation. I think the house and the country can draw their own conclusions as to just how serious or constructive his suggestion is as to what we should do with the N.R.M.A. troops.

I do not recall any other points in connection with our releasing men from the services that he mentioned other than the principle which I have mentioned of first in, first out, and the longest and hardest service. Of course it is true, as he knows and as the house

knows, that some time ago we began to try to return men from overseas by units and divisions rather than purely as individuals. The hon. member made some reference to the reduction in the point score from an original figure of 150 or 160 to 130. One reason for the reduction in the point score is that since V-E day we have repatriated from overseas over 120,000 of all three services. We returned approximately 108,000 up to the end of August and, as those who have read the newspapers will have seen, something like 18,000 came in last Sunday alone. Therefore there has been a fairly substantial number repatriated in September. I think it is fairly safe to say that by the end of September there will have been a very substantial additional number of troops repatriated from overseas, I am glad to say many more than we anticipated we would be able to repatriate at the time of V-E day.

I shall be glad to give more details as to our methods of repatriation and that sort of thing when my estimates are up, but I felt that I could not allow the amendment moved by the leader of the opposition and the speech made this afternoon by the hon. member for Nanaimo to pass when there had been no evidence offered in this debate that the demobilization policy is unsatisfactory. I should like to know from the hon. gentlemen who criticized it just what policy they would substitute in its place.

Mr. EUGENE MARQUIS (Kamouraska): As a newly elected member speaking in parliament for the first time I cannot help being impressed when addressing this honourable house. But I know every hon. member is inclined to generosity. I wish first to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, upon your election to the high office you now occupy. I am sure you will fulfil your duties with the impartiality and with the dignity you have always shown in your private and public life.

I wish to congratulate the mover (Mr. Benidickson) and the seconder (Mr. Langlois) of the address in reply to the speech from the the throne. Both of these men are young; both of them are heroes; both of them are brilliant speakers. They have proved that war has brought to maturity a new and brilliant generation. Their attitude during the war was a symbol of strength and courage and their attitude before this house is a symbol of determination to win the peace and to assure prosperity for the future of Canada.

(Translation): Mr. Speaker, I did not expect to address this house to-day.

Speakers throughout the country, and especially the hon. member for Nova Scotia and the hon. member for Saskatchewan who preceded me, both of them members of the active army and heroes of this war, did not hesitate, in accordance with their outlook and the purposes they seek to achieve, to uphold the rights of Canadians and to outline the programme they intend to advocate for the welfare of their country.

As representative of a farming community, a constituency which during the war supplied our armed forces with essentials and which also contributed toil, courage and blood, I have deemed it my duty to express to the government of my country my admiration, my esteem and my devotion.

Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of my remarks I am deeply moved at the thought that I represent to-day the native constituency of a man who was my first counsellor, the idol of his province, who has symbolized the spirit of Canada in its purest and finest form, the late hon. Ernest Lapointe. He was among the first to add lustre to the name of Kamouraska and it was he who courageously and proudly wore the political mantle of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the great Canadian leader whose memory still endures.

I stated a moment ago that the constituency of Kamouraska is an essentially agricultural community. It is composed of parishes where farming is the chief industry and lumbering comes next in importance.

As several are aware, there is in my constituency a classical college of foremost importance, where great men have received their education, and I would be afraid to offend the modesty of several members of this house if I were to single out those who attended Ste. Anne college.

In addition there is a high school of agriculture and fishing.

Agriculture, especially during the period of reconstruction which is now beginning, must enlist the assistance of science and resort to the most modern practices.

We have experts, as well as distinguished and experienced agronomists, we have specialized courses through which numerous technicians have received their training, and who come not only from the district of Kamouraska but also from the region of Quebec city where they have assisted in the agricultural development through their talents, their culture and their scientific knowledge they have won recognition throughout the country.

May I add, Mr. Speaker, that there is also in my constituency a Dominion experimental station which enables us to engage in practical studies and scientific research in agriculture and constitutes a perfect organization for the prosperity not only of the locality but of the whole province of Quebec.

In the recent election, like most of those who sit here, I was privileged to have opponents. One of them had been a Conservative ever since his early childhood and perhaps since his birth. Probably on account of some political reactions which exist in certain quarters, he suddenly felt an urge of independence which led him to a crushing defeat. The other one was an advocate of Social Credit; he was quite modest and preached a theory which did not succeed in rallying enough believers to save his deposit.

The people of the constituency of Kamouraska, who are peaceful, honest and hard-working citizens, believed in their country, in their leader, and they gave their full confidence to the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Mackenzie King). It is a testimonial much greater than the one I could give myself. The preachings of extremists, the criticism of independents, the new theories of every kind could not sway the confidence of sincere and loyal people who remembered that in our country there is a man who, especially since 1935, when he fell heir to the sorry legacy of unemployment, set about his work, fought and carried out social policies in order to place this country on a basis of progress. At the time when the country was being stabilized, war broke out, a war that threatened not only Canada but the whole world.

We have heard this truth proclaimed in this house, on various tones, it is true, but all agreed that Canada was in danger, that our freedoms were jeopardized, that the survival of Christianity itself was at stake. The people of my constituency, together with most of Canada's citizens, understood that one man, in spite of the heavy burden he had carried in the past, managed to avoid all pitfalls, to overcome all obstacles and to lead us through the whole war to ultimate victory. This man is the Prime Minister of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I know I am expressing the views of my constituents when I say that we are grateful to the Prime Minister for the way he has warded off all dangers and we thank divine providence that he is still in our midst.

There are speakers in this house who, a few months ago, asked for total mobilization of our man-power and who now want the army demobilized even before the war is officially ended. Yet, the programme of the administration in this regard clearly provides for as prompt a return of our men as most of our service men themselves would wish. It is a wonder to me that those who purport to vindicate the rights of our soldiers who fought on the various battlefields, should preach a doctrine which is not adhered to by our military men. Never, in a speech from the throne, has there been outlined so comprehensive a programme providing every possible means of reorganization and reconstruction in Canada. Does any one claim that the speech from the throne should specify the exact amounts that should be appropriated for each particular measure? I do not think any member of this house would entertain such an idea. But this programme enables all persons of good will to cooperate in the development of the country, and to contribute to veterans' assistance. This policy promotes the agricultural production, to assist famished peoples. It is the government of our country who offer a helping hand to the poor, the famished and the unfortunate.

Who are those who oppose the government measures? Who are those who fight the adoption of this policy intended to help the peoples of the overseas countries to get sufficient clothing, food and fuel? They are the gentlemen of the opposition, sitting on your left, near you, Mr. Speaker.

At the close of a conflict which has jeopardized not only our freedom of speech and our wealth, but even what I would call our right to live, our right to leave an inheritance, however small, to posterity, we should all unite in close cooperation in order to attain to a spirit truly, fully and solely Canadian in character.

I have never concurred in the opinions of any extremist. They are sowers of disunity, whatever province they hail from. I am more convinced than ever that, in this house, we all aim, now more than ever, at unity and harmony.

Mr. Speaker, while reading magazines, periodicals, newspapers I have often noted with regret the tone adopted by some speechifiers and even the ideas they dared to express. May we now say that such incidents are but the exception and that in our beloved Canada, the representatives of the people, maintaining their personal identity, remaining faithful to their race and beliefs and respecting other creeds and races, may we now say, Mr. Speaker, that all of us shall rally as Canadians around a symbol, a national flag which will serve as guide to every one?

Mr. Speaker, I know of no one in this house or even in the country who does not wish for real unity in Canada. I express the solemn hope that before long, Canada will have a recognized national anthem which all her citizens to sing before a flag around which we will gather.

Some members of the house object to the government's policy. Do they oppose the San Francisco charter, a pact which represents the resultant of the discussions held by the United Nations? Does not the speech from the throne reflect the spirit not only of Canada but of the whole civilized world toward post-war reconstruction when it asks to approve the San Francisco charter? Do these honourable gentlemen oppose the adoption of the address in reply to the speech from the throne because the Canadian government intends to proceed as rapidly as possible with the conversion of war industries into peace-time industries? As some would say, Mr. Speaker, if those gentlemen were in the place of the government, would the reconversion of those industries come more rapidly or perhaps as quickly as some among them transformed themselves into independents in the province of Quebec. Those honourable gentlemen governed this country before 1935, and to my knowledge there were no miracles in political administration during this five-year plan. There were indeed, Mr. Speaker, timely suggestions from some members who sit to your left, and I know that all the members of the government are ready to consider suggestions that may be accepted and adapted to the political conditions as they new exist in this country. I listened with much attention to the leader of the C.C.F. party (Mr. Coldwell), who, besides having remarkable parliamentary qualifications, certainly made, in his speech, a few suggestions which may, at a later time, affect this country's policies. I know that the Prime Minister has long since always carefully considered the opinions expressed by the various groups. Besides, those who are quite earnest in their criticism realize that the leaders in the administration cannot always adapt all the suggestions made to existing conditions. Evolution is inherent to politics just as it is to life; and, in the field of soldiers' reestablishment, or of reconversion of war industries to peace-time enterprises, those who urge, for the time being, a fixed and definite plan, and for years to come, a scaled plan, forget that the future is veiled to us, that we cannot know in advance what circumstance the country will face in a few months or perhaps a few weeks. That is what the government must keep in mind while carrying out its policy.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that the government which directed our war effort, maintained peace at home and rallied all Canadian forces to fight the enemy, once again, I trust that this government is qualified to effect civilian reestablishment, to help in the country's reconstruction and finally to grant our working classes the stability and safeguards they expect. The government which allayed the dangers of inflation will prevent deflation. The administration which, during the war, checked capitalistic abuses will not allow capitalism to stand in the way of a proper and just redistribution of the wealth of our country; that is why it has granted family allowances which will allow children to prepare for the future, to be properly clothed and fed, to receive a better education. In fact, the Liberal administration did not wait until the close of the war. At the most tragic periods, when Canadian lives were being lost in battle, our government turned its attention to our manpower and the protection of childhood; it decided to protect the working classes, the little people to ensure that, in our country, the middle class would be immune from capitalistic abuses. That is what the Liberal government has done for the good of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding my remarks I apologize to the hon. members of this house as it is the first time that I have had an opportunity to address them. I admit that I gained my inspiration in the study of Canadian politics, in my love of country, in my admiration and esteem for my leaders, in my faith in their sound policies. I admire their moderation and the efforts which they are making to ensure Canadian unity.

(Text): In conclusion, I thank God for having given Canada our Prime Minister, and for having given him the necessary health and strength to preside over the destinies of the nation during the war and during peacetime.

Mr. C. C. I. MERRITT (Vancouver-Burrard): Mr. Speaker, I wish to apologize to the house for intervening in this debate at such a late hour, but I find it necessary to do so for definite reasons. You will excuse a new member for having perhaps misunderstood the purpose of this debate, which is on the address in reply to the speech from the throne, the amendment thereto and the sub-amendment offered by the group to my left. It does not seem to me that the purpose of this debate is fully served simply by rushing to a vote on the question without having canvassed it properly. And this is what I mean by canvassing it properly. It was my understanding that in this debate there would be an opportunity for the ministers of the crown

to make to this country public statements which they have failed to make all summer on the great and important matters which have been exercising our people during the past few months, whether or not the members of the government know it. Before this debate terminates I hope we may hear not from private members on the government side, replying to the amendment offered by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken), but from the responsible ministers of the crown charged with the duty of seeing to it that we have jobs and housing, and that our men overseas get a proper deal when they return to this country. It is these hon. gentlemen whom I feel the country wishes to hear from in this debate.

I was very glad when Minister of National Defence (Mr. Abbott) rose to speak to the amendment in regard to the service personnel overseas and to answer the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Pearkes), who made such a telling speech this afternoon. Let me say to the minister at once that I know he was not responsible for the situation in which the government now finds itself in reference to the army. That situation sprang from the evil seed of the man-power policy which has been wrong from the beginning, and the minister has no responsibility for that. When he spoke to-night I thought I was going to hear what the country wants to hear; but all I heard from the minister was a deprecatory statement in reference to the speech of the hon. member for Nanaimo. The minister spoke of all the various ways in which men get out of the army now, as though the hon. member for Nanaimo was complaining, and as though this amendment complained, in regard to specific minor details. The hon. member for Nanaimo read out that list only to show the house the wide variety of methods by which people can get out of the army to-day, ranging from compassionate leave, which may be a perfectly good ground, down to "unlikely to become an efficient soldier," or "not amenable to discipline" which I say here is a perfectly bad ground.

Mr. ABBOTT: It has been a ground under army regulations for ten years.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. ABBOTT: Or at least since 1939.

Mr. MERRITT: The minister concluded his remarks by asking the hon. member for Nanaimo what policy he would suggest. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is not the duty of the hon. member for Nanaimo to suggest to the Minister of National Defence what policy would ensure fairness to Canadian soldiers overseas.

Mr. ABBOTT: If my hon. friend will permit a correction, I asked what different policy he would suggest.

Mr. MERRITT: Very well; I accept the correction, but what difference does it make? I say this, and I am going to leave the matter here, as I would not attempt to gild the lily by emulating the hon. member for Nanaimo. In this debate the country does not want questions of that kind; it wants to know from this government how Canadian soldiers still overseas are to be protected in regard to jobs when they get back to this country, after all the N.R.M.A. men and many others have been let out of the army ahead of them.

Mr. ABBOTT: The answer is that they are not being let out ahead of them.

Mr. CASSELMAN: Is this the courtesy extended to an hon. member in his first speech in the house?

Mr. MERRITT: I thank my hon. friend, but I need no such courtesies; I will answer any question that is asked. I will leave that question to the judgment of the house and the country, and speak now to the other two parts of the amendment. At least we can say that the Minister of National Defence rose in his place. What of the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe), who is responsible, I take it, for jobs and housing? Has he risen in his place during this debate? Not at all; we have not heard from him. The country wishes to hear from him during this debate. Lest he should be under any misapprehension as to the nature of this amendment, I say to this house that the amendment expresses exactly the feeling of this country against the government to-day. The country is both anxious and critical. The war is over, and the country is anxious about the ability of this government to show the way to full employment. The country is critical in regard to the lack of leadership exhibited by this government at the inception of the reconstruction period.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MERRITT: I hear hon. gentlemen opposite laugh. I say to them that for a long time they have claimed to be the leaders of this country. I say to them now that this country has been carrying the government on its back for a long time. Hon. members opposite may be thankful that this is a great country, and that as such it is capable of carrying even hon. members opposite on its back.

I should like to make another point about the amendment, lest it be thought that it should be allowed to go by default—like jobs

and housing. The amendment is a criticism striking directly at the capacity of hon. members who form the government to lead the people of the country. I wish to say right now that, unlike my hon. friends to my left, who believe that we need a new social order, I have believed for many years—and there are a great number of people who agree with me, and who will always agree with me—that we need no new social order in order to have full employment in our country.

What we do need, and what we have not had in my adult life—and what I fear we can never have from this government—is "action" to give us full employment. The people of Canada are a reasonable people. I do not believe they expect very much, perhaps not as much as they have a right to expect, from the government of their country. I do not think that they call for utopia, or even that they mind being inconvenienced by lack of housing, or being laid off from jobs during a difficult period.

But what they do mind, what exasperates them and prompts them to talk among themselves, as they are talking across the country to-day, is complete inaction on the part of the government to face up to problems which, although they may not be of great concern to the government, concern the people deeply. If the government has no action to offer, as I suspect it has not, then the people might be satisfied if an explanation were offered to them, and I am suggesting that such explanation should be made in this debate, and that the matter ought not to go by default. The government should explain when people might expect to find those jobs, and when they might expect to see those houses.

When the amendment was offered by the leader of the opposition the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) sought to turn it off by expressing his satisfaction in the results of the general election held in June. The hon. member for Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare (Mr. Baker), for whom I have very great respect indeed, and with whom I did not expect to take issue so early in the debate, talked about these matters of housing and jobs as if they were only small issues.

I wish to dispel any impression the Prime Minister may have sought to create to the effect that he is protected by the mandate he received from the people on June 11. I should like to recount a little history—even at this late hour—and it will not be ancient history. The history I shall offer will be very modern in the history of Canada, and although it is confined to the city of Vancouver, one of the constituencies of which I have the honour to represent, I am sure it is applicable throughout Canada.

Apparently some hon. members do not realize just what the situation is in Canada with respect to housing and jobs. So that they may do so, let me go on with my history. In May came V-E day, and in June the general election. I am not going to go at all into the history before the election; so that that excuse is not available to hon. members opposite. The people of Canada did not mind being badly housed before V-E day, because they had a war to fight. They did not even mind being badly housed after V-E day because there was still a war to fight. But they did expect—indeed, they have been promised by this government—that there would be action in respect of housing at once.

In the city of Vancouver there has been no action, and I shall recount to the house just what the situation is there. It now has in its population about 60,000 extra souls over its pre-war population. May I point out, in passing, that forty-eight per cent of the male population of service age in British Columbia volunteered for the armed forces. Those men are returning in ever-increasing numbers.

I have heard the over-all shortage of houses in Vancouver estimated as high as 20,000, but in my presentation this evening I shall settle for a very much smaller number than that. Let us, for the sake of this discussion, say that the number is only 5,000 or 10,000. On a certain day in August there were 1,400 veterans of this war who had served overseas, whose names were recorded on the books of the emergency shelter administration as having been placed in housing so unsuitable that even that harassed authority thought it should try again, if it could, to get better accommodation for them.

Let me place before the house two illustrations of how those men are living. In the first place, they are living in basements and attics. In the second place, they are living in that new and great Canadian national institution, the chicken-house duplex. And when I say that I am not attempting to crack a joke, but rather, have reference to veterans living in chicken-houses.

Let me give another illustration, from another point of view. There was one case of twenty-five men, women and children who were sharing one bathroom. If hon. members will reflect for a while on that situation they will readily realize the inconvenience entailed.

I ask the house this question: Of what use to the country and to the veterans is a veterans charter? Of what use to them is a

welcome home and a civic reception if, when they reach their homes, they must live under conditions such as I have described? What we want from the government is not grandiose plans, white papers and legislation. By offering us those they perform only half their job. We must have executive action to translate those plans into benefits placed in the hands of the men, women and children of this country.

That is all that will satisfy the people of Canada, and it is not too much to ask from the ministers concerned. Let me deal in further detail with the subject of housing. I have said that people might not mind living in chicken-houses, or might not complain about it. But what has the government done? Despite the promises made, the only housing activity of which I know in Vancouver this past summer was an application, by advertisement, for the registration of construction workers, and the throwing of Wartime Housing Limited into the already too small market for supplies.

At the moment the difficulty with the housing situation is not that of low rental housing, or of any social aspect of the question. It is simply a question of shortage of supply. That is certainly the case in Vancouver. So far as I am aware there is no authority in this country which has the job of getting after the bottlenecks in supplies. I made a little pilgrimage in Vancouver just to find out what the situation might be in this respect. I visited the wartime prices and trade board; the controller of construction; the emergency shelter administration; the mayor of the city; the private contractors' association; and I visited other agencies around town. Every one was most helpful, particularly the civil servants. They were all working desperately to try to get around this shortage, but none of them had any power to do a thing, none of them had any full responsibility. I could not find a man in Vancouver who had authority, responsibility or full knowledge about the housing shortage. That is what is at the bottom of this shortage, and nothing else. There has been no action in getting after the bottlenecks and trying to get rid of them.

I go on with my history and I mention what happened in July. In July we had a large and important strike at the American Can Company in Vancouver which supplies all the cans for western Canada. The strike lasted for fourteen days, and by the end of that time almost all the primary producers who tinned their products were desperate because their goods were spoiling. They were losing money day after day. The strike was on that old familiar issue, the closed shop. Did the government take any action? Yes, after two weeks—just in the nick of time—and, after all the agony had been gone through by the people on the Pacific coast because of the fear that their merchandise would spoil; after all the loss they had suffered through having to shut off production—the government acted and called in someone to take over the plant and to arrange a compromise. Why could they not have acted first? Why could they not have taken over the plant as soon as the strike occurred and then adjudicated and thus saved from loss the consumers and producers of primary products who had no concern with the strike? How many times and in how many places are we to have strikes on this old familiar issue without government action?

I come now to August, to V-J day. They rang the air raid siren in Vancouver to signalize V-J day. I wondered why and I soon found out. There had been some small celebration, a natural blowing off of steam which did not last too long. We then noticed an ominous undercurrent of wonder and a little bit of fear on the part of some people that there were to be no jobs in the shipyards or in the aircraft factories. The workers in these factories in Vancouver have done a magnificent job in this war and they now amount to a considerable number.

I tell you what happened, and it came very soon too. Private notices were sent out by these companies laying off the workers. There was no word whatever from Ottawa as to what was to happen to the workers; they were simply laid off by means of a notice from the private companies. The government just ignored the fact that this was going to raise a serious situation immediately. I do not suggest that the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) should have provided each of these men with a job. Under our system these men will find new jobs, but I do suggest that the minister should have laid some plans so that, even if V-J day took him slightly by surprise, he would have been able to make a public statement and give reassurance to the workers in Vancouver and other parts of the country. Perhaps he could have told them that he had been taken slightly by surprise, but to "hold on" because in a certain length of time the plans he had made to bring these plants back into production under other circumstances would bear fruit and jobs would be available. He could have said that in the meantime his advice was such and so. But there was no action; there was not even a statement of reassurance. I may say to the

house that out there on the Pacific coast we notice that lack of advice from the fountain of all authority in the country. We would be interested in having a little bit of attention paid to our problems.

The public is looking for reassurance. It is looking for leadership at once in this post-war reconstruction period. The record of this government since the general election in providing leadership for the people of this country is a sorry one indeed. I would not say that the people of Vancouver are down about it at all. I do not think they expected very much more. They have maintained their spirit, but they and the people of Canada are high-spirited. They are exasperated; that is the only word for it. They do not want anything too wonderful; they want action, that is all.

I should like to point out one way in which the inaction and lack of leadership from this government has affected things out in that part of the country from which I come. The housing crisis and the job crisis have caused many public statements to be made at many public meetings. The mayor of the city and the provincial government have been badgered by organization after organization to do work that this government ought to be doing. I say to hon. gentlemen opposite that it is not fair that provincial and municipal governments should be badgered, and perhaps lose the confidence of the people, when they have not the power to act before this government has given them a lead. The situation is quite serious and I am sure it will bring unwise political repercussions out there.

What I want and what I say the country wants is action and leadership. And for this reason. I say to the house that laissez-faire is dead. I know the house will agree with me, but let us consider for a moment just what that means. In short, it means this. When the people of Canada gave the present government of this country a mandate on June 11 to form a government, they did not elect them negatively to maintain free enterprise in being as the economic system of this country. They gave them a mandate positively to get in there and to make free enterprise work to produce satisfactory conditions for all Canadians. I want to say to the government that they have made a bad start because what is wanted in order to make free enterprise work is leadership. Leadership in reforming and controlling private enterprise when it does not serve the interests of the public, but, above all, what is wanted is leadership which promotes public confidence in our joint ability to perform the great task ahead. I say to hon. gentlemen opposite that if they have not that confidence or if they make the people of Canada doubt their joint ability for the tasks ahead, as has been done this summer, this government will not succeed in carrying out what the people of Canada want them to do. If we have not confidence in our ability to create full employment, then all fails.

The end of laissez-faire means another thing. It means that the government are no longer solely the administrators of the affairs of this country; that they can be content just to let things go. The government are ultimately responsible for every part of our national life, and there is no ill which befalls the people of this country which it is not the duty of the government to correct. If they are to correct all those ills, they must get a new outlook. They must give us that leadership and action which I have emphasized to-night. With that in mind I wish in the few minutes remaining to me to offer two concrete suggestions on leadership, and I ask all hon. members who have served in the armed forces to see if they do not go all the way with me.

First of all, I say that the time has passed when ministers of the crown can remain in Ottawa and properly conduct the affairs of this country from the capital. The ministers must get out and get around the country, and they can do it now by aeroplane, which is very fortunate, now that we have come to the end of laissez-faire. They must get around the country to find out what the people want and to see how their legislation is working and whether or not the benefits are getting to the people. I liken a minister of the crown and his deputy minister to a general and his chief staff officer. All hon. members who have served in either war will go with me when I say that a general is not a good general if he is not out seeing his troops. After a general has made his decision and given his orders to his chief staff officer, he gets out on the ground and sees how that order is working out, and by personal reconnaissance he gathers the information that enables him to make his next decision. Such a course must be followed by ministers of the crown if they are to lead the people of this country successfully.

An hon. MEMBER: Sounds like regimentation.

Mr. MERRITT: It is not; it is leadership, but the hon. member would not know the difference. My time is almost up.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go ahead.

Mr. MERRITT: The next thing the government must do is to take the people into its confidence. You can never lead them, if I may

say so to hon. gentlemen, without telling them what you are going to do and how you are going to do it.

Another thing that one can learn in the armed forces, and even when one is not in the armed forces—but very few people, including myself, do—is the vital importance of time. I say to the ministers of the crown that they must take the public into their confidence not only in routine press conferences which serve their purposes very well; but also by special press conferences and by specially timed appeals over the broadcasting system and by specially timed visits throughout the country, as these emergencies come up, instead of doing as they have done this summer, just letting things go by default. If you tell the people of this country what you want them to do, they will do it for you. They have proved that very well in the last six years. I never saw any troops, and I do not know of any people, who will do anything that you want them to do if you do not first tell them what it is that you want them to do.

If I had time I could make other suggestions as to how hon. gentlemen opposite could give leadership to this country. The suggestions I have made so far are not, of course, exhaustive, and if the ministers of the crown wish to give leadership to the people of this country they can easily find many additional ways of doing it. I would not have the temerity to tell them how to do their jobs. That would ill become a new member and a young man. I know they are able administrators.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MERRITT: Surely hon. gentlemen do not take too much pleasure in that remark. Surely they must be good administrators in order to sit in the high places they occupy; they must have something to their credit. I know they are good administrators, but I say that in this new era after the war they must be more than administrators—they have to be leaders. I want them to carry this message away with them, and I believe I speak for a very large part of the people of Canada when I say this. The government must have a new approach to present-day problems, and if I may say this without being offensive, but simply to make my point, I would say that what the government need is what we needed in the army, a sort of mental "battle drill" for cabinet ministers.

But to come back to the most important point, let the government make a start at giving this leadership that is needed. Let us have from the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply a statement on how Canadians may expect to get jobs in the immediate future. Let the government tell us what they are going to do about these questions such as severance pay that are vexing labour. Let the government tell us how soon we may expect a housing expediter and how soon action will be taken to loosen bottlenecks in supplies in order that houses may be built throughout Canada.

On motion of Mr. Ross (Souris) the debate was adjourned.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Wednesday, September 12, 1945.

The house met at three o'clock.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the house that I have received the following message from the Assistant Secretary to His Excellency the Governor General:

Ottawa, September 11, 1945.

Sir:—I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable Thibaudeau Rinfret, Chief Justice of Canada, acting as deputy of His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate chamber on Wednesday, September 12, at 5.45 p.m. for the purpose of giving the royal assent to certain bills.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,
F. L. C. Pereira,
Assistant Secretary to the
Governor General.

The Honourable,
The Speaker of the House of Commons,
Ottawa.

INCOME WAR TAX ACT

COMMUNICATING INFORMATION

Mr. STANLEY KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre) moved the first reading of bill No. 5, to amend the Income War Tax Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. KNOWLES: Mr. Speaker, this bill would add to the appropriate section of the Income War Tax Act the following words:

Provided that nothing in this subsection shall operate to prevent a minister of the crown from communicating to the Senate or to the House of Commons any information obtained under the provisions of this act.

The purpose of this amendment would be to remove the restrictions as to secrecy now imposed by subsection 1 of section 81, which in my view have the effect of denying to the house information which at times ought to be readily available.

This amendment would also affect the Excess Profits Tax Act, 1940, since sections 40 to 87 of the Income War Tax Act are, by section 14 of the Excess Profits Tax Act, made to apply thereto.

Mr. CHURCH: Communicating information from the cradle to the grave.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD ACT

COMMISSIONS TO AGENTS IN CONNECTION WITH SALE OF WHEAT

Mr. ROBERT FAIR (Battle River) moved for leave to introduce bill No. 6, to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act, 1935.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. FAIR: Mr. Speaker, paragraph (i) of section 8 of the Canadian Wheat Board Act, 1935, reads:

—in selling and disposing of wheat as by this act provided, to utilize and employ without discrimination such marketing agencies, including commission merchants, brokers, elevator men, exporters and other persons engaged in or operating facilities for the selling and handling of wheat, as the board in its discretion may determine.

In my opinion and in the opinion of many farmers of western Canada, the present elimination of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange from the business of handling wheat should be continued forever; and this amendment is introduced for the purpose of releasing the Canadian wheat board from the restrictions imposed under this legislation.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT

INMATES OF INSTITUTIONS FOR THE POOR

Mr. ROBERT FAIR (Battle River) moved for leave to introduce bill No. 7, to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1938.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. FAIR: I have introduced this amendment on other occasions, and I feel that this is the appropriate time to re-introduce it, in the hope that during this session it will be treated as it should be. Section 14 deals with the disqualification of electors, and subsection 2, paragraph (k), states:

—in any province, every person who is an inmate of an institution which is maintained by any government or municipality for the housing and maintenance of the poor, if such person is by the law of that province disqualified from voting at an election of a member of the legislative assembly of that province, and did not serve in the military, naval or air forces of Canada in the war of 1914-18.

In the near future, Mr. Speaker, we are going to deal with the question of citizenship. I believe that before our deliberations on that matter are completed, this paragraph should be deleted from the Dominion Elections Act. Let us have democracy throughout our country.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

STANDING COMMITTEES

LABOUR AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—SUGGESTED APPOINTMENT OF SEPARATE COMMITTEES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to make a suggestion to the Prime Minister and the government with regard to the standing committees of the house. I would preface this by saying that in my opinion the present standing committee set-up of this house could be improved. If the suggestion I offer receives the approval of the government, consideration ought to be given to this point before the special committee now preparing the list of members to serve on these committees makes its report to the house.

Two of the most important subjects with which the house must deal are labour and external affairs. Under the existing arrangements both these subjects fall within the jurisdiction of one committee, the standing committee on industrial and international relations. At this and succeeding sessions these two subjects must receive far greater attention than has been the custom in the past, and I believe the work is too heavy and too important to be placed upon a single committee. In my opinion there should be two standing committees, one on labour and industrial relations and the other on commonwealth and international affairs. Thus we would be assured of the opportunity for more adequate study by duly constituted committees of both these vital subjects, which have now achieved an importance far greater than at the time the existing committee on industrial and international relations was first established.

Would the Prime Minister and the government give consideration to presenting to the house an amendment to standing order 63 to give effect to this proposal?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I may say to my hon. friend that the suggestion he has just made

is one which, if my recollection serves me aright, has been made at previous sessions and I think is one deserving of very careful consideration. When industrial and international relations were referred to one committee, it was felt that most industrial problems had become more or less world problems, and equally, that the most perplexing of the world problems were related in one way or the other to industry. So it was thought that the committee which would be considering the one subject would naturally be interested in the other. I agree with my hon. friend that at the present time there are no questions more important than those which relate to industry and those which relate to international affairs. If there were two separate committees therefore it might and I believe would improve the opportunities of hon. members to give careful study to these questions. I shall be very happy to consult with my colleagues immediately as to the desirability of instituting two committees instead of one.

WAR APPROPRIATION BILLS

INCLUSION OF SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES IN PRINTED BILL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Finance with respect to item No. 5 on page 12 of the order paper. During war time the government in bringing down the war appropriation bills has, with a considerable measure of agreement by the house, departed from the usual parliamentary procedure in dealing with money bills. In presenting such bills in the past few years it has been the practice of the Minister of Finance to provide the members of the house with what one might call a "fluid schedule" which was debated at great length at the resolution stage before the bill was introduced. This schedule, as I understand it, was submitted only as a guide to the house, but was not made a part of the bill introduced. It did not, therefore, restrict the government in the use of the total appropriation. There were, no doubt, reasons for proceeding in that way during war time. Now that the war is over my question to the minister is this: Will he not now revert to the usual peace time practice with respect to money bills, and have the schedule of expenditures attached to and printed with the bill? If that procedure is reverted to, the members of the house will have the printed bill before them and the breakdown of expenditures in the form of a schedule to the bill.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, very full and extended consideration was given to the proposal which the hon. member has now put in words. On the earlier occasion it was not made by him, but rather by members within the government itself, and was given full consideration. Eventually we came to the conclusion that it was too early to revert to the practice of itemizing estimates, and that the situation now is scarcely less predictable, with accuracy and certainty, than it is in time of war. It was felt that there must be some power—and a very considerable power—in the changing of plans in respect of expenditures. That is to say, suppose we give the house an indication of our intention to spend, say, $150 million for a certain purpose. It may turn out between now and the end of the fiscal year that the amount required is only $75 million, but that a larger amount than we now intend to spend for some other purpose will be required.

May I add that the same question must have arisen at the end of the last war. The armistice was on November 11, 1918, and in June of 1919, a date within the fiscal year following the fiscal year in which the war ended, the government of that day decided it would have to continue the practice of providing for some fluidity in respect of intended expenditures. If the leader of the opposition will look at the 1919 statutes he will find there a demobilization appropriation act based upon the same principles as our war appropriation acts, and indeed using the same words as our acts.

I admit at once that just as soon as possible we should get back to a position where items are passed, and where the government is strictly limited in its expenditures to each item passed. As Minister of Finance I should like to see that position resumed at the earliest possible day. It is a protection to the treasury; it is good in principle and it is a right practice to follow. I am quite unable, however, to recommend that we follow it at this moment or at this stage. We are in the middle of the year in which hostilities have ceased, and at this time many of the items we are going to place before the house, while perhaps a little better than guesses, are not what one could call estimates in any true sense of the word. Nothing like the degree of certainty is possible in respect of these estimates that is possible concerning the estimates for civil purposes.

I hope the leader of the opposition will believe that this matter has been approached with a deep sense of responsibility. It has been canvassed with the senior officers of the

various departments, and while there might possibly be a very human desire on their part for a certain freedom in respect of expenditures, yet they have been most sincere in the advice they have given unanimously that this year we should follow the same principle with which we started the fiscal year, namely, that we should have a lump sum appropriation which we can apply to this, that or the other purpose, provided that those purposes are connected with the war.

Mr. BRACKEN: I should like to thank the minister for giving the reasons for bringing the measure forward in this fashion. I can understand that there is considerable justification for it under present conditions. I would strongly urge, however, that this be the last time the government proceed with a measure of the kind in this way. When may we expect a break-down of the items to be presented to the house in connection with this matter?

Mr. ILSLEY: If the debate in reply is completed to-day, I would expect to introduce the resolution to-morrow.

Mr. BRACKEN: And the minister would have a break-down then?

Mr. ILSLEY: I can have a break-down then, which can be placed upon *Hansard*.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

CANCELLATION OF MEETING WITH REPRESENTATIVES OF MANAGEMENT AND WORKERS IN STEEL INDUSTRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Reconstruction. I sent him notice of my question before eleven o'clock this morning. Has the minister cancelled a meeting which was to have been held this afternoon, Wednesday, of representatives of management and workers in the steel industry, to consider employment and related problems? If so, why?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction): For the past several months I have had a number of meetings with representatives of labour from various industries. These meetings have been arranged by a committee composed of high officials of the several labour congresses and federations of the country. Some weeks ago I held such a meeting to discuss the problems of the steel industry. In the course of the meeting Mr. Millard asked me to arrange a meeting between a group from labour in the steel industry and a group from the industry itself. At some considerable inconvenience I arranged a meeting—and had to use a good deal of persuasion to do it.

Four or five days ago a number of clippings were put on my desk stating that Mr. Millard, in addressing a labour meeting at Toronto, had said that he would not attend the meeting I had arranged unless I apologized for something or other. It then appeared to me that the purpose of the proposed meeting was undoubtedly political, rather than constructive. For that reason I cancelled the meeting on the ground that I am too busy at this time to attend political meetings in my own office.

Mr. COLDWELL: When it was suggested to me that I make this inquiry I asked the question regarding the alleged statement by Mr. Millard, to which the minister has referred. I am informed that neither Mr. Millard nor the union nor any member of the union authorized any such statement. I am informed, further, that they intended to attend the meeting, if it was called, and that the press report is entirely incorrect.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. COLDWELL: I think the minister should know that, though.

Mr. HOWE: Yes.

PRAIRIE FARM ASSISTANCE

QUESTION AS TO DECLARATION OF EMERGENCY CROP YEAR

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture arising out of the report of a statement made by Mr. Sinclair, one of the officers in Regina administering the Prairie Farm Assistance Act. His statement was to the effect that he anticipated an emergency year would be declared this year, because of the drastic reduction in crops in Saskatchewan and other parts of western Canada. Is the minister in a position to give a report as to the probability of an emergency year being declared.

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): The act provides that a decision must be made by the government before November 1. The matter is considered each year prior to that time; and when it has been considered an announcement will be made.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Tuesday, September 11, consideration of the motion of Mr. W. M. Benidickson for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Bracken, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Mr. J. A. ROSS (Souris): Mr. Speaker, may I first of all offer my congratulations to the mover (Mr. Benidickson) and the seconder (Mr. Langlois) of this motion for an address to His Excellency. I wish to compliment them on their able presentations on their first appearance as members of this house despite the fact that they failed to see any of the shortcomings of the government of the day. Like my colleague, the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. Merritt), I was surprised to notice that last evening the government were ready, in fact seemed eager to have the vote on this motion proceed when there are so many perplexing or vexing questions before the people of this nation and when as yet responsible ministers had not made statements in connection therewith. It has been pointed out that while the address was quite lengthy it is rather vague and I had thought some of the ministers would have made statements on some of these vexing questions.

The first matter I should like to deal with or at least ask questions about is that of meat rationing which was introduced again in this country on September 10, while this parliament was in session and without any statement on the situation being made by any responsible minister of the government. Some reference was made, I think perhaps by accident, by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) when he was answering a question which had been asked on hog production. His remarks will be found on page 24 of *Hansard*. He stated that there was a great surplus of meat in Canada at the present time and that we were called upon to supply approximately six per cent of the requirements of the devastated countries. One reading that statement could not help gaining the impression that he did not favour meat rationing in this country at this time. I am glad he is in his seat and if I am wrong in my belief I know he will correct me.

Mr. GARDINER: As the press stated, I did not mention rationing at all.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I think anybody reading the remarks of the minister would gain the impression I have mentioned. He is at liberty to state now whether or not he favours rationing at this time. According to Mr. Donald Gordon, head of the prices control board, who is in charge of rationing, the great surpluses of meat are to be found at the present time in Canada and the United States. I should like to refer to a report in the New York *Times* of August 18, 1945. The secretary for agriculture, Mr. C. P. Anderson, who I think is recognized as the czar of food controls in the United States of America, is the sole authority in determining the need of civilian rationing. According to this article he has stated that meat rationing might well end this fall because of the cut-backs and the heavy runs of grass-fed cattle in that country.

I want it to be clearly understood that I am heartily in accord with the idea of supplying all the meat and foodstuffs possible to Britain and the devastated countries of the world, but as I have stated no reasonable explanation has been given to either the producers or the consumers of this country that we are following the proper course to see that these people obtain this much needed meat and foodstuffs. In fact statistics and experience would indicate that meat rationing at this time is an improper course to follow.

It is true that as a result of government policy hog production is down over thirty per cent at this date, but beef cattle production has increased over thirty per cent since 1939. That is the increase which has occurred during the war years. In many cases the producers have found great difficulty in marketing their stock at the various yards throughout the nation. We had meat rationing from May 27, 1943, until February 29, 1944, and during that time processed meat was allowed to accumulate and spoil at the cost of the Canadian taxpayer. It was estimated that more meat was consumed in Canada during that rationing period than had been consumed previously.

Along with other members, I have been receiving telegrams during the last few days. I happen to represent a constituency which is not entirely wheat producing. The people in my constituency are mixed farmers and I would estimate that half of them harvest their crops with the old threshing machine in order to save their straw for their stock. Among other telegrams I received one from a local processor, a butcher, pointing out that the local rationing board had not received any meat coupons for transients. This meant that during this period no farmer in the locality could purchase meat for his threshing crew. One can understand what that would mean during this busy season with the prevailing shortage of man-power.

The first thing I did was to get in touch with the office of Mr. Taylor, the food administrator, who had made this announcement to the people of Canada. I was directed from one office to another, about a dozen in rotation, but I finally found a man who said that he understood the local situation and that these coupons should have been there. He assured me yesterday that he would have this matter straightened out through the Winnipeg office. This gives one some idea of the great bureaucratic set-up we have and the enormous number of officials and inspectors employed in the carrying out of such an undertaking. I trust that this matter has been satisfactorily settled and that these people will be able to procure much needed rations. I do not know of anyone more deserving than those who are working long hours in the harvest fields producing other forms of food.

The producers of meat in Canada are extremely anxious to have as much meat as possible go to Britain and the other devastated countries in order that future markets may be established. However, they do not consider that meat rationing is the proper course to follow at this time and they are vitally concerned. We could better supply that demand on a quota basis rather than have this rationing set-up.

During the past summer and early autumn we had strikes in the packing plants across Canada which lasted for many days. During that time no meat was processed for anyone in this country or overseas. The government of the day took no action whatever. The producer who happened to have stock at the yards during that period took his trimming when settlement was made for the cattle or hogs. During those days national selective service failed miserably.

Under our prices set-up for beef why should the producer have to take at least one and one-half cents per pound less in early August for animals which had grown and were in better condition as compared with what he would have received early in July? That is what occurred at the various markets across the country and I imagine it may be worse before snow falls this winter. During the past few years there has been a racket in our marketing policy which has affected the level of prices paid to producers of meat.

The Minister of Agriculture was requested to institute a permit system covering exports to the United States of America in case there should be a heavy live stock run. This could be done quite satisfactorily on the same basis as export permits are granted for barley and oats being shipped to the United States. The differences in price are very great, usually at least fifty per cent more being paid there than is received in Canada, but that difference could be pooled for the producers. It would be very simple to handle and the producer would not be taking the licking that he has been forced to take every time these runs occur in the yards throughout this country. By so doing we would preserve our price control system for the Canadian consumer, so that no fault could be found in that respect. I believe that some such provision as this should be made immediately. As I have pointed out, we have over thirty per cent more cattle in the country to-day than at the beginning of the war, and many of our farmers will be forced this fall by force of circumstances to market almost their entire herds in certain parts of the west. Therefore it is imperative that some such step as I have proposed be taken for their protection.

We should also endeavour to obtain world markets. If we go along much further as we have been doing, the United States and other markets will be lost to the producers of this country.

As I have said, this is a vexed problem for many people in Canada, both producers and consumers, and a statement should be made by a responsible minister of the crown before we are asked to vote on this motion. We should not be asked to content ourselves with statements made by people, many of whom might not be able to have themselves elected under a democratic form of government such as we have in this country. The war is over, whether it has been declared over or not, and our people expect something different. They expect to hear from their democratic representatives.

A few words on another matter. It is quite apparent, despite all the government propaganda about its reconstruction plans, propaganda put out, by the way, at the expense of the Canadian taxpayer, that the government's plans are at this date non-existent.

My colleague the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Pearkes), in speaking of demobilization yesterday, gave emphatic proof of the unfairness of the present demobilization system, especially with reference to the overseas men who have done so much for us during the past five years and more. He also pointed out how the present system of demobilization operates to the advantage of many of the members of our second army, the N.R.M.A. men, which I think is unfortunate.

At one period of the war men in the army were allowed upon discharge a clothing allowance at $35; later on, the clothing allowance

was raised to $65, and at the present time it is $100. I sincerely trust that the government will see that all the men discharged eventually receive the same clothing allowance. I think that can justly be expected of the government.

With respect to members of the armed forces wishing to take university training it is recognized in my province at least, that grade 12 is the equivalent of first year at university, and in my little town—and the same is true of many towns in the province—grade 12 is taught in collegiate. But we had a statement from the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Abbott) the other day that grade 12 will not be recognized as first year at university, and that these men must attend the university.

I noticed a statement in this morning's press by the president of the great university of Toronto that over 900 applications had been received to attend that university this fall, 600 of which were from the armed services. He said that they could accommodate only 400. Therefore I urge, Mr. Speaker, that this matter be reconsidered and that these young men be allowed to take their first year university training in their own home districts. Many of them are young chaps with no position to support them and, if this suggestion were adopted and they could take their first year's training at home, their parents would not be out of pocket for their son's living expenses.

I wish to refer to national housing. As was so well said by my leader, the present situation is a blot on the record of the government, and worse. In the prairie provinces, outside of the large cities, it is an absolute washout. The finance companies, and the insurance companies whom the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) has been consulting, refuse point blank to have anything to do under the act with housing in the towns and villages of the prairie provinces, so that the plan is entirely inoperative in any shape or form outside of the large cities. That is true of every town and village west of the great lakes, where there is an urgent demand for housing to-day. Canada's housing requirements are probably half a million houses short of being met to-day. We have national housing under the Minister of Finance and we have wartime housing under the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply (Mr. Howe). It has been charged in recent days by responsible lumbermen that certain finishing materials have been frozen for wartime housing, where the material is actually not required as yet. If that is the case these materials should be released. In my neighbourhood—and I think the same is true all across the country—many people have begun to build their homes which they intended to occupy this winter, and now they find they cannot proceed to make them habitable for the winter months because of lack of materials. That is a very serious problem for many people. In the three prairie provinces seventy per cent of the population is rural; yet under our controller system there is a priority for the cities of the prairies of 70 per cent of the lumber available. The whole thing is just wrong end to. The result is that the individual cannot get the finishing materials which he urgently requires at this time, and some statement clarifying the situation should be made by a responsible minister. I trust that the responsible minister will be able to do something toward decentralization in this matter. Centralization seems to be growing in every department of the government, but now that the war is over, theoretically at least, it is time that we moved toward decentralization in many government undertakings, and the government should at least tell the people what they may expect in the matter of housing during the coming months and in the near-future years because the people are much perturbed over the present situation.

Another matter on which I should like to say a few words is the transferable vote, and this is a personal thought of my own. I know there is difference of opinion in all groups about the transferable vote. When the Prime Minister accepted the leadership of his party in 1919 he set forth in his chart the subject of election reform. It is passing strange that at this late date he has made no move in that respect. He has told us that this is his last parliament, and yet no move has been made by him to institute the transferable vote in our dominion elections. We have had the transferable vote in Manitoba for many years and it has worked most satisfactorily there. They have it in Alberta also, I think, and it has worked well there too. In a democracy such as ours surely the will of the majority should prevail to the fullest possible extent. But what happens under our present system? In the last dominion parliament we had seventy-four members who were elected on a minority vote. In this parliament we have 149 members who were elected on a minority vote. Provision should be made in our election machinery for the transferable vote, so that where a number of candidates are contesting a riding the voter can indicate his second choice and the will of the majority of the electors prevail. I have always thought we should have that in a democracy such as ours, and I trust that the government will do something along this line.

I was surprised at the way in which the Prime Minister wandered around in his remarks the other day, following the speech

so ably delivered by my leader. I could understand, of course, that the right hon. gentleman might be very tired after the load he has carried. Nevertheless I had expected more of the Prime Minister than what we heard. He spoke of having received his second mandate, although he did not go into detail and tell us how he had received it. True enough, his party received more votes than any other group, but they received very far from a majority of the votes. He did not tell us of the appeals he had made to sectionalism, both during the war years and during the campaign, pitting the wishes of certain sections of the country against those of others. I am very proud of my leader; he conducted a statesmanlike campaign from coast to coast in Canada; he was prepared to stand or fall by his principles as a great Canadian. Of that I am very proud, and I would be just as proud had I been defeated in my riding.

As to the soldiers' vote, they were so confused, that the vast majority of them never cast a ballot. I can understand that to some extent. The government in power, with their propaganda at the expense of the taxpayer, and their set-up to get it across to the troops, so befogged many of the soldiers that, as I say, the majority failed to cast a ballot at all. I am very happy to be able to point out that, despite the government propaganda, I for some reason received a complete majority over both of my opponents, as did my leader, the hon. member for Neepawa (Mr. Bracken).

I think I should follow the example of the leaders of the groups and endeavour to be brief on this occasion. But there are some vexing problems before the people at the present time, and I again appeal to the responsible ministers to make some statements on them for our guidance.

I shall support the amendment moved by my leader. I will not take time to read it; it will be found on page 34 of *Hansard*. I do not believe that any member of the house of any group dare stand up and tell his constituents that he is opposed to any one of the three sections of the amendment and that he is satisfied with the efforts of the government in any one of these three respects. Therefore, if they are to vote conscientiously, no matter where they sit in this house they should support the amendment.

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): The speech of His Excellency delivered at the opening of this parliament has received some criticism and some praise. There is, however, one paragraph in it on which all hon. members can agree, that is the first paragraph, which reads:

> You will rejoice with me that the opening of the twentieth parliament of Canada comes at the moment of the victorious conclusion of the war.

I believe that not only all the members of this house but all the people of Canada and the peoples of the united nations who, with us, carried on this victorious conflict rejoice at the ending of the war.

However, it seems to me that our rejoicing is not complete. Our people are not entirely happy. They have fears and forebodings, which were discernible for a considerable time before the war ended. The men and women in the services and the men and women in the war industries were hoping for the end of the war, but fearful of what was going to happen to them when the war ended; and I submit to you, sir, that if we consider the ten years preceding this war, and the fact that the men and women who went into our armed forces and into our war industries were recruited in the main from that section of our population which came to maturity in the ten years prior to 1939, it is no wonder that they were fearful of what they would come back to when the war was over.

I think, although perhaps he did not intend it in that way, that the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. Merritt) in his forceful speech yesterday evening proved this point, although he did not draw from it the full conclusion that he should have drawn. He said, as reported in yesterday's *Hansard*, at page 105:

> What we do need, and what we have not had in my adult life—and what I fear we can never have from this government—is "action" to give us full employment.

I do not know my hon. friend's age, but I imagine it is somewhere between thirty-five and forty. Consequently his adult life was not only in that period when this government was in office but also in the period when his own party was in office, and the full employment we are looking for to-day was just as far distant then as it is to-day.

That brings me to the next point I wish to make, and that is that this war, the last one, and the period in between the two wars have proven one thing, and proven it beyond the possibility of a doubt, namely, that the capitalist system can give full employment only in time of war; it has never given full employment in time of peace, and it never can give full employment in time of peace because its operation depends upon a reservoir of unemployment to keep it going.

Mr. HOMUTH: Oh, no.

Mr. MacINNIS: Say your "oh's" somewere else.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): "No, no," not "oh, no".

Mr. HOMUTH: It was both.

Mr. MacINNIS: I wonder if my hon. friends will take the word of a more respectable authority than myself.

Mr. FRASER: Not "more respectable", surely.

Mr. MacINNIS: I accept the compliment, but I still insist. I have in my hands a copy of the report of the governor of the Bank of Canada to the Minister of Finance for the year 1943; and in the section where he refers to our victory bond sales he says this:

For many individuals, victory bonds and war savings certificates purchased during the war period represent the first significant backlog of saving they have ever been able to build up. . . .

I think that is conclusive. That is not the full sentence; I will read the rest of the sentence, which gives us another sidelight on the capitalist system which is no better, indeed, but perhaps worse than the one I have already mentioned. But it is strange that we had to have a war in order that our people might be able to set a little bit aside for that rainy day which we are told always comes at some time in our lives. The next part of the sentence is this:

. . . and it is apparent that some high pressure promoters of dubious or worthless securities are attempting to exploit these savings.

That is capitalism.

I shall touch briefly on two or three points in the speech from the throne. The first item with which I wish to deal is the paragraph which reads:

Preparations for the demobilization, rehabilitation and reestablishment in civil life of the men and women in the armed forces were well under way when Germany surrendered. The same is true of measures for the reconversion of the economic life of our country from a war-time to a peace-time basis, and for the maintenance of a high level of employment and national income. The plans thus developed to meet the requirements of the period of transition are now being put into full operation.

There is something wrong here. That paragraph is either a mis-statement of facts or the references that we hear throughout the country to the unpreparedness of the government, and the references that have been made in this house, are not correct. I maintain that this paragraph is a gross misrepresentation of the facts as they now are. As a matter of fact the government has no plans and it cannot have any plans on the procedure that it is following, because it does not take under its control or direction the economic life of this country on which depends the reestablishment of the returned men and the full employment and prosperity of our people.

In the copy of "Post-war Planning Information" which came to my office yesterday the government gives its objectives as high and stable employment and income, and a greater sense of public responsibility for individual economic security and welfare. Here is what they say:

(1) To facilitate private enterprise to produce and provide employment.

I want hon. members to note the wording of that statement. It is not employment that the people of this country need. What they need is production; but we are going back to the psychology of the nineteen thirties. We are thinking in terms of employment and not in terms of the things that people work for. Let us look at the different attitude that was adopted during the war. We got full employment during the war, but we did not get full employment by trying to provide jobs for people; we got full employment by providing the needs of the war. I submit to you, sir, that we can never get full employment in Canada by just thinking of making jobs for people. We have to think in terms of the people's needs and then plan and organize to fulfil those needs. If we do that, we shall have full employment; and when there are no needs to be filled, if people are unemployed so much the better.

The other objectives are:

(2) To promote bold action by the state in those fields in which the public interest calls for public enterprise in national development;

(3) To provide, through public investment, productive employment for our human and physical resources when international and other conditions adversely affect employment; and

(4) To provide, on a basis of small regular payments against large and uncertain individual risks, for such hazards and disabilities as unemployment, sickness and old age.

I tell you, sir, that the government can never meet the situation that confronts us at the present time with a policy of that kind. The hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard said last night that *laissez-faire* was dead. I go further than that and say that the capitalist system is dead. It reminds me of the old nursery rhyme:

Humpty Dumpty sat on a wall,
Humpty Dumpty had a great fall,
All the king's horses and all the king's men
Couldn't put Humpty together again.

And we are not going to put it together again with a policy of that kind.

The next paragraph in the speech from the throne to which I should like to refer is just as far off the mark as what I have read. It reads as follows:

Through the joint efforts of the government, industry and labour, the conversion of war industries to civilian production is taking place with a maximum of delay and inconvenience.

Mr. GREEN: It is "with a minimum of delay".

Mr. MacINNIS: Yes, "with a minimum of delay and inconvenience." I did not wish to be unfair to my hon. friends across the way. I do not know just when this speech was put together, but I imagine that it was before we had that fine example of cooperation at the Lambton Golf club.

Mr. HOWE: Since when did your labour leaders travel with reporters and camera men?

Mr. GILLIS: They did not.

Mr. HOWE: They did.

Mr. WRIGHT: No, they did not.

Mr. HOWE: I was there.

Mr. MacINNIS: Then it can be assumed as logically that the reporters travelled with you; you were there too. That does not prove anything, it is the manner in which they were received that is important. Those of us who have been closely associated with the affairs of labour since the war began, and long before that, know the difficulty that labour had in getting any cooperation or recognition in industry. It was one continual battle. In 1941 the government refused point-blank to sign a contract with a trade union; and it was not until the fall of 1942 that it passed an order-in-council—I do not know why it was necessary—to permit itself to sign agreements with a trade union.

If any other proof of the lack of cooperation is required I cannot do better than read a statement made by the Minister of Reconstruction at the meeting of the Trades and Labour Congress in Toronto in 1944. And may I say before I read this that I have the highest regard for the minister's ability and the work that he has done during the last six years. He has been told that from this side of the house on many occasions, but there are more things required in life than just ability. Talking to the delegates he said:

You will say at once that I could have proposed this close association during my period as Minister of Munitions and Supply. I look back over the last five years and admit that better results could have been obtained had a closer exchange of views been arranged. My excuse for not having taken the initiative in making arrangements of that kind is that there have not been hours in the day sufficient to do everything that should have been done.

We all learn by experience—

Some more than others.

—and sometimes an opportunity comes to reorganize in a way that will profit by that experience. Therefore, in reorganizing the Department of Reconstruction I intend to ask you, who represent organized labour, to take an active part in the work of that department.

That department has been organized. I do not know exactly who are the officials now, but in April 1945 all the officers of the Department of Reconstruction had been appointed. I have their names here, and I do not find the name of a single representative of labour among them. Here they are: Mr. R. A. C. Henry, who I think was deputy minister in the Department of Munitions and Supply, on leave from Montreal Light, Heat and Power Consolidated; J. H. Berry, director-general of war supplies, on leave from General Motors Corporation.

Mr. HOWE: My hon. friend has no right to say that. Mr. Berry has not been associated with General Motors for some five years, and he is not on leave from that company. Mr. Henry is not on leave from Montreal Light, Heat and Power.

Mr. MacINNIS: Very well; I take the word of the minister for it, but I still say there is not a representative of labour among the officials of this department. Each of them is or was a representative of big business. I will read the names. If my hon. friend is so touchy on the matter that he does not like me to read the names of the companies with which they were associated, I will leave that out. The other names are: Hon. J. A. Brillant; H. J. Carmichael, both names which are familiar to most of us; A. A. Mackay, F. M. Ross, H. Carl Goldenberg and F. W. Bruce. That is the kind of cooperation that has existed between management, the government and labour since the war began; and the feeling in the labour movement to-day is that there is a conspiracy between the government and big business to reduce wages as quickly as possible.

Mr. MITCHELL: My hon. friend himself knows that is not true.

Mr. MacINNIS: I do not think my hon. friend has any right to make that sort of remark, and I ask that he withdraw it.

Mr. MITCHELL: Very well; I will withdraw it.

Mr. MacINNIS: I am not stating anything here that I do not believe to be true. I am not built that way.

Mr. MITCHELL: I will put it this way, then; I do not think it is true.

Mr. MacINNIS: Very well; it will be for my hon. friend to prove that.

Mr. MITCHELL: If I may say this to my hon. friend on a question of privilege; he is casting a reflection upon all the ministers sitting here when he says there is a conspiracy on the part of government and big business to break down the wage structure of this country. That was the language he used. I think that is a reflection upon my character and upon the character of every minister in the House of Commons. My hon. friend is not out on a soap box in the market square; he is facing his peers right here, and he should not forget it. I am not going to stand for that sort of thing.

Mr. MacINNIS: I did not say that. I said that was the opinion of labour. There is a suspicion in their minds, and usually where there is smoke there is fire.

The next words in the speech from the throne to which I wish to direct attention are these:

> Our country will ever remember with pride the heroic exploits of Canada's fighting men and merchant seamen.

To-day Canada has a fairly large merchant marine. I have in my hand a booklet issued by the Minister of Transport, which states that at the present time there are about 180 large ocean-going cargo vessels, requiring skilled seamen to the number of some 12,000. The number of seamen in our merchant marine before the war, that is under government control, was 1,400. The wages paid at the present time by the crown company, Park Steamship company, under whose control most if not all of these vessels are operated, are also given in this booklet. I have raised the question of the wages paid on Park Steamship company vessels on a number of occasions in this house. I have shown that they were out of line, being lower than the wages paid on any other line in Canada and away below those paid on similar vessels in the United States. The last time I spoke of this matter was on the estimates during the session of 1943. I am not sure whether or not the wages have been increased since that time, but the wages paid an able seaman as of 1944, according to the Minister of Transport, were, basic wage, $89.93 per month, with a war risk bonus of $44.50, making in all a wage of $134.43. Now I think there is an application by the Park Steamship company to discontinue the bonus.

Mr. HOWE: Does my hon. friend know that to be true? I am the minister responsible for the Park Steamship company, and I am sure I have no knowledge of any such application from Park or anyone else. If my hon. friend is going to make that statement, which has been made several times, I hope he knows whether it is true. Has he ever seen the statement or application?

Mr. MacINNIS: I have been so informed; I have not seen the statement.

Mr. HOWE: Bring your evidence before you make any such statement.

Mr. MacINNIS: Does the minister deny that any such intention is in mind?

Mr. HOWE: I have never heard it suggested by Park or by any official of any Canadian steamship company, and I have never seen any intimation that this move is contemplated. If my hon. friend does not know anything at all about it I think he had better say so.

Mr. MacINNIS: Then I ask the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell). Is there an application to that effect before the national war labour board?

Mr. MITCHELL: I understand there is, but I did not get the implication of what my hon. friend said.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MITCHELL: Just wait a moment and give me a chance. You are not out on the stump now. My hon. friend has been doing mental gymnastics all afternoon trying to prove his case. No one knows better than he that this House of Commons is not the place to argue a question of wages that can properly go before the national or a regional war labour board.

Mr. COLDWELL: This is the place to argue anything.

Mr. MITCHELL: I know that is what my hon. friend says, but when you establish machinery representative of labour and the employers, with an impartial chairman—

Mr. MacINNIS: Just a moment. Mr. Speaker, I do not mind the minister asking a question, but I am not going to stand here—

Mr. McCANN: You asked the question and he is answering it.

Mr. MacINNIS: He answered it.

Mr. McCANN: You asked it.

Mr. MacINNIS: He is not answering it now; he is lecturing me and he is not going to do that.

Mr. MITCHELL: Just a minute, now—

Mr. MacINNIS: He cannot do that on my time. He answered it and he should sit down.

Mr. MITCHELL: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. GREEN: Order; Mr. Speaker is on his feet.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understood that the Minister of Labour asked the hon. member who is now addressing the house if permission would be given to ask a question. Permission was given. If the hon. member now wishes to withdraw that privilege, it is his right to do so.

Mr. MITCHELL: I will close the matter this way; if the hon. member does not want the story I shall sit down. But let us be fair about it. I have been asked a question and in answering it I was doing the best I could to educate the hon. member. Goodness knows he needs it. But if he does not want to know, I shall sit down.

Mr. MacINNIS: If the ministers could only get together before they begin contradicting me, rather than after, we would make much better progress. The conference they are now holding should have been held before they came into the chamber. In any event I shall leave the matter there.

The next point I should like to discuss is that of housing. I am not going to deal with it at any length, because it has been dealt with by several hon. members. It was referred to by my leader, and undoubtedly further reference will be made to the subject in the house, unless something is done very quickly.

So far as housing is concerned, conditions in Vancouver are deplorable. Housing conditions in most cities of Canada were bad before the war. They have continually become worse. I am not blaming the government for that, because it was inevitable that that condition should develop. In British Columbia since the beginning of the war there has been a great increase in population. From 1941, when the census was taken, to 1944, the population increased from 818,000 in the earlier year to an estimated 932,000 in the latter year. It is considered that over 60,000 of those people are settled in Vancouver. The situation grows worse daily as many of the men from the armed services who enlisted in other provinces are taking their discharge in British Columbia, or are coming to that province after being discharged. That happened after the last war, and it is happening again this time.

The government is leaving the matter of housing to private enterprise. I hold in my hand a news item from the Vancouver *Daily Province,* dated July 16, which says, "Ilsley introduces vast scheme to provide veterans' homes. Ottawa guarantees builders against loss." I thought my friends favoured private enterprise, and urged that private enterprise had a right to its profit because it was prepared to take risks. But the private enterprise we have to-day asks the government to take the risks while it takes the profits. Surely that is a poor sort of private enterprise. And when it reaches that stage I say it ceases to be private enterprise and should receive no further consideration from anyone.

When during the war we needed so many planes, so many tanks, so many ships and so many guns the government planned for the production of them. So far as it was able it did not permit anything to interfere with that production—and it had wonderful success, but when veterans need homes, when war workers need homes, when our people generally need homes, why in the world can we not decide how many homes we need, and then plan and organize to build them? Why should we leave those things to private enterprise, while we guarantee them against loss, if they should have any, and at the same time permit them to take a profit, if there is one? We cannot carry on the business of making provision for our people that way.

In the short time remaining to me may I make the admission that perhaps the reason for the mental gymnastics of which the Minister of Labour complained a few minutes ago is that I have been trying to understand the social and economic philosophy of the official opposition. During the election and since that time I thought they wanted the removal of controls, and a return to private enterprise so fast that it would make one's hair stand on end. But since coming to parliament and listening to them I have decided that their tune has changed. Perhaps when I say that I am not altogether correct. In my view they have two tunes, if I have caught the strains correctly, one of which is entitled Throw the Controls out of the Window, and the second of which is Let the Government Get Action. But they cannot have both. The authority which is going to get action must have control. If we want the government to act—and this group does want it, and is willing to give the government the authority and control for action—it must have control. But hon. members to my right want it both ways. I should like to quote their position as it was placed before the house last night by the hon.

member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. Merritt). This is what he says as reported on page 107 of *Hansard*:

> The end of *laissez-faire* means another thing. It means that the government are no longer solely the administrators of the affairs of this country; that they can be content just to let things go. The government are ultimately responsible for every part of our national life, and there is no ill which befalls the people of this country which it is not the duty of the government to correct. If they are to correct all those ills, they must get a new outlook.

Somewhat earlier in his address—and as I said before, his maiden speech was a good one—the hon. member said we do not want a new social order. Now it seems we must have a new outlook without a new social order.

Mr. FRASER: What Canada needs is a new leader.

Mr. MacINNIS: But if the new leader has the old leader's outlook, where does it get us? As a matter of fact, my hon. friends are in an impossible position. They want to keep in with those who want the old and also keep in with those who want the new. You cannot have it that way. This group is asking for a fundamental change in our attitude toward our social and economic problems because we are convinced that it is only by economic and social changes comparable with the changes that have taken place in our means of production that we can meet the problems with which we are confronted today.

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, may I in commencing my remarks congratulate you upon having been selected for the high and responsible position which you now hold. I have observed since you have commenced to read the prayers in this house that you have read them with a sincerity which is quite noticeable. It seems to me that you have approached the tasks which you are endeavouring to perform with a humble trust in divine providence. This is a fine example which you have set for the members of this house and the people generally throughout the country.

I should like to congratulate the mover (Mr. Benidickson) and the seconder (Mr. Langlois) of the address in reply. They did very well under extremely trying conditions. As these two splendid young boys spoke I could not help recalling the last war and the boys who returned from it, my classmates, my chums. The youth of my generation had the challenge thrown to them; the call went out; they rose and marched and stood-sufficient in their generation. Once more in my lifetime I have seen a noble generation of British youth rise and prove itself equal to its testing. For those who have come safely home, for those who are impaired in health and limb, for those who have laid down their splendid young lives for freedom, for those whose lives are blighted in bereavement, there is comfort I think in a line which I discovered quoted in a little poem left us by an airman whose shattered young body lies buried in Lemnos. This line goes:

> Now God be thanked who has matched us with this hour.

The boys of the last war were told that they would have "homes for heroes;" a disturbing percentage of them were unable to obtain or maintain even hovels for heroes. They were told that they were fighting a "war to end wars;" they found on return that someone behind the scenes had contrived to make another war inevitable. They were told that they were fighting a war to make the world safe for democracy; they found that behind their backs the world had been made impossible for democracy. The boys of this war have won the world one more chance to make good. It is a comforting thing that in this house there are so many returned men, so many of the boys of this war. By careful study they will discover the difficulties which confront a government of a country like Canada in times like these. That will be a help.

One thing that is disturbing is that they are so dangerously divided. I sat here and listened to four on the Liberal side who simply adored the grand old Liberal party and appeared to believe that in it lay the hopes of the future. Then we listened to one on the Conservative side who believed that there was no need at all of a new order. Apparently his devotion to the Conservative party was equal to the devotion of the other four to the Liberal party. To what extent there is a difference between those two parties I am not at the present moment going to pronounce. We heard also a returned man from the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation group who was certain that change must come in the social order.

These boys are all united in their objective, on whatsoever side of the house they are or in whatsoever party, but they will have to learn that they will have to be united in the method or the technique to be employed or their enemies will defeat them. I fear that thus far in this debate our returned boys have not given the house such hope as we wished we could have had that they will be effective in this house.

Somewhere there is a way of doing the things which the boys wish to have done. This country is able to produce all the food, all

the clothing, all the shelter, all the health services, all the educational facilities, all of everything which is necessary to give every one in Canada that high standard of living to which we as a people have a right. Everybody wants them to have that high standard. I doubt if there is a member in this house who does not want them to have that high standard. The trouble is that we have not yet determined what technique should be applied to enable the people to attain their desires. I commend to the returned men that the first important task for them is to determine what that technique shall be and come to agreement on it.

So far in this debate several hon. members have been rather touching in the beauty of their expression of the lofty ideals which actuated them in coming into this house. Those ideals are all to the good; they are all dreams of a bright new world. But new worlds and new orders cost money. The main problem confronting the members of this house is where to get the money we need. There is no need for members of any party in this house to rise and rail against the members of the government. I doubt if there is a member of the cabinet who is not just as eager to give people the things they want as the people are to get them. But in the last analysis they must find the money, and I would suggest to my friends of the Conservative party and my friends of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation that they would save themselves a lot of time and the house a lot of time if they would concentrate on the problem of where to get the money.

In the world into which we are now emerging the Canadian parliament must find much money. There are four main purposes for which it must find money.

In the first place it is going to be the duty of Canada to supply more and more goods abroad. It is going to become our duty, and is our duty, to maintain a high standard of military strength in this country, as well as in all the countries of the British commonwealth and empire. It is going to be the duty of this parliament to maintain a high standard of living in all Canada for all Canadians. At the same time the government must find increasing sums of money to pay for the government services which are daily becoming more and more urgently demanded by the people. Without going into details I think it is easily observable that the demands on our purse are great.

First, with respect to the amount of goods that we must send abroad, and by the goods we must send abroad I do not mean the goods that we trade abroad. As hon. members know, we were all brought up in our schools on the doctrine of trade, and now we find ourselves embarrassed, if not confounded, as soon as we learn that the people who need goods from us happen to have insufficient goods to return to us in repayment. We are facing a situation which is rather new throughout the world. This whole need has existed throughout the war and has been taken care of by the United States through its lend-lease arrangements, and by the Dominion of Canada through an extensive Mutual Aid programme. Let us not carry away the idea that lease-lend and Mutual Aid came to stay only while the war was on. They foreshadow a new technique which will have to be employed in the post-war world. The money to pay for Mutual Aid is not going to be a negligible item in Canada's budget. We must provide our share of the goods for the nations of the world, for the peoples of the world as a whole. Otherwise how can we possibly discharge our responsibilities under the Atlantic charter by which we were committed to a policy of freedom from want? We assume freedom from want for all mankind. And now we must provide goods for the liberated countries, for there is upon us a special responsibility with respect to them. Until they can get on their feet, as we say, to the extent that they can carry themselves we must contribute our share toward carrying them.

Then we must see to it that the members of the British commonwealth are not deprived of any goods which they need that we can produce in surplus. Especially must we remember Britain. Britain has exhausted herself during the war just past as she has never exhausted herself in her history. She has had to liquidate all her foreign investments upon which she depended for great quantities of raw materials imported from abroad. Her factories in large measure were transformed into war factories and continued operating as such until so near the coming of peace that they will be several months behind the factories of such nations as the United States or Canada, which countries have been engaged meanwhile in great measure in producing consumer goods.

Then, again, Britain's supremacy in the carrying trade of the world has been in large measure impaired owing to the tremendous percentage of her shipping that was sunk in carrying goods to all her allies on the far-flung battle-fronts of the world. Long before she can overtake her previous position in shipping, there is some indication that great concerns in the United States will have entered the field with air transport and taken over the business upon which Britain to a great extent depended for raw materials from abroad.

These are the factors which have contributed to the "economic jam" we hear of in Great Britain. The damage to Great Britain's economy I fear is in a considerable degree permanent. The whole condition calls for a Mutual Aid scheme, extensive, comprehensive and in large measure perpetual. If we do not provide for such a scheme we shall be neglecting to protect the standard of living of the matchless British commoners. We shall, moreover, be failing to provide an outlet for Canadian surpluses otherwise unmarketable abroad, and we shall be failing to ensure a strong, hopeful Britain, a fearless, unconquerable outpost guarding our frontiers for the future. Where should we have been in this war had it not been for that same outpost? Is it to be supposed for one moment that the babes who now toddle around our cradles will not have an equal need for Britain when their time of testing shall come? And what sort of improvident creatures shall we prove to have been if we neglect to foresee and to provide what is required? Therefore we must find much money for goods which are to be distributed abroad, quite regardless of the goods which we shall trade abroad.

We must make sure that we of the British commonwealth shall at all future times be strong, strong enough to discharge to the full our responsibilities for maintaining the peace of the world. Let us never forget the lessons of the League of Nations. Let us not be deluded by all this wishful thinking and talking about the security council. Let no one interpret my remarks as indicating that I have any objection to the security council; I merely suggest that if we trust too far in the security council we shall probably find it weighed in the balance and found wanting, just when we need it.

Far too many of us trusted far too much in the high-sounding phrases of collective security dreamers. We permitted ourselves to become unprepared. Tens of thousands of the noblest youth our people ever produced have died by reason of the foolhardy blunder we made in leaving them unprepared. The men who left the British peoples unprepared betrayed a whole generation of the youth of over 600,000,000 of the British peoples. While we talk about German and Japanese war criminals, perhaps we should give a little attention to British, Canadian and United States war criminals and others who neglected to keep their countries prepared. Let us remember, while we are discussing all the other things which require our attention, not to allow this important matter again to fall into disregard.

[Mr. Blackmore.]

Why did the British commonwealth leaders leave their peoples unprepared? Partly at least because they were deluded into believing that there was no money. Why was the Maginot line not completed to the point where it should have been? Why was construction stopped at just the point where the Germans would enter? Well, it was reported that there was no money. Why did the Bennett administration between 1930 and 1935 allow much of Canada's already meagre military strength to be dismantled? This fact must sober my Conservative friends. It happened. Well, they thought there was no money and they must economize; and flesh and blood and life paid the price of their folly. They were not alone in their error. They were the victims of a mentality. The all-important thing for us, is to see to it that we also do not become victims of the same mentality.

There are at least four reasons why we allowed ourselves to become unprepared. The first was the money reason. The second was the strange subversive doctrine of pacifism, foremost among the exponents of which, I regret to say, were the leaders of the movement which is now the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation. They were deluded; yes, and they deluded a lot of others, and once more flesh and blood and life paid the price of the folly. Then there was the League of Nations delusion, the idea that somewhere or other there was a body that could take care of our troubles for us, so that we all began to think, "let George do it". Well, George didn't do it, and finally we had to do it. That is likely to occur again. Lastly, there was the doctrine of appeasement.

In this question of no money, this notion of pacifism, this delusion regarding the League of Nations, and this false doctrine of appeasement we must seek the causes of our unpreparedness. But the foundation of most of this fallacious thinking was the no-money complex; and that is likely to be the most compelling of all motives in future, unless we seek and gain enlightenment regarding money.

As to the serious responsibility which is upon this parliament of maintaining a high standard of living in the Dominion of Canada, I shall not go into details. Everyone in the house will readily recognize the significance of the items I mention. We must manage to guarantee, both to producers and to consumers, prices which will stimulate production and consumption. We must manage to maintain in this land a wage structure which will again stimulate production and consumption and will give people that high standard of living for which we all long. Then we must provide for allowances on a generous scale.

The miserable pittance which we now give our old age pensioners is a scandal. I would hesitate to tell you what I think in fifty years people on the floor of this house will be advocating in the matter of old age pensions; I would be considered an impossible fanatic, and I am afraid the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) would have to go to an institution for his nerves if he were to hear what they will be talking about in fifty years regarding old age pensions in this country. Then we must provide pensions for the blind; pensions for others who for some reason or other are unable to gain access to the wage stream and are consequently unable to purchase the goods which the producers of Canada stand ready to produce in greater and greater abundance. When we provide them with incomes to buy we shall provide ourselves with a market to the extent to which we provide the incomes. All this is involved in maintaining a high standard of living in Canada.

The health standards which obtain in this country are an utter disgrace. I need not go into detail. All hon. members know. We all know how many people have gone year after year without visiting a doctor for extremely important medical examinations simply because they dreaded that they would hear they were sick and would have to go to a hospital; many of them have continued until they died of disease. In this wonderful Canada of ours such things must not be.

Also our educational standards in the country are far, far too low.

All these things we must undertake in this parliament to provide for in some way or another on a standard which is fitting, fitting not only for the boys who have come home from this terrible war and their wives and children, but fitting for the mothers and fathers who raised those boys, and fitting for the mothers and fathers who raised those mothers and fathers, whom we are now relegating to garrets and basements in little dark, dingy unseemly places in our cities where they—I hesitate to use the word which would describe the kind of existence they have to eke out at thirty dollars a month. Remember they are the mothers and fathers of the mothers and fathers who raised the heroes of to-day.

Another major item for which we must provide money is that of discharging the responsibilities of the government with respect to our debt, the costs of government, and so forth. I shall leave that without further comment. But I believe it all adds up to this simple fact, that we are faced with a problem of providing money which is positively bewildering.

What does the government say is the source of the money we shall use? We can have no more money than that which we can wring out of the people of Canada by all sorts of taxation; the amount of money they happen to have in their pockets is the absolute limit, beyond which it is impossible for Liberals to go. Never mind how much wheat we can produce, how much milk and cream and cheese and meats and fruits and vegetables and every other kind of food we can produce; never mind how much clothing we can produce, or how much furniture, or how many buildings or how much building material, or how vast our resources, or how willing our people are to work, or how skilful they are in the performance of their work; never mind how great our industrial equipment, we simply cannot in any way, according to these gentlemen, increase our income for our government beyond that which we can squeeze out of the people by merciless and tyrannical taxation, a process which in its very application decreases their purchasing power and thereby decreases the markets within Canada. Such is the Liberal government; such are the brilliant gentlemen who managed to trick the people of Canada into voting them back into power on the grounds that they fought the war well. I would not in any way decry the way in which they fought the war. Generally speaking, most people of average intelligence can do a pretty good job if you give them a wideopen purse; and I think the government will have to grant that they had a wide-open purse. Never a dollar that was ever asked for in this house or in a loan campaign across the country but was oversubscribed if the request was made that such be the case; therefore they had a wide-open purse, and the debt which now is accumulating against the name of the Dominion of Canada clearly indicates that they used it rather freely. Therefore let us temper the praise we give the Liberals for their war effort with the reminder that we have paid rather freely for it. Not only that, but we have committed ourselves to taxation for the future, so that most of the splendid boys who come back from fighting the war have to take off their coats now and deprive themselves for the rest of their natural lives to pay the cost of the war after already paying for it in blood and sweat, risk and suffering.

There is another group of gentlemen who are identical with the Liberals, namely, the Conservatives. They, too, believe that the only possible source of even a cent in this country is what they can wring out of the people by taxation. If I am doing the hon. gentlemen any injustice I trust at the earliest

convenient moment they will rise and assure me that they have begun to see the light and that they see another source of money than taxation. There you are. That is what you have on two sides of the house. I think there is no difference between the Liberals and Conservatives. I am challenging any member of the Liberal party or the Conservative party to rise and show a single iota of difference between the two parties. In fact I would judge that the Conservatives are probably just a little more liberal than the Liberals and the Liberals a little more conservative than the Conservatives. I think I have not been unkind.

Now we come to the socialist concept. Here I tread with a measure of trepidation because I am not entirely sure I have been able to learn from the speeches I have heard and the books I have read just what socialism stands for. But my idea—I speak subject to correction—is that they depend on taxation and borrowing just as the Liberals and Conservatives do. There is no difference at all in that respect between them. But they do say that if they had the government take over the industries so that the government could acquire all the profits which industries are making that would constitute another source of revenue for the government; and if they should see fit to raise the price a little on the goods coming out of the factories they would be able to tax the people in that manner too. Therefore they have another method of taxation through government ownership of industry. If I have been unfair to them I should be glad to be answered in great detail. I have endeavoured to be courteous in my analysis of the situation.

Is there not some other way? Should not the amount of money which is available to a government depend directly upon the goods and services which the nation can produce? If we think of the goods and services producing capacity of Canada and we contemplate our ability to produce enough goods and services to supply our people with all the food, clothing, shelter, housing, education and health services that they need, and to produce enough goods and services to take care of our costs with respect to armaments and to produce enough goods and services to discharge our responsibilities with respect to goods which have to be shipped abroad, and to produce enough goods and services to pay the costs of running our government, immediately hope fills our hearts. We think of the great stretches of grain-growing country and all the other resources which we have; of the tremendous machine equipment which has developed during this war, and the skills which we have acquired, including all the different technological plastic advances, and we say, surely we can produce enough goods and services to accomplish all these things. Let us go forward in faith, happiness and good cheer. But the minute we think of paying for them by taking all the necessary money out of our pockets, then, Mr. Speaker, we are immediately overcome with despair.

I should like to commend to the young men and the new members who have come to this house the proposition, that it is possible to turn into money the goods and services which the nation can produce. It is possible to turn these into money within the nation. What is physically possible is financially possible. And may I commend to them this proposition for most earnest study? May I suggest to them that through this device, through this technique, lies the way to the new order.

Mr. BONA ARSENAULT (Bonaventure): Mr. Speaker, my remarks shall be brief, as I had no intention of taking part in this debate. I represent in this house the county of Bonaventure, which is situated in the eastern part of the province of Quebec adjoining New Brunswick. Its population of about 40,000 people are descendants of Acadians, empire loyalists, early traders and fishermen from France and the English channel, Irish, Scottish and English. Racial harmony has ever prevailed in that county, and the majority of the people speak both languages. I am thankful indeed to that constituency for having elected me to this house by a substantial majority. One of my predecessors representing that county here, one who certainly will be remembered by the older members of this house, was the late Hon. Charles Marcil, who was elected for the first time in 1900 and represented Bonaventure without interruption for thirty-six years.

As I mentioned a moment ago, I did not intend to take part in this debate until yesterday, when the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Pearkes) made certain references to service men seeking their discharge from the army. I should like to quote briefly from the address of the hon. member at page 78:

> A soldier may go up to the sergeant-major, and if he cannot speak French all he has to do is to shrug his shoulders and say, "Me no speak English" and he is out—out to go and seek a job before the long-service men come back from overseas.

The hon. member for Nanaimo, who I understand has been in charge of the Pacific command for a certain period, should know better; but there is another aspect to this matter

which I should like to stress very briefly before this house. For many years a certain element in the Conservative party could not find any better solution for some of our most crucial problems than to play one part of the country against the other, than to stir up and spread prejudice against one-third of the population of our country, and to capitalize week after week, month after month upon the resentment which they themselves help to develop in certain sections of Canada against the province of Quebec. Yet to-day they wonder why that party has not had a chance to come back into office more than once during the last twenty-five years. They wonder why they were so badly defeated on the last polling day; and they wonder why an ex-Conservative like myself should be standing now on this side of the house supporting the Liberal administration. In referring to the service men in the terms he used yesterday the hon. member for Nanaimo was keeping in line with the familiar Tory way of playing ball. From 1939 to 1942 the shares of the Conservative party were so low in the minds of the people of this country that some drastic measure, some radical move had to be undertaken in order to save that party from total disappearance. In the fall of 1942 a convention of the party was held at Winnipeg, in which I actively participated in a last and vain hope that the party to which I had belonged all my life and to which I was very strongly tied by family traditions, would be regenerated. That was where and how the old Conservative party became overnight the young and up-to date Progressive Conservative party; at least I, together with many others throughout this dominion, strongly held that belief. A new leader was elected, certainly an outstanding man and, I must admit frankly, a man for whom I still have a great deal of admiration. A certain platform was adopted, and the younger generation in the party thought that at last it had got rid of the Tories and all their reactionary influence within the party.

For about a year and a half the new leader of this party succeeded in quieting down that element, so much so that at one time the name of John Bracken was popular not only throughout the other provinces of Canada but even in the far distant rural sections of old Quebec. But then came the Saskatchewan provincial election and the sweeping victory of the C.C.F. over the Progressive Conservative candidates, while the Bloc Populaire apparently was making decisive headway in the province of Quebec. That was enough for the highly inspired strategists of the Progressive Conservative party to change their mind about Winnipeg and throw into the waste paper basket the gentleman's agreements which had been arrived at there after long days and nights of laborious discussion in committee rooms. This change of mind is confirmed by a Toronto weekly, *Saturday Night,* in an editorial which appeared on June 24, 1944, from which I wish to quote a brief extract:

> In spite of Mr. McTague's clever pleading this new attitude—

They mean the attitude of the new party.

> —is definitely a change of mind, and a change back in the mind of Mr. Meighen and the element which had charge of the party before South York. . . . It means in effect that the party has decided to capitalize on the resentment against Quebec and to abandon all idea of obtaining any Quebec support for many years to come.

Then followed my resignation as president of the Progressive Conservative association for Quebec and the announcement that I was leaving the ranks of the party.

Again I refer the house to a brief extract from an editorial published by the Toronto *Saturday Night.* While this was published over a year ago, on July 1, 1944, it looks as if it had been written to-day:

> The action of the Progressive Conservatives in tossing Quebec into the discard in order to improve their position in other provinces is probably, from the Liberal point of view, a more interesting development than even the Saskatchewan election itself.
>
> It will make it extremely difficult for any French-speaking members from Quebec to co-operate with any other party than the Liberal, even if they do not admit to being Liberals themselves in the next parliament; and after the McTague speech they are unlikely to do anything that would bring into power a party which is practically going to the country on a platform of teaching Quebec what's what.

The short term result of such an attitude has been to consolidate the Liberal party's hold on Quebec, without lessening it to any substantial extent in Ontario where the Liberal vote was barely 5½ per cent below the Conservative, in spite of the results of the provincial elections held in that province one week prior to the federal vote.

As a long term result, the Progressive Conservative party has thrown away the best chance it has had since 1930 to take office, and has thrown that chance away for a long period of years to come. In the past any attempt to lessen in the minds of the people of Canada the magnificent war effort performed by Quebec in the last five tragic years of war has not paid dividends to the Progressive Conservative party.

Turning to volunteer enlistments, I would challenge from my place in the house any hon. member outside Quebec to place beside

the record of the county of Bonaventure, which I represent, the record of his constituency in respect of the number of volunteers for the army, the navy and the air force, on a pro rata basis of population, and I am satisfied the comparison would reflect no discredit upon my riding. The same condition has obtained in the neighbouring county of Gaspe, and also in Dorchester and very likely in many other constituencies in my province.

Despite her two cultures, Canada has made a tremendous contribution to the war effort in the last five years. It is most doubtful whether the adoption of any of the drastic measures advocated by the Progressive Conservative party would have added materially to that contribution. On the contrary, I am sure that in the long run it would have torn confederation apart.

Mr. Speaker, you have now been told why I stand to-day on this side of the house pledging my support to what I believe to be the only national party in Canada, the only party the policies of which are accepted generally by all sections of the country and all classes of our population.

One point which must not be overlooked, but which must be recognized, is that the leader of the government has performed an outstanding and almost superhuman task under most adverse circumstances. During these long and tragic years of war he has spared no effort in shaping the development of an extremely powerful military and economic war effort, while at the same time safeguarding in all ways humanly possible that measure of Canadian unity, understanding and friendship which is the basic fundamental of that true and sincere collaboration shared by citizens of Canada of different racial origins. I firmly believe that this Liberal government is the one government which can bring about the best understanding in Canada, and lay the most solid foundation of a great Canadian nation of the future.

In conclusion, I should like to make a special appeal at the beginning of this session to all members of the house, both new and old, and to ask them to do their utmost to bring about goodwill, better understanding and sincere friendship among Canadians of different racial extractions and different creeds. I appeal to all true Canadians to lay aside past dissensions and to join hand in hand in building up on this continent a great and prosperous Canadian nation.

This war has taught us many things. It has taught us, for instance, that Canada is a nation among the nations of the world. It has taught us also, that what we lack most in Canada at this time is Canadian-minded Canadians. We now know things that we did not know before the war. We know that Canada is capable of great achievements. In the past perhaps we have suffered from a lack of a spirit of enterprise, a lack of vision and of initiative. Now that we have learned how to use men, money and machinery, our generation will undoubtedly benefit from that knowledge. We have used men, money and machines for war-time purposes and we must continue to use them for peace-time progress. Our society must be given the conscious purpose of inspiring peace-time devotion as well as war-time sacrifice. This aim, this objective can be attained by collaboration between the different nations of the world, but it can be obtained in the first place and more surely by cooperation by individuals. That is why I stand for cooperation. I never stood and I do not stand for a separated Quebec in a disunited Canada. I am a Canadian-minded Canadian and I stand for a united Canada which will secure the full benefit of our British connections.

The diversity of racial origin in Canada to-day should not be a problem. We have so many other problems to deal with. Why try to divide the French and English speaking people of this country on five per cent of our differences when we should stand united on ninety-five per cent of our resemblance, of our mutual interests and of our common ideals? After all, we are proceeding, sometimes perhaps by different roads, toward the same goal, toward the same aim, which is the greatness, the progress and the prosperity of this country. It is the combined efforts of all the elements of our beautiful land carried out in a spirit of justice, mutual understanding and mutual loyalty that will guide us Canadians, French and English speaking, toward glorious realization.

Mr. Speaker, may I add just one word to thank you, as well as the hon. members of this house, for the keen attention which you have had the kindness to give me, and to assure you, Mr. Speaker, of my full cooperation.

The needs of the constituency I represent are many. I shall no doubt have the opportunity of pointing them out to you in the debate on the budget, but to-day I do not wish to delay any longer the proceedings of this house.

Mr. PAUL-EDMOND GAGNON (Chicoutimi) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, your nomination as Speaker is a tribute of esteem and an unequivocal mark of confidence on the part of the hon. members of this house. I take pleasure, with the hon. members who have spoken before me, in tendering you my most

sincere congratulations and my best wishes of success in the discharge of your important functions.

The mover of the address in reply to the speech from the throne the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Benidickson) carried out his task with a brilliance and a skill which portend splendid successes for the future. His performance has given me much pleasure.

No one could have lauded or eulogized the right hon. the prime minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and his government more sincerely or with more enthusiasm than did the seconder of the address, the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Langlois). I congratulate him, without however envying him, for having felt the liberal grace at such an early age, and I wish he may have perseverance. May he always see, in life and in politics, only the bright side of things.

No one in this house is more delighted than myself to hear that at long last, the government intends to provide the Canadian nation with a flag of its own. If the supreme consolation of pressing to their dying breast the glorious emblem of their race and country was denied our gallant soldiers, we who shall reap the fruits of their sacrifice shall joyfully feel our hearts thrill to the sight of the glorious symbol whose folds will ever show the stain of their blood and sweat.

The plan to make Ottawa a gigantic memorial in commemoration of our brave fighters who fell on the battlefield was a happy thought. I heartily endorse it, but as a finishing touch to this magnificent scheme, I should like to see an isolated plot of soil of sinister and mournful aspect set apart for the raising of a cold unadorned pillar, similar in the style to a government order, in honour of all the civilians victimized by the wartime prices and trade board and selective service, so that the memory of the countless dictatorial annoyances and vexations borne during the war by the people on the home front may be kept alive.

I hope that the government will codify the social legislation it will submit to the approval of the house during the present session so as to grant equal privileges to every Canadian citizen. In this sphere, we already have the family allowances act which is excellent in itself but vitiated in its form and application to French Canadians. That is why the Duplessis government, hoping to supplement the federal act and to remedy its shortcomings, has decided to contribute a part of the allowance and thus ensure to large families the benefits which accrue from this security measure.

This family allowance measure is a striking example of things to be expected in the legislative and economic fields were we to allow the federal government to centralize our sources of income together with the privileges now held by the provincial administrations.

If, on the one hand, we have reason to commend the wisdom and excellence of the measures forecast in the speech from the throne, I believe that, on the other hand, the deficiencies noticeable make it an incomplete and unfinished document. I realize that the government cannot give at the opening of a new parliament, a thorough outline of all the steps contemplated; however, I think the greatest attention and the first place should have been devoted to the problems inherent to the transition from a war-time to a peace-time economy. The people of Canada want work. The earnest desire of the man on the street is to bring home a pay envelope sufficiently full to take care of his needs and those of his family. I know the worthy workers of my constituency. They are skilled men closely grouped together and who ask nothing but the opportunity to earn a living honourably, but I know that in the event of a return of unemployment, of a decline in the number of jobs available, which is the case at the present time, our workers will not relish the total or partial closing of their plants, even though the national flag be unfurled over the buildings.

Chicoutimi constituency, which I am honoured to represent in this house, besides being one of the most beautiful in the country, is among those who have been foremost in helping and speeding the war effort. Not only have we supplied, for the armed services, numerous recruits who have fought courageously on every battlefield of the world, but, by the intensive production of aluminium at Arvida, by the surprising volume of our agricultural output, our district, I am proud to say, has been one of the principal factors of victory. Having shared in the battles on all fronts, we are to-day entitled to share in the reward.

In our midst lie tremendous opportunities for industrial expansion. The possibilities for development of the Saguenay region are unlimited. We now have, besides those already in existence, previous to the war, one of the mightiest hydro-electric plants in the world, the Shipshaw power house. Thousands upon thousands of horse-power presently go to waste in the absence of industries which could utilize them. A group of far-sighted and patriotic citizens, concerned about the future of our district, have formed a board of economic guidance to develop an extensive

programme designed to attract Canadian and foreign industries interested in establishing their headquarters or branch offices in Canada. However, the aim of these enterprising men of my constituency can be realized only with the help of the government. We ask neither for money nor special privileges; all we want and wish is a proper and permanent job for every member of our working class which would ensure the development and prosperity of one of the most beautiful parts of the province of Quebec. We wish the government to undertake, in and out of Canada, an advertising programme informing capitalists and business men that we possess hydraulic developments awaiting utilization and an available and skilled manpower comparable to any for efficiency and service. We demand to be free from the fear of unemployment, for we wish to live in peace and enjoy the freedom for which our soldiers, airmen and seamen have fought and died.

I believe I am right in presuming that the yearnings of my constituents, both male and female, are shared by the whole population of Canada. Our ideal is that of the youth of our country who at last desire to get their share of happiness and welfare which Divine Providence has placed within the reach of everyone.

Our ambition is to forget the hideous spectre of war and to give a deeper meaning to the word brotherhood; it is to forsake the road leading to misery, pain, hatred and death, to enter resolutely the path of hope, life and love.

Our people must not be left under the impression that war is a great cause of prosperity and that a solution to the problems which confront mankind must always be sought on the graves of our sons.

Therefore, I say that the great task facing the government, and which is one of its main concerns, is to strive unremittingly to achieve a prompt and smooth reconversion of our war-time economy to a peace-time one.

And one of the most powerful means of providing our country with a permanent and real standard of prosperity is to possess a merchant marine which will enable us to export our manufactured goods to all the countries of the world and especially to South America.

I therefore support wholeheartedly the suggestion of the hon. member for Gaspe who has made interesting and timely remarks in that respect, and I feel that the government should regard this matter as a vital one. One need not be a great economist to know that if we have a favourable trade balance, the whole economy of our country will benefit therefrom and the lot of all the classes of society will improve correspondingly.

(Text): Because I love my country and because I want it to be great, strong and prosperous, my collaboration is pledged to those who assume the responsibility of assuring its greatness, its prosperity and bringing about its financial, economic and moral strength. While keeping my full freedom of thought and action and remaining totally independent of all political parties, I feel it my duty to cooperate with government authorities so as to promote and protect Canada's interest, and I shall not fail to keep my pledge.

On motion of Mr. Stewart (Winnipeg North) the debate was adjourned.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

A message was delivered by Charles H. Larose, Esquire, Acting Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, His Honour, the deputy of His Excellency the Governor General, desires the immediate attendance of this honourable house in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, the House went up to the Senate.

And having returned,

Mr. SPEAKER informed the house that the deputy of His Excellency the Governor General had been pleased to give in His Majesty's name the royal assent to the following bills:

An act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for national defence and demobilization.

An act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending 31st March, 1946.

It being five minutes after six o'clock, the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Thursday, September 13, 1945.

The house met at three o'clock.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

STRIKE OF EMPLOYEES AT WINDSOR PLANT OF THE FORD MOTOR COMPANY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Labour. What action is being taken by the government to help bring about an early settlement of the labour dispute at the Ford Motor company plant at Windsor, Ontario?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in reply to my hon. friend may I say the strike was called only yesterday. I understand the report of the board of conciliation reached the workers yesterday morning. I have had no word from the company as to its attitude toward the report of the board, but I do think at this time the history of events might be placed on the record, so that everyone may understand what we have done to prevent this stoppage of work in the city of Windsor.

In the early years of the war the Ford Motor Company operated without any signed contract between its employees and the company. Commencing in the fall of 1941 demands developed for an agreement between the company and its employees.

In November, 1941, the Department of Labour arranged a vote of the employees under an agreement with the company that it would make a contract with its employees if the majority of them indicated by the vote that it was their desire that the company do so.

As a result of these negotiations an agreement was completed between the company and its employees of January 15, 1942. Disputes have arisen since the time of the agreement and the department has succeeded in bringing about agreement with comparatively little actual stoppage of work.

Negotiations have been going on for the past eighteen months looking to a new agreement. With the permission of the house I would ask that the document I hold in my hand be placed on *Hansard,* and taken as read. It is lengthy, and sets out the details of the negotiations which have taken place.

Mr. COLDWELL: I think it should be read.

Mr. MITCHELL: If the house would like to have it read, I shall read it.

Mr. COLDWELL: Read it.

Mr. MITCHELL: Very well. The following is a summary of conciliation in industrial relations between the Ford Motor Company of Canada, Limited, and local 200, U.A.W.-C.I.O., Windsor, Ontario, showing action taken by the Minister of Labour of Canada and the Minister of Labour of Ontario.

November, 1941: Consent vote conducted by Department of Labour of Canada to determine bargaining agency.

January 15, 1942: Agreement completed between company and local 200 after negotiations following vote.

November, 1942: Employees went on strike to enforce claim that 37 female employees were performing work previously performed by men and were therefore entitled to equal pay. After conciliation by Hon. Peter Heenan, Minister of Labour of Ontario, Hon. C. P. McTague was appointed umpire and decision handed down December 31, 1942. He found that clerical work performed by men was incidental to other duties not required of women. Claim of union not upheld.

December 31, 1942: Memorandum to agreement concluded, amending agreement of January 15, 1942.

January 11, 1944: Memorandum of agreement concluded, further amending agreement of January 15, 1942.

April, 1944: Dispute with regard to suspension of certain stewards, followed by stoppage of work by all employees, and termination of agreement by company in consequence. Minister of Labour of Canada sent conciliation officers to Windsor. Parties accepted a proposal of the wartime labour relations board on April 28, which provided for certification of bargaining representatives and negotiation of new agreement. Work resumed May 1.

May 2, 1944: Workers again went on strike because of objections of union to grievance procedure as determined by the national wartime labour relations board. Mr. Justice O'Connor (in his capacity as a supreme court judge), Mr. M. M. Maclean, industrial relations officer, and Mr. B. Wilson, one of his assistants, went to Windsor. Work finally resumed May 11 on the understanding that board would clarify the grievance procedure, which was done on May 12.

May, 1944, to June, 1945: Mr. Louis Fine, Ontario Department of Labour, acted as umpire under terms of grievance procedure established by board. Company has refused to implement one decision of umpire, which refusal is now the subject of an application by the union to the Ontario labour relations board for leave to prosecute.

May, 1944 to January, 1945: Negotiations for new agreement continued as provided in settlement of wartime labour relations board, dated April 28, 1944.

January 22, 1945: Ontario labour relations board asked Minister of Labour to appoint conciliation officer under section 12 of P.C. 1003, one of the parties having advised the Ontario board that negotiations had continued for more than thirty days and that there appeared no likelihood of concluding an agreement.

January 29, 1945: Minister of Labour appointed Mr. Louis Fine, of Toronto, to confer with the parties and to attempt to effect an agreement.

March 28, 1945: Mr. Fine reported to Minister of Labour that in his opinion an agreement was impossible and the situation was very complicated and difficult.

April 5, 1945: Application by company to wartime labour relations board (national) for interpretation of the termination clause (section 14) of April 28, 1944, settlement. Arbitration committee appointed by the board ruled that certain sections of the settlement which preserved the individual rights of the employees could be terminated only at the expiration of one year on two months' notice by either party. All other clauses of the agreement would terminate at the expiration of fourteen days after a conciliation board reported to the Minister of Labour.

April 18, 1945: Minister of Labour appointed Hon. Mr. Justice S. E. Richards, of Winnipeg, Manitoba, an industrial disputes inquiry commission, under order in council P.C. 4020, to confer with the parties, endeavour to effect an agreement and report his findings and recommendations to the minister.

August 3, 1945: Hon. Mr. Justice Richards submitted to Minister of Labour an interim report recommending that the present agreement be allowed to stand until the end of the present year and that negotiations for a new agreement be entered into afresh on October 15, 1945.

August 16, 1945: Mr. Justice Richards' report transmitted to parties.

August 21, 1945: Reported that local 200 U.A.W.-C.I.O. had rejected the recommendation of Mr. Justice Richards.

August 28, 1945: Mr. Justice Richards recommended to the Minister of Labour that in view of the rejection of the recommendations in his interim report a conciliation board should be immediately established.

August 30, 1945: The Minister of Labour established a conciliation board.

September 1, 1945: The union nominated Mr. Bora Laskin of Toronto as a member of the board.

September 1, 1945: The company nominated Mr. S. L. Springsteen, K.C., of Windsor, as a member of the board.

September 1, 1945: In the absence of a joint recommendation from the two board members, the Minister of Labour appointed the Honourable Mr. Justice G. B. O'Connor of the Supreme Court of Alberta as third member and chairman of the board.

[Mr. Mitchell.]

Mr. Justice O'Connor and other members of the board conducted hearings in Windsor last week.

The board submitted its report on September 11, and it was released to employees and employers on the same date.

The board in its report expresses the opinion that the main issues preventing an agreement between the company and its employees are the questions of "union shop" and "check off." The union asks for the inclusion of both these provisions. The company, on the other hand, is fully determined that there shall not be a condition of employment with the company that a person must be, become, or remain, a member in good standing in the union.

The report of the board of conciliation records the belief that the Minister of Labour of Canada as well as the Minister of Labour of Ontario from time to time have exhausted every possible governmental effort to compromise the difficulties between the parties and to keep the Ford plant in operation.

There were a number of issues brought before the board of conciliation other than those of "union shop" and "check-off."

In dealing with "union shop" and "check-off" the chairman and the representative of the employees recommended that the parties agree to a voluntary check-off irrevocable during the term of the contract as a solution of the present difficulty. In addition, the representative of the employees recommended that a provision for maintenance of membership be coupled with a provision for "check-off."

The representative of the company on the board of conciliation did not concur in either recommendation.

My department has one of its conciliators on the spot at this time to keep the minister and the government informed of developments.

HOUSING

CONVERSION OF MILITARY CAMPS AND OTHER GOVERNMENT PREMISES TO MEET EMERGENCY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. In view of the pressing shortage of shelter for Canadian families, which is likely to become extremely acute during the coming winter, has the government given consideration to the conversion of suitable military camps and other premises owned by the government into temporary housing accommodation to meet this emergency?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Yes, consideration has been given to the utilization of camps and other premises owned by the government. I think it was two months ago or thereabouts that the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) and I met a delegation of mayors from the larger cities of Canada and made an offer on behalf of the government to make available such premises as we thought could be given up by the military authorities and where they would be suitable. Since that time certain premises have been made available to the municipalities, and others are under discussion at the present time. There is an officer in the Department of Reconstruction who is working on this class of problem, and perhaps the Minister of Reconstruction would like to add something to what I have said. In any event I can say positively from my own knowledge that the matter has been given extensive consideration and necessary arrangements have been set up to deal with the situations that arise.

QUESTION AS TO FREEZING OF PLUMBING MATERIALS IN PARTLY CONSTRUCTED HOUSES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. H. HARRIS (Danforth): I would ask the hon. Minister of Finance if it would be possible to hold back the plumbing freezing order now being invoked on houses partly constructed, until such time as these houses are completed, inasmuch as the majority of them are to be occupied by returned soldiers?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): I do not think that is in my department.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): Perhaps the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply can tell us.

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction): I must say that I never heard of this order in connection with houses under construction.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): In regard to plumbing.

Mr. HOWE: There may be one, but I have never heard of it.

CATTLE

CARRY-OVER IN TORONTO STOCK YARDS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. C. SENN (Haldimand): Before the orders of the day are called I should like to address a question to the Minister of Agriculture. This is based on a wire which I understand the Toronto live stock exchange sent to him either yesterday or to-day. The wire describes a serious and in fact critical condition which exists in the Toronto stock yards where some 2,000 head of good cattle have been carried over since Sunday with no buyers in prospect and asking that permits be granted to ship these cattle to the United States. Will the minister make a statement to the house as to what action has been or will be taken to remedy this situation?

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): I received the wire referred to just before I came down to the house, and I did not expect a question with regard to it. I can say that there often is a carry-over on the Toronto market at the beginning of the week but I do not think it is usually due to the fact that there are no buyers. My understanding is that the weighing capacity of the yards is only 3,500, that no more than that number can be put through whether there are buyers or not. The only way in which that could be corrected would be to have the weighing capacity increased. I understand that these yards are under the control of the provincial government and I do not know what their attitude with regard to that would be or whether the capacity could be increased. The wire includes a statement which is contrary to the facts. It states:

> Understand meat board cannot handle any further shipments of beef until end of this month.

The meat board is buying all the meat that is offered every day. All the meat that does come from the plants in shape to be shipped to Britain is being purchased by the board, so if there is any delay that is not the reason.

Mr. SENN: Will the minister permit a supplementary question? Can he say whether the abattoirs in Toronto are being operated to full capacity?

Mr. GARDINER: I doubt if they are being operated at the same capacity as they were at the peak of supplies, say last year, but they are being operated at a capacity which is very high as compared with some other times.

WAR SERVICE GRANTS

ELIGIBILITY OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT DISCHARGED FROM ARMED FORCES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. O. PROBE (Regina City): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Veterans Affairs. I regret that this matter came up so recently that I was unable to send him a

copy of the question. Are members of parliament who are also members of the armed forces or discharged veterans debarred because of their membership in the House of Commons from eligibility to receive any or all of the benefits to which they would otherwise be entitled on discharge under the War Service Grants Act, 1944 or the Veterans' Land Act, 1942?

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): This question came to my attention about three or four days ago. Our policy is directed entirely toward the protection of members of this house. The matter has been referred to the deputy minister of justice for a ruling as to whether or not any benefits conferred upon relatives of any hon. member of this house would be jeopardized by the independence of parliament act. As soon as I have the decision I shall be glad to make a reply to my hon. friend.

MEAT RATIONING

EXTRA RATIONS FOR FARMERS EMPLOYING NUMBERS OF MEN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance under whose jurisdiction is Canada's new meat rationing plan. An urgent message came to me this morning from one of my Peel farmers stating that he is stook threshing and corn cutting this week and will have fourteen extra men for meals at his farm. He tells me that he went to the nearest rationing board office, which is at Orangeville, to obtain extra meat rations and was advised that no instructions had been received and no authority had been issued by the wartime prices and trade board to give additional meat coupons for that purpose. In view of what appears to be a very urgent situation with respect to the rural parts of Canada I would ask the minister to give consideration to having that authority and direction delivered to the appropriate officers so that these extra rations may be available for the purposes I have mentioned.

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): I shall bring the matter to the attention of the wartime prices and trade board. I received notice of the question too late to permit my making a more extended reply to the question.

Mr. GRAYDON: As this matter is so urgent in the rural parts perhaps the minister would suggest to the chairman of the wartime prices and trade board that telegrams be sent to the ration board centres throughout Canada. This situation is a matter of extreme concern to farmers because they are right in the middle of the season and need additional supplies.

REQUEST FOR ABANDONMENT OF RATIONING AND REQUISITIONING FOR EXPORT

Mr. W. C. MACDONALD (Halifax): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance with regard to meat rationing. It is reported in the press to-day that retail butchers have asked that meat rationing be abandoned and that instead meat be requisitioned for shipment overseas and the balance equitably distributed throughout the country. I should like to ask the minister what consideration has been given to these representations.

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): The hon. member sent me a notice of this question and I have a brief statement prepared in answer. There appears to be no difference of opinion that Canada should make every effort to make the maximum amount of meat available to the United Kingdom and liberated countries in Europe, but the question is raised as to why coupon rationing is necessary to achieve that result. It is suggested that we might requisition such meat as we need for export and that the balance should be distributed equitably among the Canadian people. The matter is not nearly as simple as that. In the first place, meat for export must come from the inspected packing plants. It is only meat from these plants which can enter into interprovincial trade. It is meat from these plants which in general goes to feed the people in areas which are not self-sufficient in meat supplies, such as the maritime provinces, the northern parts of Ontario and Quebec, and British Columbia, and it is these plants which in large measure provide for the larger cities.

Requisitioning of meat for export would therefore shorten the supply of meat from the inspected plants and create a serious deficiency in those areas which depend on such plants for supplies, leaving areas whose meat requirements can be taken care of locally with abundant supplies. The truth of that is emphasized by what took place before meat rationing was first introduced in 1943. Butchers in Toronto, Montreal and elsewhere had nothing to sell, and stores were actually closed for lack of supplies, while there was an abundance of meat in other areas. As soon as coupon rationing was introduced, that all changed. The flow of coupons from the consumer through the retailer to the packer automatically controlled the flow of meat, and every retailer and every

consumer received his fair share. It should not be overlooked that the previous rationing was introduced primarily to do the very thing I have described, namely, to ensure equitable distribution. This time the ration is designed to reduce consumption of meat in Canada for reasons with which I think most Canadians are in agreement, but at the same time it will maintain an equitable distribution of the supply available for domestic consumption. I have every reason to believe that the very merchants who are protesting against rationing to-day would, with their customers, be the first to suffer in many cases, if we requisitioned meat for overseas shipment and discontinued coupon rationing.

We know also that maldistribution breeds black markets. The existence of black markets would attract an increasing amount of live stock from the normal trade channels and either reduce the amount of meat we would export or further shorten the supplies of the honest retailer who will not engage in black market activities. We would find ourselves in the vicious circle which such a situation always produces.

I am satisfied most of those who have protested do not realize the results which would follow if we had attempted to meet our obligations to our allies without rationing. If they did, I cannot believe that they would have joined in voicing these protests. No one welcomes rationing; neither the wartime prices and trade board officials who must administer it, nor the consumer, nor the retailer nor the packer. To all it means added work and inconvenience. On the other hand, however, it means an opportunity to assist those of our allies who have felt the physical ravages of war; to demonstrate that humanitarian considerations still play a part in world affairs and to maintain the enviable record which Canada has established during the war years of being sufficiently self-disciplined to provide for the needs of all its citizens in an orderly and decent fashion.

As hon. members are aware, the mechanics of the meat rationing system introduced last Monday differ somewhat from the mechanics of the previous system. These changes were introduced with a view to simplifying the problems of those who have to operate under rationing. Protests have been received, however, from retail butchers, and the wartime prices and trade board has therefore arranged to meet with representatives of the Retail Merchants Association here in Ottawa on Wednesday next, September 19.

SMALL PACKERS—TRIMMINGS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. H. HARRIS (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, I would like to base a question on a series of telegrams which have reached my desk since the house convened at three o'clock, and perhaps the Minister of Finance would prepare a reply for to-morrow, taking this as notice. The telegrams have to do with the small packers. The first one reads—I will give only the substance:

Impossible to continue to remain in business under new rationing regulations for the reason that—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I must remind the hon. member that it is against the rules to read telegrams.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): I bow to your ruling, sir. I would ask the hon. Minister of Finance if he could tell the house what arrangements are being made to keep the small packers in Canada in business under the new meat rationing regulations, which make no provision for the trimmings produced by small packers, to find a market which would keep them in business.

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): I will make inquiry about the matter of the trimmings and let my hon. friend have an answer to-morrow.

MEAT RATION FOR LOGGERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. A. CRUICKSHANK (Fraser Valley): I have two questions, Mr. Speaker, to direct to the ministry, but first may I suggest to them through you, Mr. Speaker, that they speak up so that they can be heard by the rest of the people's representatives in this chamber.

I would ask the Minister of Finance, do loggers and other hard workers in the province of British Columbia get the same ration of meat as members of parliament or newspaper men or someone who does no hard work? If so, why do they not get more?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): I will make inquiries.

BEDFORD BASIN NAVAL MAGAZINE

INQUIRY AS TO EXPLOSION AND SAFETY MEASURES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. C. MACDONALD (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, press reports indicate that Halifax narrowly escaped a serious explosion yesterday at the Bedford Basin naval magazine. I should like to ask the Minister of National

Defence if he has had any report from there as to what happened, and whether there is danger of further explosions. I should also like to ask him if the committee of explosive experts that was to be appointed to study the design and suitability of the magazine and the adequacy of the safety precautions has yet begun its work?

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of National Defence for Naval Services): I have had a report as to the incident which occurred yesterday. There is no danger of any further explosions in the magazine. What happened was that a gasoline launch which was used by the disposal officer was moored alongside the jetty. It had been filled with gasoline a short time before, and when the motor was started the engine appears to have backfired. In any case an explosion took place and the crew were thrown into the water. The fire was put out shortly afterwards, and the crew are back at work to-day. There is no danger of further explosions as a result of that accident.

As to the committee that was appointed to inquire into the arrangements at the Bedford magazine, it has begun its work. Colonel Ogilvie, the head of the committee, Doctor Ross, of the explosives division of Munitions and Supply, and Mr. Whyte, of Woolwich arsenal, visited the magazine some time ago. I asked them first to investigate the adequacy of the steps taken to dispose of the damaged ammunition, and their report was that the arrangements made and the precautions being taken were satisfactory. They spoke highly of the competence of the officers now in charge of that work. The committee is returning to Halifax at the end of this week with some additional members to carry out the main purpose of their inquiry, which is to investigate the design and arrangements of the magazine.

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

RELEASE OF PERSONNEL DESIROUS OF ATTENDING HIGH SCHOOL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the minister of defence for the army, as a result of inquiries that I have received from several secondary and high school teachers in Toronto and county of York. Would not the minister, with the Minister of Labour and his very capable deputy, Mr. MacNamara, consider extending the principle of the recent order in council which allows the early discharge of intending university students to apply also to those who wish to go back to the secondary and high schools of the country to complete their education? I do hope that the minister for the army will consider the matter over the week-end because in the case of many of these students their fathers are still overseas or they have brothers or other members of the family still at the front.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. CHURCH: I would like to get a reply from the minister, also from the Minister of Labour.

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of National Defence): The regulation allows students at university or equivalent educational institutions to be discharged. That is as far as it goes. In the case of students who are eligible for their senior matriculation, which is equivalent to first year at some universities, while no hard and fast rule is fixed, I think that sympathetic consideration is being given in all three services to applications made by these students. I believe that would cover the majority of the cases, because if a lad does not come into the service until he is eighteen years old or better he should be pretty nearly eligible for senior matriculation at that time.

WAR CRIMINALS

TRIAL PROCEDURE—ESTABLISHMENT OF CANADIAN COURTS

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Inquiries have been made from outside the house of the government with respect to the trial of war criminals, and particularly in relation to Canadian courts to be established for the purpose. I have thought that perhaps I should give the house a brief statement which would be of interest to hon. members as well as to the public generally.

In November, 1943, Mr. A. G. Slaght, K.C., then a member of the House of Commons, was named as honorary counsel to the government to advise with regard to the custody, trial and punishment of persons charged with war crimes. An interdepartmental committee was established at the same time, including representatives from the Departments of External Affairs, Justice and National Defence.

The Canadian government also participated in the work of the united nations war crimes commission which was set up in London and, at a later stage, Mr. Vincent Massey, the Canadian High Commissioner, was appointed as the Canadian representative on the commission.

Since the surrender of Germany, rapid progress has been made in the plans for the apprehension, trial and punishment of war criminals. The political leaders of nazi Germany are being dealt with under arrangements agreed upon by the governments of the United Kingdom, the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and France. The others of the united nations are not participating.

War crimes arising out of conquest and occupation will be dealt with by the countries concerned, for example, the Norwegian authorities will deal with atrocities committed during the occupation of Norway. The remaining war crimes include atrocities committed in the course of battle and crimes against prisoners of war and civilian internees. It is recognized that jurisdiction to deal with such offences should depend upon the nationality of the victim rather than the national character of the place where the offence has been committed. Accordingly, arrangements are being made to establish military courts to deal with these offences. Canadian military courts will deal with offences against Canadians, including members of the Canadian armed forces regardless of their individual national status, British military courts with offences against British, United States and Soviet courts will deal with offences against United States citizens and soldiers and Russian citizens and soldiers, respectively.

In order to carry out this general plan, a recent order in council authorized regulations to govern the custody, trial and punishment of persons charged with violation of the laws and usages of war. The regulations are similar and, in matters of substance, are identical with the regulations which have been established for British military courts. Further, the nature of the courts and the character of the procedure will be substantially the same as in the case of those which are being established by the United States authorities.

A war crimes section has been set up in Canadian military headquarters in London headed by Lieutenant-Colonel B. J. S. Macdonald, who had formerly occupied a similar position in the war crimes section established by General Eisenhower at his supreme headquarters. When the section at supreme headquarters was disbanded early in the year, a number of the Canadian officers who had been associated with Colonel Macdonald were transferred to the Canadian section and they have since been engaged in the preparation of Canadian cases and in submitting them to the united nations war crimes commission for approval.

The commission will deal with cases submitted in this way in the same manner and in accordance with the same procedure as in cases submitted by other governments. If the commission considers that there is a case which should be tried, it will remit it to the Canadian war crimes section for action. Colonel Macdonald and his associates will then undertake the prosecution of the accused. The courts will be established in accordance with military law, the procedure will be in accordance with the principles of justice, the accused will have full opportunity for defence, and the arrangements for constitution of the court and execution of sentence will follow recognized military practice. In view of the impossibility of assembling all of the witnesses, some of whom may have been demobilized and many of whom will have been repatriated, there are some modifications of the rigid rules of evidence applicable under our ordinary criminal procedure. There are, however, sufficient safeguards for the accused to make it certain that they will receive fair trials, and that they will be convicted only if convictions are justified by the laws and usages of war and supported by evidence.

Under the arrangements which have now been established, the Canadian courts will be concerned with war crimes involving death or grievous bodily harm to Canadian civilians or to members of the Canadian armed forces. Prosecution will be undertaken by the war crimes section of Canadian military headquarters and the judge advocate general's office will be responsible for examining cases and for authorizing prosecution. The courts will be constituted from military personnel experienced in the laws and usages of war; and the proceedings will be conducted with dignity, fairness, and justice.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Wednesday, September 12, consideration of the motion of Mr. W. M. Benidickson for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Bracken, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Mr. ALISTAIR STEWART (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, we have read in the speech from the throne about the intention of the government to bring the legislation respecting national status, naturalization and immigration into conformity with the definition of

citizenship. Now I know as yet of no definition of citizenship, so I can say nothing about that; but this I can and must say, that many of the administrative orders and regulations in the department of immigration are iniquitous in principle and vicious in their effect.

The other day the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) suggested that when we spoke we should have facts to support our arguments. I have these facts. He also suggested and implied that captious criticism would not be welcomed, especially criticism regarding the last six years. He forgot about the years prior to that when also he was Prime Minister of this country. He forgot, I think, about those years when thousands were out of work and hundreds of thousands were on relief. He forgot about those years when the young men of Canada were an unwanted generation, when neither industry, commerce nor the government had time for them, but who—these men who were the rejected and the despised in Canada—when war was declared, suddenly became its saviours. He may have forgotten that. I can assure him that these men and their families have not forgotten.

I should like to draw to the Prime Minister's attention another statement which he made. He made it in Winnipeg on the 24th of May of this year during the heat of the campaign—and I am firmly convinced that he said it in all sincerity, and that anything he does to implement the spirit of the statement will receive not only our applause but our complete cooperation. On that occasion the Prime Minister said:

> Any man who lends his voice or pen to stir up racial or religious strife is an enemy of mankind.

I commend these words to certain of his followers. I suggest that they should treat them as a text, read them, mark them and inwardly digest them, and then act on them.

Even the blindest observer in Canada to-day surely sees the danger there is in the growing racial animosity which prevails; and there are many reasons for it. In the first place there is the stupid myth of race, which has no basis at all in science or in fact. I cannot concede the theory of a French race, an English race, a Jewish race, a Ukrainian race, because there is no fact at all behind that belief. This theory of race is a myth, and I say quite as definitely that those who spread racial animosity are enemies of mankind. They are essentially bigoted men and cowardly men at heart; the very essence of fascism when it started was to oppress the weak, and it is always the coward who is the first to do that very thing.

I suppose that if any member of this house were asked whether he had at any time stirred up racial animosity he would deny it immediately because humanity has a tendency to rationalize its most stupid emotions by regarding them as conclusions arrived at as the result of experience.

There is one small group in this country, a defenceless and economically very weak group, to whom I should like to call the attention of the house. I refer to the coloured people, Canadians who are of negro origin Many of the members of this house must know members of this group. When we pass across Canada in a train we see them occupying humble positions as porters; yet I submit that they occupy honourable positions, because any man who by his toil enhances our welfare or adds to our comfort is occupying an honourable place in our society. Yet I know one of these men, a graduate of a university, cultured, kindly, essentially civilized, who is condemned apparently forever to one job only in life and that is to act as porter on a train. That man can contribute great things to Canada, but he is given no opportunity. I know of children of coloured people who are told not to go to university because they will get no economic benefit in after life from their education. They are condemned to one sphere. I know of coloured people, friends of mine, who have the greatest difficulty in getting housing accommodation. That is true of many people, but ten times more true of men or women who are coloured. I think I have the right to ask the protection of this house for these minorities. I have the right on the basis of the following which is contained in the compendium of parliamentary rules and forms prepared by Doctor Beauchesne, at page 4, of which, there appears a quotation from Bourinot. It is the high privilege of ours—

> —to protect a minority and restrain the improvidence or tyranny of a majority.

That is a sacred obligation of this house, but we find this discrimination in the highest places in the country, and in it are the seeds of tremendous danger to Canada.

Just a little over a year ago in Manitoba a group of us, Canadians, accused the board of governors of the university of permitting racial discrimination of the vilest type to exist in the faculty of medicine of the university. The charge was denied, at first loudly, and as time went on with lessening vehemence, because the facts were undeniable. Here is what happened. When the applicant for admission to the medical college sent in his name he was placed in one of four lists—the preferred list, the Anglo-Saxon, the

French and the Icelandic. Then followed central Europeans, and these central Europeans came from northern Norway down to the southernmost boundaries of Europe. Then, as one would expect, there was a separate list for Jewish people, and then, as one would not expect, a separate list for women. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that there is as much discrimination against women in this country, in many ways, as there is against men because of ethnic origin or religious belief. Because we publicized this discrimination and challenged the board of governors with it the situation has been corrected. There is no statute yet on the books of the province of Manitoba to make sure it will stay corrected, but we have the vigilance of the people to ensure that.

Lest the members of this house think that this shame rests only upon Manitoba, I would say something to members who come from Montreal and Toronto, because in these two institutions of learning, McGill university and the university of Toronto, they will find that this discrimination exists against people because of race, which is a scandal in a democratic country. I hope that as part of their responsibilities and duties they will realize that it is their task to try to eradicate the discrimination that exists. In the university of McGill, I am informed, Jewish students have to have an appreciably higher percentage of marks than other students before they can expect to pass. Here is one of the examples of anti-semitism in high places in this country.

But not only do we find it in institutions of learning where we should never expect to find it; we find it in certain of the orders of the government. The Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) is not here, but I am going to tell him this. A minister of the crown is responsible to this parliament for everything which happens within his jurisdiction. He may perhaps have no knowledge of what has happened and therefore we will temper our criticism, but in the application form for wartime housing there are many questions, two of which are: What is your religion? What is your nationality? What have these things to do with the right of man who has fought for Canada to get a home in this country? I suggest to the Minister of Reconstruction that he take steps immediately to strike out these two vicious questions.

I should like now to deal with the department of immigration, and first of all I want to establish the policy which has been carried on in the past. We find it in the report for 1941:

> Canada, in accordance with the generally accepted practice, places greater emphasis upon race than upon citizenship.

That is as regards people who come into the country—"greater emphasis upon race." In 1941 when these words were being written and read in this house we were encouraging Canadians to enlist in the services to go abroad and die in order to wipe out that stupid supersitition. Yet here we practise it. Immigration into Canada has been on the basis of race, and I am going to suggest to the minister if he makes any changes in the immigration law he will be well advised to start by first of all tearing up these orders and rules and starting anew. I suggest further that he has a great responsibility because he is dealing with the lives and happiness of people, and I think it is wrong that a responsibility such as this should come to the attention of the House of Commons only when we learn of the orders. I suggest that all legislation vitally affecting any principle of immigration should come before this House of Commons.

What are the facts? Again we come to the preferred and non-preferred groups. The most preferred obviously are British and those from the United States, and in the group called preferred are included French, Belgians, people of the Netherlands, Germans, Swiss, those from Scandinavian countries, Iceland and Finland. So we have established a category of citizens. Then we have the non-preferred. We have established two categories of citizens in Canada, the non-preferred being those who come from Poland, from the Ukraine, from Austria, from Czechoslovakia and from similar countries. But we have categories even below that, those who are lower than the non-preferred, who can get into this country only by special permit; those who come from Turkey, Romania, Greece, Italy; and the Jews. I think it is a matter of statistical record that immigrants from the countries I have named have been few in number, and therefore it appears to me as though the intent of this order were anti-semitic, designed to exclude Jewish people from Canada. That feeling is still further strengthened when it is remembered that under the second category a certain discretion was given the railway companies as to who were to be brought into Canada, but no discretion was given them in this matter. For instance, a Polish citizen could migrate to Canada if the railway company brought him here, but a Polish citizen who was of the Jewish faith could not come into this country without a specific order from the minister. There is discrimination again, Mr. Speaker, at its very worst.

While I am speaking about the Jewish people I should like to say that a few years ago there were 17,000,000 of them in the world. In the last few years due to the barbaric devilment of fascism, 7,000,000 have died, and there have been few Christian voices raised in protest. In certain areas in Europe there are between 800,000 and 1,000,000 Jews left alive, but they are friendless, homeless and landless; no Christian nation in its charity will stretch out a hand to help them. Instead we have done our best to keep them out and to keep them down. For these people I ask some pity. I should like to see the Prime Minister translate that pity into action by making representations to the government at Westminster that the Balfour Declaration be lived up to in all its provisions; that Palestine be opened as a home for the Jewish people, because only there will they be free from the persecution they have suffered at Christian hands; only there will they escape these wretched perversions of human nature.

It is not only the Jewish people who suffer in Canada. There is wicked discrimination against those of Ukrainian descent. We have several hundred thousand Canadians descended from men and women who came to this country from the Ukraine to establish homes and bring up families, who contributed great wealth to Canada, who have given their sons and daughter in Canada's wars, and who deserve well of Canada. Yet because of their name, because of their ethnology, they find it difficult indeed to compete with Anglo-Saxons, let us say. Just the other day a young boy whose parents are Ukrainian, and who had served five years in our air force, came to me. He wanted to pursue a certain line of work and asked if I could help him. I did what I could, but I am afraid I was unsuccessful, because the first question I was asked was as to his nationality. If I said he was a Canadian, the reply came, "You know what we mean. Where did his parents come from?" So I failed, I am afraid; but if so, the social consequences may be bitter indeed for that boy and his family, because already he has been asked by his friends, "Why do you aspire to this vocation? Don't you realize that you have no chance? Don't you realize that you had better go to the railway shops at Weston or Transcona and work there as a labourer?"

There again are the seeds of disunity. Why talk about national unity when people have in their hearts the bitterness of knowing they are discriminated against? It is impossible to have unity on that basis. You find the same thing in connection with citizens of Polish descent. They are discriminated against because of their religion, perhaps, or again because of their name. We have in Canada people with Polish names that rank high in honour in the country of their origin; yet we in our insolence tell them that before they get work they must anglicize their names. These people need the protection of this parliament. We have Canadians of German descent, loyal, sound democrats who have fought for Canada. I know one boy who made thirty-two operational trips over Germany, who received an honourable discharge, yet again, because of his name, he is discriminated against.

We need in Canada, Mr. Speaker, a bill of rights to protect the minorities in this country, and I am going to suggest to the government that it give us such a bill. Within a few weeks we are going to debate in this house the charter of the united nations, and in the preamble we shall read these words:

> We, the peoples of the united nations, determined to . . . reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women . . . and for these ends to practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours . . . have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims.

Here we make our declaration of faith to the world. I ask that this parliament make the same affirmation of faith to Canada. I ask that the government introduce a bill of rights and that this house place it upon the statute books of Canada, so that our children may grow together in dignity and in grace, with equality and justice, and above all in brotherhood.

Mr. J. M. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a few brief remarks on the motion may I begin, as others have begun, by expressing my pleasure that the mover (Mr. Benidickson) and the seconder (Mr. Langlois) should have been veterans, not in years but in military service, in this war. Speaking as one whose military service is further behind him than he quite likes to think, may I say how fitting that seemed to me to be.

May I also take just a moment to refer to the chief impressions made upon the mind of a new member at the beginning of this session. First of all it was a great interest and pleasure to watch the ancient observances that we follow here and to reflect that in countries all over the world which share our traditions and beliefs these same practices are being followed, operating, I would think, as a tie linking together in common purposes all those who believe in these institutions. The other thing that struck me and which I should

like to mention was the feeling that in this house, regardless of parties, tongues or anything else, there was a friendliness such as I suppose Mr. Churchill had in mind when, not long ago, he spoke of an underlying comradeship. I suppose some people thought Mr. Churchill forgot that occasionally during the last election campaign; nevertheless I am sure he is one of the people who feel it basically, and of course basically it is there.

And I should like to say that as one who for years lived in the province of Quebec and had good friends in that province, one of the things that gave me pleasure in coming down here was to believe that I could again make good friends coming from Quebec though speaking their language so badly that I must learn to speak it better before I can talk to them except in English.

In saying that, I would add that I hope it will be a beginning of my answer to the comment made yesterday in the house, one which deeply distressed me, that the party to which I belong was a party seeking to create dissension in this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for a few moments I should like to speak about my constituency. I think very highly of my constituents for electing me. I represent a double-barrelled constituency, that of Muskoka-Ontario. Not so long ago it was two constituencies, until some ten years ago when they were united. It was a marriage of convenience rather than a love match, and I think the people in the constituency doubted whether the convenience was entirely theirs. However, they have lived together in amity—although I think it is probably true that if opportunity were afforded they would like again to resume single blessedness. Speaking for myself, I would regret that, because I have received kindness from both consorts, and would dislike to lose association with either of them.

I should like to say a word about the people in my constituency. For the most part, indeed almost altogether, they are descended from the immigrants who came from the British isles. However, on the western part, overlooking Georgian bay—which, by the way, I recommend all of you to visit, because we are a great tourist constituency—there is a group of French Canadians living within sight of the route followed over three hundred years ago by Champlain. In those early days he came down through the Georgian Bay district. Sometimes we are apt to forget just how long ago it was that those early voyagers travelled through our country, and just how very much we owe to them. If it will not appear simply as an advertisement for my constituency, may I say that in the midst of his other occupations that great traveller and pioneer found time to refer to the excellent black bass, and to the no less excellent blueberries which abound in that area.

Now a word about geography; geography has most definitely separated the two sections of my constituency. The southerly part is as beautiful and fertile a farming land as will be found anywhere in Ontario. I believe it was one of the premiers of Ontario who with Scottish modesty referred to his province as the banner province. At any rate, that section of my constituency is remarkably fertile. Then, going north one steps almost at one bound across to Muskoka, and there finds himself in the area of the pre-Cambrian shield, that formation we know so well composed of rock, river, lake and forest.

About the industries I should like to say one word, because what I shall say will lead to a point I wish to make. As I have already indicated, the industry in the southern part of the constituency is that of farming, while in the northern part are the industries connected with the woods, which have been developed to some considerable extent; and also the tourist industry. The tourist industry has, of course, the tremendous advantage, first of all, of being one of the greatest providers of American exchange—and at no cost whatsoever to Canadian resources. The only thing we send out in return for that exchange is good-will which, so far, has not been rationed.

Just one further word about the industries in that constituency. I suppose it is true that in pioneer countries there has always been the danger of being wasteful. One industry rushes ahead, with the result that it gets ahead of the others. In the northern part of Muskoka, by its development, the woods industry has tended to militate against the tourist industry. Woods have been gradually been taken off, streams have shrunk, and, in spite of the present prosperity we are in danger of finding that various activities which have been carried on do not jibe.

The result has been that only a few days ago in the district of Muskoka there took place a meeting which, I suggest might well be duplicated up and down this country. This was a meeting by the people for the purpose of helping themselves. They are prosperous enough now, but they are looking forward to the time when possibly they may not be so prosperous. It was because of that they held the meeting of representatives from all the townships in the district of Muskoka, for the purpose of considering and taking stock of their situation, finding out what needed to be

done, where forestation might be best carried on, and the like. That meeting has been held, and the hope is that through the collaboration of the province and the dominion, assistance will be forthcoming when needed, so that those people who have set to work to help themselves will find the necessary help from others as a means of post-war planning, and various other activities of which we hear so much. Naturally they look with anxiety toward the dominion-provincial conference, and it is their hope that in God's good time it will be completed and the results available for the benefit of all of us.

The ancients, I believe, Mr. Speaker, held the view that a democracy should be small enough so that all the citizens could gather together for the discussion of their common problems. We have got a long way from that. But we who sit in the House of Commons are merely representatives, and are here only because our constituents themselves cannot be here. I thought that to-day, for the few remaining minutes I propose to detain you, I should like to imagine that my constituents, of whose intelligence I have already spoken so highly, were here. With that in mind I shall venture to put before you some of the questions I believe they would be asking if they were here.

In the first place I think they would ask a question which is so much in the minds of all of us, a most perplexing question, that of controls. Perhaps they hold rather dark views of controls, because the controls which affect them seem, in some cases, peculiarly trivial, peculiarly nagging, and from their point of view so entirely unnecessary. I am not saying they are unnecessary, but am only expressing what would seem to be their views.

I was in a very small shop one day located in my riding. Like most country stores it was really a small departmental store. In it was a dry goods section, a grocery section, a boots and shoes section, and so on. I should think one could have taken any of those departments and put it in a good-sized wheelbarrow. The owner of that shop was somewhat annoyed on the day of my visit. It seems there had been two government inspectors who came to the shop during the afternoon. They travelled in very fine cars supplied with plenty of gasoline—and this was during the rationing period. One of them examined, let us say, his dry goods; the other examined, let us say, his boots and shoes, to see that all was in order. From my own point of view it was perhaps a good thing, because I think the owner of the store was a faithful member of the Liberal party, and I left that shop with some feeling that perhaps he might change his allegiance.

However that may be, the fact is that in my constituency they take a dark view of controls. On this subject I should like to speak as I believe they would speak if they were here to say a word or two for themselves. Those of us who believe in individual private enterprise earnestly wish to get rid of controls as fast as we can. But to say that is not to get rid of them, because there are great difficulties in the way. In my view the question is one of vast importance, because I believe that to ask individual enterprise, which we so much desire, to serve us at the present time and to do its job is like tying a man hand and foot and then asking him to run a race. I do not think I underestimate the difficulties. But who is to get rid of these controls? Are we to leave it entirely to the cabinet ministers? Cabinet ministers are very busy men. No one will doubt that they are carrying tremendous burdens. I submit that it will be extremely difficult for them to attain the necessary mental detachment. They are doing a full-time job and it would be extremely difficult for them to stand off and look at it in a detached way and try to consider how it shall be changed, to decide then the time has come to get rid of these controls.

Are we then to leave it to the permanent officials, whom I greatly respect, to decide when these controls are to be done away with? One might facetiously say that would be like getting a lot of admirals together and asking them to reduce the navy. That is what they used to do, and they did not get very far. But I am not making any such cheap suggestion as that. I believe that the senior men in charge of the main controls are not men who would cling to a job. I believe that they could have better jobs to-morrow if they wanted them. They are there because they believe in their work. Again I submit, how are they to have the detachment as well as the wisdom or the courage to do this? I submit that it is extremely difficult for them. They believe that they are doing a good job, and let us admit for the moment that they are. How are they to decide when the time has come to change?

It is not an easy question to answer. The other day I read an article in the London *Economist* which interested me. I think we shall all agree that the London *Economist* is that good mixture of left and right which we would all like to be. I wish to read

just one short sentence from this article which struck me quite forcibly because it contains a suggestion which surprised me. I have no doubt it will surprise a great many people who are now acting in the position of controller. In this article the *Economist* was urging on the present British government, with which it is extremely sympathetic, that in order to make a success of that small area of economic life which they have taken under their control they will have to make the rest of it succeed; they will have to ensure the success of all that area which is still under private enterprise. The *Economist* was urging them to do away with controls and, speaking of what had gone on during the war, they say this:

> By what right can a government department maintain in peace time that it has more right to the use of a building than its owners?

That rather struck me and I suggest that it would strike a great many people who are operating controls with the same force. Let me read it again:

> By what right can a government department maintain in peace time that it has more right to the use of a building than its owners?

It then goes on to ask this rather pertinent question. Perhaps it is more of a statement than a question:

> The traditional and very healthy British view puts upon the official the onus of proof of his own right to existence... The time has come to restore this.

Let me read that one sentence again:

> . . . puts on the official the onus of proof of his own right to existence.

How is he going to discharge that onus? Is he to decide it wholly with his minister? I suggest that that is leaving it in too small a compass. I suggest that he and his minister are too fully engaged in the job, too fully seized with the work they are doing. They will find it almost impossible to stand off and look at it with a critical mind. Therefore I suggest that there is only one body—as a new member it is not for me to suggest how it should be done—that should be asked to do this, namely this high court of parliament.

In that connection I should like to draw the attention of the house to another statement that was made. I realize that it is not easy for hard-working ministers and hard-working officials to be submitting everything to parliament and I have no such foolish idea as that in my mind. I know business has to be done; I know decisions have to be made, but there will be questions which I believe will be of vital importance in connection with these controls and I do not think they should be decided in camera by a small group of men. Thank heavens the need for secrecy is gone and I see no reason why we should not give consideration to these things that matter.

There was a time during the war when it would have been almost impossible to do this. A member of this house who is by no means unfriendly to the government wrote in a Canadian magazine in 1943:

> To-day the state is in business. In Canada it is conducting more than half of all the business of the nation with devices like those in the Department of Munitions and Supply and the wartime prices and trade board.

Listen to this:

> Over these parliament has about as much control as it has over the movement of the stars.

I am not criticizing that statement in 1943. It was extremely difficult when security was such a prevalent consideration, though perhaps the plea of security was sometimes over-used a little. Perhaps they were only human. But if that is true to-day in peace time then all I can say is that the sneers against parliament which have been so common up and down the land for the last two or three years and which I personally have greatly deprecated—if I had believed them I would not be here to-day—are perfectly correct. If they are correct, then all I can say is that I tremble for the situation in our country. If respect for this body in which we are sitting this afternoon is not to be maintained I wonder where the moral authority is to come from to make the people like the things they must have to put up with before reconversion is over.

If my constituents were here—this is not an original idea—they would have a word to say about taxation as everybody else would, and I would suggest that their word might have a special validity. They are nearly all workers-on-their-own; very few of them are on any payroll. They get only the money they earn themselves. If they pay out more than they take in they go broke. There is a lot of realism about people like that; you cannot fool them.

They have been patriotic citizens. When the war was on they did not complain about their taxes. They paid them like everybody else, but now that the war is over, like other people they are perplexed and troubled. They had hoped that taxation would go down, though perhaps their hopes were exaggerated.

Now what do they find? They fear that there are signs of taxation being kept up and up. They fear that perhaps the state has turned itself into a Santa Claus. Let me say quickly that there is not one of us who is more ready to support proper social

services than they are; there is no one more ready to see that those who are unfortunate, those who are disabled, those who are old, those who have suffered unemployment, those who have suffered through no fault of their own, and those in distress should be taken care of. They do not want any withholding from those people. But they are people like ourselves who believe in private enterprise and who sometimes feel that there is a danger that too little stress is laid on the virtues and qualities which have brought us the distance we have come.

They begin to ask if it is really true that the state has discovered some secret store of money when the fact is that the state has no resources apart from that which is produced by its citizens. They say, "Is it still true that the goods that we have, the services that we have, the resources that we have to help those people come only from the thrift, and energy, and providence, and readiness to take a risk, of the people who have initiative and energy?" Let me say just in passing that when we talk about the profit system we are using a misnomer; we should talk about the profit and loss system. When a man asks to have his wages raised he is seeking a profit; the only difference is that he is not taking any risk.

What do these people say about taxation? I think all that they would say, all that anyone can say at the moment, is that we are now coming to a time when as rapidly as possible we are going to remove the controls from private enterprise. That is, those of us who believe that private enterprise has to carry on are ready to remove the controls. Remember that every day they continue is not only a day lost but is one day more of tampering, of retarding and discouragement for the people who are waiting and hoping for the day when they can get busy and again provide labour and wages; and taxes for the state. Do not let us forget that it is only from private enterprise and profits that the state gets its taxes, and incidentally I would point out that the *Economist* put that up to the British government when they urged that in all that area of economic life not yet taken over by the state they must see to it that private enterprise resumed its activities and that profits are made for it. Who has more desire to see profits than the state, because that is where the state gets its taxes from?

We shall soon be considering a question which I suppose is the most difficult one that any minister of finance has ever had placed before him. How much of the great burdens that we are to have shall we carry by taxation, and how much by borrowing? There is a sixty-four dollar question which it will require our joint wisdom to answer. It would be easy to make generalizations. Two can be made right away. If we raise too much by taxation we just grind still further into the dust all those who are seeking through their individual initiative to make the contribution which under our system they have primarily to make. On the other hand, if we raise too little by taxation and too much by borrowing, we meet the other lion in the path—inflation. I shall not detain the house one moment to discuss that. But it is a question we should all be considering, a question on he proper determination of which our happiness may very likely depend.

There is one other thing my constitutents would say if they were here. It was said by the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. Merritt) the other night. They would like a lead. They would like someone whom they regard as having moral authority to tell them what the score is, to tell them where we are, to tell them what can be done and what cannot be done, and to tell them as honestly as possible, as persuasively as possible, what their sacrifices are to be. Still more they would like someone to tell them honestly that the sacrifices are being shared, to tell them that there will be a square deal all round, that no one is to be left with the short end of the stick. That is what they are afraid of. They want to be assured that everyone will share in the sacrifices.

That is particularly true, I suppose, of labour. I myself have had some very modest dealings with labour. I have a good many labour friends. I believe that if things are put to them, cards on the table face up, if they are given full information, it is astonishing how quickly suspicion disappears. If labour is dealt with fairly and persuasively, there is nobody in the world that can be more reasonable or more understanding than they are. But it has to be done in time. And nobody must try to drive them. What is needed now is to try to get their cooperation, to work with them.

Finally, if my constituents were here, they would say this—or perhaps they would only feel it, so that I will say it for them: now that they are welcoming back their sons and daughters from the armed forces and mourning those who will never come back and as they are condoling with the relatives of others who have not come back, they would feel like reminding us here of the quality which these young people have shown during war time, and I think they would like to say to us that we need to have, not a double portion, for that we could never have, but some small por-

tion of their spirit. I know it has never been fashionable to serve the state in peace time. It is astonishing the number of people who will do their utmost in war time, who will do nothing in peace time. Some who will do most in war time never think of doing it in peace time. It is a foreign idea to them. But it should not be a foreign idea to anybody here, and I conclude by saying to you, sir, and to this house, that I do not think the great affairs, the tremendous problems, such as we are going to have to face, can ever be dealt with by little minds and in a little way. And I would say that these young people who have served in our armed forces in the war and their relatives have a right to expect that we shall show at least some portion of the spirit that they have shown.

Mr. MAXIME RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few brief remarks in order to define the attitude of members of the Bloc Populaire regarding the speech from the throne as well as the two amendments which have been moved.

The present government has been entrusted with the mandate of administering the affairs of the country during the next five years, with the responsibilities arising therefrom. It is therefore bound to introduce measures necessary to take care of the grave situation in which Canada finds herself to-day, after six years of war which have completely upset its economy.

What are those measures? We do not know them yet. The speech from the throne, drawn up as usual in vague and general terms, does not set them forth in detail, but it informs us that they are meant to meet present-day needs. But how can we deal effectively with measures that we do not know? It seems to me that, logically, we should wait until those measures have been submitted to us so that we may be able to deal efficiently with them. I therefore consider that, for the present, long debates would serve only in delaying the presentation of these measures, some of which are of an urgent character, as, for example, those concerning the housing problem, and the placement of our demobilized service men and our war plant employees.

We shall therefore facilitate the adoption of the address, thus helping the government in bringing down these measures which we are anxiously awaiting; and I can assure the administration that we shall judge them on their merits with no other object than to serve the true interests of Canada. Such is our stand regarding the speech from the throne.

We are told of the formation of a committee to prepare the design of a Canadian flag. We have sponsored such a measure for a long time and I am gratified to note that the government have finally realized the importance of giving our country a distinct national emblem.

As for the amendment moved by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) and the sub-amendment of the leader of the C.C.F. party (Mr. Coldwell), they are drafted in general terms and I really fail to see that they add anything whatever to the speech from the throne. I consider them, at this stage of the session, as useless and designed to delay the business of the house. We refuse to be party to any delay in our work, and, for this reason, we shall refrain from expressing our views on the amendment and the sub-amendment. Mr. Speaker, such are the few remarks I deemed it my duty to make in order to do away with any doubt as to the stand we intend to take in this house.

Mr. PATRICK H. ASHBY (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, I was sorry to see the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) leave this chamber, because I happen to have discovered the solution of all our problems: in fact, sir, utopia is just around the corner. I do not know which corner, because I am a stranger here in Ottawa; but I am not the only stranger. It is, sir, an honour and a great privilege to come to this house to represent a section of the people of Canada. I consider it an honour to have been chosen by the people of Edmonton East to represent them and their will. I think I should repeat those last words, "to represent their will." I told the people of my constituency that if they wanted someone to come here to represent liberalism, socialism, communism, fascism, or any other "ism," not to vote for me; I would not accept the position under those circumstances; but if they wanted a man who would come to this house to represent them and their will, to vote for me and I would do so to the best of my ability. That, sir, is why I am here.

The people of Edmonton East, like the majority of the people of Canada, are honest, hardworking people, trying to make a living. Let me repeat—and I shall repeat quite a lot of things—they are trying to make a living; but ninety per cent of them never do make a living. They exist while trying, but they exist only. The object of work and toil is to obtain a living, and by a "liv-

ing" I mean a full and abundant life. There are mighty few people in this great dominion, this wonderful country, with all the marvellous resources and advantages which God has bestowed upon it, who obtain a living. Ninety per cent never obtain a full and abundant life no matter how hard they struggle.

We are slaves indeed, slaves to these "isms", to systems, to methods such as those which this government has practised and supported ever since it has been in office. There is, however, one difference between the people of Edmonton East—in fact, the people of Alberta generally—and the rest of the people of Canada. Albertans are becoming enlightened; they are no longer voting for methods and means but are voting for and demanding ends or results. That is why I was elected to represent them and their will, and I am here on instructions from the people of my constituency to demand certain results. They are going to get those results, I tell you, before I am through. When all the people of Canada—and in the east, too they are becoming enlightened—realize that they can have democracy, by which I mean a form of government that makes it easiest for the greatest number of people to enjoy the largest amount of individual freedom and security, and when they realize the full meaning of democracy and elect individuals to represent them, and not some other form of government or some "ism" or some method, we shall begin to make real progress.

The reputation which has been built up by party politicians in the past is not an enviable one. I have yet to hear an adult speak with respect of party politicians. The name "politician", if you will pardon my saying so, stinks to high heaven. The names of many politicians are being associated with such criminals and scoundrels as Dillinger and Hitler; and when the people of Canada begin to lose faith and trust in the men they elect to represent them, it is time we turned over a new leaf and began to represent the people.

In Alberta we have a government which is respected by the people because they have tried to the best of their ability to serve the people instead of ruling them. That is our duty here as members of this parliament —to serve our fellow men, not to rule them.

We in Alberta are not hampered in this progressive movement by any natural laws or any laws that God has made, but only by man-made rules and regulations. I must say that we have been hampered only by the actions of political bosses in Ottawa and in this parliament; for had we been given the freedom to go ahead as we desired, without any interference with the rights of other provinces or any other part of the great empire we call the British commonwealth of nations, to-day we would have seen in Alberta, and possibly in the rest of Canada—for the rest of Canada would soon have followed—a majority of the people enjoying, for the first time in their lives and the first time in modern history, a full and abundant life.

We have just passed through in this war a period in human history that will forever remain a blot, and a bloody blot, upon the records of party politics. For this war was not fought between peoples, because the majority of the people everywhere are too busy trying to make a living to be bothered with making wars. The people, I know, were used by the various dictators, whether hidden or open, who wished to gain for themselves advantages over one another. On the one hand we have dictators hiding behind the scenes centralizing control, trying to gain control over the whole earth. Whether you believe it or not does not alter these facts. On the other hand there was that notorious dictator named Hitler who also coveted that position. They are insane; there is no doubt about it in my mind. It is a peculiar mania from which they have suffered, the mania to rule.

It is our duty in this house not to rule but to serve, and yet I find that the majority of members desire not to serve their people so much as to serve the party to which they belong. Before this war the federal government of Canada, who were supposed to represent the people, did not represent the people of Canada. The people of Canada wanted food and could not buy it even though the stores offered it for sale. They could not buy it because they had no money and this government said, "We have no money. We cannot build highways, we cannot build schools, we cannot reforest our burnt-out areas, we cannot build public works or carry on other activities because we have not the money." And so the people starved, living in misery, suffering and privation which was unbelievable, and must be unbelievable to many members here who have not seen the conditions under which the people lived.

Thousands of our people died as a result of the actions or inaction of this government, who were then supposed to be representing the people of Canada. Thousands of our boys who went overseas in this war rode freight trains seeking means to get a living, and failing to do so. We all know this if we stop to think. But the moment war was declared the money

began to flow forth in billions upon billions of dollars. We then found money enough to produce great highways, airports, tanks, guns, ships, planes, bombs, bullets by the millions. We erected great factories and equipped them with all the most modern machinery, and we trained men and women and paid them well while training them to operate these machines. And with all this production we took the most able-bodied of our boys and sent them over to deliver these goods to people who did not want them. Those people said "We will not take them and we will blast you out of the sky and sink your ships if you try to deliver them." Our boys said, "We will deliver them and you will get them just the same." Well, we delivered them without charge to the enemy. We delivered them absolutely free, and we were all far more prosperous during the war than we ever were before.

Now the government are going to continue to let the money flow forth just as they did during the war, and if they do not do so then they will be dishonourably discharged from office as traitors to the people of Canada. I have instructions from the people of my constituency and from hundreds of thousands of returned men to demand in their name certain wants which I am going to outline to you in a few moments. And they are going to get them this time. I told them before leaving Edmonton; I said to these men, thousands of them: "I shall give you the name and address of every member of parliament who does not vigorously stand in this house and demand that these wants be satisfied." I know that these men mean business this time, and I think that they will want to call on such members and pat them on their hands, or maybe they will spank another part of their anatomy, and they will not use a hairbrush. But of this I am sure, that if any returned man is caught serving any member who does not get up in the house and vigorously demand these things he will never again be served by any returned soldier unless that soldier becomes a traitor to his fellowmen. That means that the member of parliament in this house who does not demand these things will never get a shave possibly, or a haircut, nor will he be able to buy food nor a railway ticket. That is true, for these men this time are determined that they shall not suffer as did the old soldiers of the last war. I am joining with them and will stand up for them in this house on every possible occasion. I will represent them and fight for them with all the power I can muster, because I had to make a slave of my wife and slaves of my children. For years and years we toiled and sweated and slaved under the soldier settlement board, and we suffered. I will never ask any human being to suffer as I did. I tell you, sir, that I would be willing to take up arms in defence of Canada and of the democratic rights of Canadians and die; I would much rather do that than go through what I had to go through then.

Out of twelve returned soldiers that joined with me in my community two only are left, myself and a white haired, stoop shouldered old soldier whose wife taught school to help pay that notorious soldier settlement board the shekels it demanded.

One of the first things that the people demand of me is that all taxation on all incomes of $5,000 a year and less shall be immediately abolished. I hope you have that down. The second is that the old age pensions be increased and the age limit reduced. Our national leader, the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Low), yesterday suggested $50 a month at the age of sixty years. I always like to turn things around. I think it looks a great deal better if we say $60 a month at the age of fifty; and if the people desire it I can assure them they can have $100 a month at the age of forty. It all depends on what the people want. We are their servants, and that is what we must be if we are loyal, and if we are not traitors to them. We are here either to serve them or to rule them, and I am sure I am not here to rule the people of my constituency. I am here to accept from them instructions as to what they want; and when the people of this great British empire realize the situation and compel their members of parliament to serve them, then God's gifts will open up before us as though we saw the light of day for the first time in our lives. Then we will begin to live, for that is all human beings work and toil for—to live.

I have some horses on my farm. I know very well I could not possibly work a horse eight, ten or fifteen hours a day for twenty, thirty or forty years. The animal would die. I know a number of poor old farm women right in my own constituency who have toiled and sweated and outlived and outworked seventy-five or a hundred horses. Are we animals? Well, certainly we are beasts of burden when we have to toil all our lives. I have a letter here from the Canadian Legion, which I am not going to read, telling me of men over sixty years of age, old soldiers of the last war, who are still toiling on, though crippled with arthritis and rheumatism; poor beasts of burden. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that unless we see that human beings can live, we must resign from

office; and I am afraid a good many hon. members will be asked to resign before this parliament is over.

So that is what I am instructed by my constituents to demand for them: $60 a month at the age of fifty. Who is to oppose their will? Are there any dictators in this house who will oppose them, who will say, "We are superior to those who elected us"? They are demanding $60 a month at fifty years of age, and the same for all who are blind or incapacitated.

The next demand they make is that immediate steps be taken to reduce taxation on goods of all kinds, in the process of manufacture or distribution, being offered for sale or given away. They realize that if we could give away shells, bombs and all the rest of the war material absolutely free it is not unreasonable to ask that the people be allowed to buy their own production. If the Minister of Finance does not know where to obtain revenue other than from the pockets of those who are trying to earn a living, he had better resign from office, or I will come over and show him how. Plenty of us know how, and he knows, too; for he let the cat out of the bag when war was declared. We now know there is an abundance available any time our dictators want it for their own purposes. So taxation shall be reduced on all goods, bringing prices down below pre-war levels. That will increase the purchasing power of all those who toil. I might point out here, Mr. Speaker, that it is an utter impossibility to make a people prosperous by forcing them to pay in taxes the very money which would enable them to be prosperous. That is very simple, is it not?—but it is true.

If these measures were taken, what would be the result? Immediately there would be a demand for goods, because people are just itching to get their fingers on a few dollars to spend on the things they want. As soon as they begin to buy goods the retailers go to the telephone and order more goods from the wholesalers, who wire the factories to make more goods, and the factories put out signs "Help wanted." When it comes to production in our factories, we can produce all that the people of Canada want; and who should want it and get it sooner than those who created the goods from their own natural resources, that is, the Canadian people? I say no sooner would this happen than there would be no unemployment problem at all; there would be a problem of getting sufficient help.

[Mr. Ashby.]

Then we should look upon agriculture as our leading national industry. If the Minister of Agriculture really wants the farmers to produce meat and other farm products he must go about it in an entirely different way than at present, for this government are deliberately restricting the production of food to-day. The minister has been told on a number of occasions by farm organizations all through Canada, and particularly by Mr. H. E. Nichols, secretary of the Alberta farmers' union, that unless steps were taken to place a floor price under farm products the hog population of this country would dwindle to a serious level. I know on my own farms, where my boys sweat and toil about fifteen or sixteen hours a day during the summer and twelve hours a day during the winter, with no holidays, we have been compelled to cut the production of hogs seventy-five per cent. It might interest some of our listeners in the gallery to learn that for the last load of well-finished, healthy, pure-bred Hampshire Down sheep we took to the market, my boys received the pittance of 1½ cents a pound. So when you are buying food and there is rationing, you can say to yourself something is lacking in the Department of Agriculture of this government.

The people of my constituency are demanding that fair and just prices be paid to primary producers for the kind and quality of foodstuffs required—I do not say for everything produced, but for the kind and quality required by the people of Canada. It is up to the farmers to supply the kind and quality they desire, for the consumer is dictator—or should be—as to what he will eat, and as to what its quality will be. Further, he should have sufficient money to enable him to buy what he wants of what is produced. If the quality is not satisfactory, then the people should vote against it—for money is a ballot—and, by buying better quality, compel us as farmers to produce the highest possible quality of foodstuffs desired by the consumer. If we are given a fair and just price we can do that. We can flood the country with such abundance that no facilities we have to-day could possibly handle it. I will warrant that we farmers in Canada can double the quantity of hogs we produced in the peak years of the war. I will warrant that for every pound of butter and every quart of milk we have ever produced we can—and I know this from my own experience—produce ten more. And likewise with our cattle and our sheep. And we can produce a quality of all farm production that will be superior to anything the people have ever enjoyed. All we need is sufficient reward for the services we render society in

producing food for it, and in producing fibre in the form of wool. I well remember shipping wool at a time when the government said it could not pay a bonus—oh, no! I remember shipping wool when the freight came to more than the amount I received for the wool.

I have left until the last a discussion of the demands by our returned soldiers and merchant seamen. First of all, these men want good houses to live in. We have forests, an abundance of trees, plenty of mills and help. We have great factories, and can manufacture anything from nails to doorknobs. I see no reason why every returned soldier should not have a good home. There is only one obstacle in the way. That is found in this House of Commons—and it will be removed, I can assure you of that. Our returned boys want the sum of $6,000 set aside for the purpose of building houses for themselves. I do not say we should build the houses and rent them to the soldiers. They will build the houses for themselves, to suit themselves, where they want them and when they want them.

Our returned men have instructed me to demand:

First, that the sum of $6,000 shall be set aside for the purpose of providing a house for each soldier and merchant seaman returned from this war who desires one.

Second, that they shall receive hospital and medical care for life, with permission to choose their own doctors and hospitals. This would prevent their being used as human guinea-pigs, as were so many of the old soldiers in the last war.

Third, security—and that is what they are demanding for their old age. They have saved our country and saved us from destruction; why should they not have all the rewards they desire, when we can so well afford to give them to them? It would take from no one to give these boys $6,000. They are demanding security in their old age.

I have been instructed to demand, in their names, that in addition the sum of $10,000 be placed in trust in the Bank of Canada for themselves, their wives and their children. If the trustees are satisfied that the investment is sound, this money can be used to establish them in a good business of their own.

Another demand is that all the widows of all the returned men and merchant seamen continue to receive identically the same pensions as did their husbands who died.

I well remember listening over the radio when those dictators met on the Atlantic and said that they were prepared to give us poor slaves the four freedoms. I remember sitting with a companion in a hog pen, my companion being a sow who was about to increase the hog population of the country. I said to the poor old sow: "I have been far more generous to you than these dictators are to us poor slaves, because I have given you more than four freedoms. Why, I have already given you free hospitalization and maternity care. Then, you have freedom of speech, for you can grunt all you like and I care not. You have freedom from fear, for so long as you obey the rules and regulations your dictator lays down I shall never beat you. You have freedom of religion, because I don't care if you worship the old turkey gobbler roosting on the hen house. You have freedom from want, because your self-feeder is in front of you, and in it you will find everything you desire. You will find luscious alfalfa in the pasture, and you may help yourself to it. I have given you a fifth freedom—yes, I have given you freedom from toil, because I do not make you work, as we poor slaves are forced to work."

For toil is work men do because this government compels us to do it or to go without. That is toil, and work is something men do because nature compels them to do it. So it is clear that I have also given my sow freedom from work, because I do the work for her. I clean out the barn—or the members of my family do it—and grow the feed for her, grind it and feed it to her. She also has freedom of leisure. But there was one freedom I dare not give my cattle, my hogs, or my sheep, one which was purposely left out of the Atlantic charter, and that is the freedom of choice. That freedom of choice, sir, is the freedom for which the people of Canada are now crying, and which they shall get.

Mr. H. G. ARCHIBALD (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I am starting out definitely behind the eight ball, because I cannot hope to duplicate the efforts of my hon. friend to my left. However, I shall do my best.

As a new member of the House of Commons, and an industrial worker—when there is work—I should like to give my impressions of this parliament for the short time I have been here. It seems to me so divorced from reality, from the everyday struggle on the job, that I sometimes wonder if our efforts are not in vain. Many similar institutions were found wanting in the last war. I hope this one will survive, and will manage to bring about conditions in the country which will warrant its continuance.

I listened with a great deal of attention to the speech from the throne. That speech is of key significance because it outlines the official programme of the administration.

It is within the power of the administration to give full employment; it is within the power of the administration to see that every worker has a job, that every worker is well clothed, that every worker is well fed. It is also within the power of the administration to stop a depression that will be far worse than the one we had before. We all know of the advances that have been made in technology; we all know that these advances have removed the worker from the job, but at the same time they have added more wealth to the country.

I must say that the proposals outlined in the speech from the throne do not fill me with enthusiasm. They remind me too much of the programme outlined by the Liberal party under Premier Pattulo in British Columbia in 1933. That programme began with the slogan, "Work and wages". The workers of British Columbia know to their sorrow how it worked out. It was much like the modern glass of beer—all froth and no content. It quickly collapsed. I speak from personal experience because I took part in many of the demonstrations and unemployment strikes of that period. Mr. Pattulo's answer to us at that time was, "Root, hog or die." According to labour we have a somewhat similar statement just lately from the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) that in its way was just as brutal.

To-day the Liberal party in British Columbia exists no longer as a separate entity; it has had to combine with the Tories. To-day in British Columbia the most popular party is the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation. If the political advance in British Columbia foreshadows what will happen in Canada as a whole under the present Liberal administration, then the workers of this country are in for some bitter disillusionments.

Canada was plunged into this war with a promise of peace, a promise of more democracy, a promise of security. But to-day in all Canada fear is universal, fear of unemployment, fear of want and fear of a third world war. The next world war may very well wipe out the whole of humanity. But this is the reality that faces us: the promises of the Liberal government about the war have not been borne out by events. Those promises sound like a hollow mockery when considered in the realities of the present day.

The Liberal government speaks of a high level of employment, but that government does not contemplate an adequate programme of public works nor does it contemplate the reconverting and operating of publicly built war plants which could wipe out scarcities overnight. There is great talk about the fear of inflation, but no attempt has been made to stop it by producing more goods immediately. The factories are there and they are idle. The workers are there and they are idle. The Canadian capitalists were unable to provide jobs during the peace—I am not talking about war now; I am talking about peace—so that the working class know what to expect in times of peace. We know what to expect from such a programme as outlined in the speech from the throne.

What does the speech from the throne, or the platform that was outlined before that, offer the returned war veteran? There is an offer of small holdings to the war veteran, but in order to maintain those small holdings the veterans must have jobs. Under the Soldier Settlement Act, which is not basically different from the present act, 25,000 soldier settlers went on the land, but up to date only about 5,000 have been able to pay off their debts. I can indicate from personal experience how the problem works out.

Prior to my discharge I went to the rehabilitation officer on my station and asked him what chances there were for a job in civil life and how one would go about it. I wanted to know how it applied to the other men, and he told me that he was asking them to write personally to prospective employers in the line in which they wanted to get. Mark you, those rehabilitation officers are able to classify you fairly closely; they know what you are best able to do. The men did that, but ninety per cent of the answers that came back from those private owners were of a nature to slough off the question. They stated they did not know what their business prospects would be after the war and therefore they could not promise a job. If the ex-service man fails to find a job he cannot maintain his small holding. Therefore the political salve of the small holding fails in the case of general unemployment.

The government has offered loans to fishermen to start in the fishing industry. That sounds good, but the fact is that the government is not allowing fishermen to combine their loans in order to buy a boat capable of competing with the large fishing interests on the Pacific coast. The act states that two can combine, but the officials are not allowing them to do so. They say that they might quarrel and they do not know how to cut a boat in two and make it float. The kindness of the administration in this respect cuts me to the quick. This is a definite slap at cooperatives and plays right into the hands of such outfits as British Columbia Packers.

Then there is the logging industry and the concern of the Liberal party for the lumber monopolists. No loans are to be advanced

to veterans to establish small logging claims. I had one lad who was sleeping right next to me in barracks, who tried to get a loan, but it was not there. We hear a lot about maintaining the competitive system, but we on the Pacific coast can see that it is simply not there.

Ex-service men are not all farmers or lumbermen or fishermen; the majority are industrial workers who prefer to work in a factory along with their fellowmen. Therefore their problem is directly tied up with the war worker and we can begin to see the handwriting on the wall as to what is happening to them. They face general unemployment; they face a grim future. The concern of the Liberal government for the monopolist is not new. We saw the industrialists go on strike shortly before the beginning of the war until their profit demands were met. What occurred in British Columbia was true, I imagine, of the whole of Canada. At Justkatla inlet, on the Queen Charlotte islands, a large base logging camp was built with government funds. I was in it. The machine-shop equipment was of the latest type; a locomotive could go in and out the doors at each end, and a large horseshoe wharf was built. Not one log was ever shipped out of that camp. I do not know how much the logging interests made on it, but I can imagine they did handsomely. If I were to ask the government whether that plant was to be sold to private interests I would be wasting my time; the answer is apparent. The kindness of the government toward these men in contrast to the loggers themselves is only too apparent. The loggers in those isolated camps up the coast had to remain in them for one hundred days under the most primitive conditions or lose their bonus and transportation.

It might be argued that the onerous conditions placed upon the workers during the war was due to a war-time economy; but already we are beginning to see that they are being asked to take worse conditions and lower wages, that the onerous conditions will continue to be imposed upon them in time of peace, in spite of a more highly developed industrial technology, in spite of the wealth that could be produced in this country.

In British Columbia—and again I speak of my province because I am more familiar with conditions there—poverty and unemployment during peace time, with malnutrition, were in general evidence. Many of the children still bear the marks of malnutrition. The government found that out when it came to the calling up of men for military service. They found that many were unfit owing to lack of proper food and other bad living conditions when they were children. Relief camps dotted the country in those days of peace in the nineteen-thirties. During the war the scene was much similar; only the camps this time were reestablished for the armed services. During peace time the provincial police patrolled the highways and bridges on a scale that was only exceeded after the attack on Pearl Harbor. That was when the workers at various times were demanding jobs and demanding more food. The pitiful amount of relief that was handed out to the workers during that period could be measured only by the amount they could raise by panhandling. Those were the conditions that obtained in peace time.

I realize that the government had heavy burdens during the war, but if they are to go back to the same principles of economics to which they adhered during peace we can expect an even greater depression in the next few years. To go back to the economy that we had during peace time in the nineteen-thirties just means that you will be building up for social upheavals of a tremendous nature.

After the last war a crime wave swept throughout the world. It was more apparent in Europe than on this continent. But the whole world was involved in the last war to a greater extent than in the war of 1914-18, and I imagine that ahead there are, to say the least, troubulous times.

Let me again call to the attention of the house to how the demands of the workers were met during those intolerable times of peace. We were met with tear gas and clubs in the hands of the police. We remember the attack on the unemployed workers in Regina and the attack on the unemployed workers in Vancouver in 1938. During those days the blacklist was common on the job, especially in the logging camps. A blacklist was kept, for instance, by Black's logging agency in Vancouver. It was a cruel weapon in the hands of calculating employers to keep the workers down. Are we to return to that sort of thing again or are we to have a strong, militant trades union movement where the workers can protect themselves?

In the light of this shameful record during peace time, how can we expect any improvement during the coming period? If we are to judge from past performance, the speech from the throne does not foreshadow a period of prosperity and jobs for everyone. On the contrary it is the prelude to mass unemployment.

When the Liberal government was building up the armed forces it came out with some wonderful slogans. One I shall never forget.

It was, "Have you the guts to go active?" Well, the veterans and the war workers have the right now to demand of the government: Have you the guts to give us a job and guarantee it? The men responded to these appeals, to this demand in the final analysis, and finally, through the befuddled attitude of the government on demobilization the situation at Aldershot was brought about. It was the natural result. One may well ask why it was that men had to take part in a form of riot in order to make their demands known to the general public. The sentences meted out, running up to seven years, are a disgrace for a democratic country, especially when they are measured in terms of the government's attitude toward notorius elements such as Adrien Arcand.

A staggering burden of taxation has been placed upon the backs of the workers. Salaries as low as $660 a year are taxed, and there is no sign of relief. It is notable that the first country in the British empire to lower taxes on incomes is Australia, where a Labour government is in power, which is the duplicate of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation in Canada. The Australian government has already lowered taxation to the extent of 12½ per cent. Those responsible for the enormous national debt that we now have in Canada point to its astronomical figures as necessitating the continuation of our heavy taxation. There is no necessity in our economy for the curtailment of production or the shutting down of the factories, which can only result in our returning war veterans facing lack of employment. The taxes should be lifted off so that full employment could be brought in, and when you have full employment the national debt, even at its present astronomical figures, could be wiped off in no time if the full productive forces of this nation were turned loose.

Housing conditions have gone progressively from bad to worse during the past twenty years. During the period before the war, when the administration had all the time in the world to build homes, they did not do a thing. Compare that with the action of the New Zealand Labour government prior to the war, when they were building houses for the workers and are continuing to do so. But in this country, oh, no. Under our Liberal administration, that would be interfering with private enterprise. There must be no interference with private enterprise in the face of this most acute housing crisis. Seemingly the financial institutions in this country do not believe that the workers have in their hands that tremendous back-log of savings that would enable them to pay the high rents which have been demanded over a long period of time. Therefore they are bogging down on the job. The government could go ahead and have low-priced housing schemes which would be within the range of the lowest paid workers; it just requires the will.

I should like to propose another important measure, if we rule out profits and run the economy on use. I should like to see them continue the operation of the government-financed and government-built plants. I should like to see them come in with a programme of public works to cover irrigation, the building of hydro-electric power projects, and so on. In Prince Rupert, for example, we have a government-owned dry dock. Prior to the war this dry dock was used partly as a cow pasture; yet it was recognized at the same time as a key installation. During the war that dry dock built corvettes and 10,000-ton freighters, as well as repaired many an ocean-going boat. Why does the government not modernize that plant and continue the building programme, even a minimum building programme, so as to keep that trained crew and personnel in that key installation? Capitalism is a system of war; therefore the system itself will likely produce another one. Far be it from me to advise capitalism how to protect itself, but it would be a good idea that that plant and equipment should be kept up instead of having a mad rush every time a war breaks out.

Under the government programme as outlined in the speech from the throne, Prince Rupert, like many another city throughout Canada, faces stagnation. Yet Prince Rupert has magnificent possibilities under proper planning. Let me quote the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) who, in a speech delivered at Prince Rupert in 1920, when he was leader of the opposition, said:

> Was the Grand Trunk Pacific policy a wise one? What was Sir Wilfrid's vision when the transcontinental railway was being planned, and his vision of this particular city? I know, it was of ships plying from this very harbour, crossing the Pacific with the products of this country, bringing back other commodities here, making this community one of the greatest marts of the world; of a railway running through a country as fertile as any in the world, with feeders running north and south, tapping the resources of the province, mineral and timber, and great national wealth; a great community, with ocean wharves, docks, repair yards, dry docks, round houses, hotels, railway stations, and all of the sights and signs of a great world metropolis. And what have you got to-day? A side line and not a main artery! The difference between the Liberal and Conservative parties.

We in Prince Rupert are wondering if the Prime Minister has shortened his horizon to that of a cow pasture.

It is with such experiences in mind that the members of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation have come to the conclusion that only through the socialization of industry and the financial institutions will living standards rise and there be a continuous expansion of industry. During the war the federal government considered the building of the Prince Rupert highway an urgent national necessity. It wasted no time in putting men and materials on that road. It poured them on. It set an example for similar public works in peace time. But as soon as the necessity or the "squeeze" ceased up in the Aleutians the government forgot all about that road and allowed it to slip into a sad state of disrepair. One small slide was allowed to remain on that road blocking people from driving over it, with the government machinery all tied up and doing nothing. Speaking for British Columbia—and I speak for British Columbia—

Mr. REID: Oh, no, you don't.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: I should like, Mr. Speaker, to have a chat with the hon. member on the other side after October 25.

May I now bring to the attention of the government the dire need of a railroad outlet from the Peace River. The people of Peace River and Skeena riding have been waiting for years for that to be completed. As I understand it, the settlers went to the Peace because of the promise that such a railroad would be built, but they are still waiting. They are still isolated in that area, and they want that outlet to the Pacific. It would increase the national wealth by building up that northwestern corner of British Columbia which has proved so vital in time of war. This would provide jobs for thousands. It would bring industry into the country; and, as the Prime Minister stated, this territory has the mineral resources, the power, and the timber. Industry will follow transportation. Thousands of jobs could be made available on such a project.

I should also like to mention another one, the building of a highway from Hazelton north through the Atlin country up to White Horse, known as the "A" route. It should be built on that route because it would drain all that northwest corner of British Columbia on to a Canadian highway, much as those who built the Canadian Pacific railroad just north of the 49th parallel of latitude so that the Canadian economy would drain into it. The necessity is apparent in that corner, so that we shall not be at the mercy of international financiers working through the Alaska panhandle. It is tragic that only the threat of war forced the government to take action. A threat to private property forces the government to bring in work with wages. I should like to see them take a lead in developing this country and making it a worth-while place in which to live.

The completely inadequate character of the government's proposals to meet unemployment in the post-war period will lead only to a devastating social crisis. If the Liberal government continues its present course it seems to me inevitable that large masses of workers will be unable to find jobs. I would think they would take a different attitude if only to maintain the respect of the people of Canada.

I have a different philosophy. I claim that a new system has to be brought into being, a system of socialism which is both national and international in outlook because it includes all those who need things in this world. Therefore, though I will support every measure that is introduced which will benefit the country, I maintain that only socialism will bring about real freedom and social justice.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. J. S. SINNOTT (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, as I am a new member of this house this will be my maiden speech. I am the new member for Springfield, formerly represented by my late good friend Mr. John M. Turner, who had many friends in this house.

I wish at the outset to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, upon your elevation to the office of first commoner and I also wish you much pleasure in the position you now hold.

I speak here to-night for the first time and I do not intend to speak very long. I am a man of few words; I believe more in action. May I first of all congratulate the mover and the seconder of the address upon their admirable speeches, also their maiden speeches, in parliament, because they represent a large section of the armed forces. I am considerably moved and interested in the large number of members of the army, the navy and the air force who have been watching proceedings in this house from day to day, many of whom I presume left families and jobs to go over to the other side to protect dear ones at home. I am sure that this house will see to it that nothing we can do will be too good for those who have done such a magnificent job.

I believe it is my duty to say a few words about the constituency I have the honour to represent, which is considered to be one of the largest in Canada, containing one of

the most varied cross-sections of our population. In that constituency there are people from practically every part of the world and we all get along very well. At the western end we take in the suburbs of Winnipeg and a large part of the Red river valley market gardeners and small farmers. To the north there are large and small lakes where there is a large fishing industry, and centrally there are farm lands which are regarded as one of the surest crop districts in western Canada. Coming to the eastern portion adjoining Ontario, we have a large lumber industry, pulpwood and paper mills. The mines and natural resources of that part of the country have hardly yet been touched.

I join with other speakers in regard to the expansion of industry in the west. In war time we have shown our ability to produce munitions and supplies with as small an overhead as any other plant in Canada. We have the Winnipeg river which supplies an abundance of power to all Manitoba, and its capacity is only partly developed at the present time.

We have in Canada the means and the people to produce far more than we can consume, which will enable us to share a large portion of our surpluses with some countries that are not quite so fortunate. It was mentioned here a day or two ago that Canada should have a large immigration. In my opinion, we can take up the slack for a while, but we have in Canada to-day the ability to produce far more than we can consume, so that the only way in which we can make it work is to have a good deal of immigration.

I am one of the many to-day who know that the horse and buggy days are gone and gone forever. I believe in the Liberal party and in the members of this house who are here at this session and I believe that by working together we can bring about the necessary reform. Our Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King)—and I have every reason to believe him—has said that we can make laws only in accordance with the desires of the members the people send to parliament. There is no reason why we should have such criticism as we have had to listen to from the other side of the house, since the war is hardly over yet. God has given man brains and man has produced science and invention, and in this machine age we have seen what science and invention have caused in this world in the way of destruction. Let us hope that the same science and invention will do as much for sound construction in peace time.

[Mr. Sinnott.]

As the representatives of the people of Canada, we shall be called upon to perform tremendous tasks, unheard of and unthought of in the past, and described as nonsense by some. We are told occasionally that we are up against a stone wall when we come up against the British North America Act. However, I believe, as many other Canadians do, that if the British North America Act does not measure up to the requirements of the Canadian people to-day, the Liberal party and the members of this house have the ability to redraft it in order that the people may have the benefits they should enjoy.

There has been a good deal of talk about full employment, and there has been much criticism. Let us not forget that to-day we are in the machinery age. At the time of confederation it took many days to get from the east coast to the Pacific coast. To-day you can have your breakfast in Halifax and be in Vancouver for supper. The machines of to-day have been so built that they will make life much easier for the working man if they are used properly. We know that at the end of hostilities, with our soldiers, sailors and airmen coming back, it will be hard to find positions for all. It will be necessary for the opposition in this house, including all groups opposite, to cooperate or we shall find ourselves in difficulties. I regret to say that in this machine age it will be impossible to find jobs for all our people. The only way we can serve the people properly is to put our machines to work and give those people who have no jobs a decent living. Let the machines do the work; that is what machines are for.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that it will be my endeavour to help the government in any possible manner, and to cooperate with all hon. members of this house to build a better, peaceful Canada.

Mr. PARK A. MANROSS (London): Mr. Speaker, I, too, am a new member of this house, although I do not know whether or not this will qualify as my maiden speech. Since the house opened a good many maiden speeches have been made, and some have been of such high quality that I think I shall require a little practice before I can qualify. I am a new member representing the constituency of London, Ontario. I am not going to tell you that London is the greatest city in Canada, although that word has been used, or that it is the fairest city, or the gayest city. We are quite content to call it the best city.

In the first place, Mr. Speaker, let me compliment you upon being elected the chief commoner of this house. I think that was a wise choice, and as a new member I hope I may further my education in parliamentary matters by carefully watching your decisions and judgments. Then, as a veteran of the last war, I take great pleasure in congratulating the mover and seconder of the motion for an address in reply to the speech from the throne. It gave me a great deal of satisfaction to see that they were two young men, new members, from the armed services of this country.

One or two of the first speakers in this debate spent some little time in eulogizing their respective leaders. In advertising we sometimes call that "blowing up" our leaders. There are two interpretations of that phrase, and I am not going to deal with either one. The riding of London is an urban constituency. We have 175 subdivisions entirely within the city itself, so that it is a concentrated riding with a large population. We have a great deal of varied industry there, and it is the centre of a large agricultural district. Sometimes it is called the garden spot of Canada, but I am not going to emphasize that tonight, for I might get into an argument. I was interested yesterday to receive a London newspaper, in which I saw the picture of the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Abbott), who I am sorry is absent from his seat tonight. According to the newspaper he is going to pay a visit to our city on Friday and Saturday. I do not know whether the minister is adopting the suggestion offered by my colleague the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. Merritt) that he visit the military districts and check up on the demobilization programme. Perhaps that is the purpose of his visit, because London is the headquarters of military district No. 1. Incidentally, on the same days there is a meeting in London of the western Ontario Liberal association, but probably that is just a coincidence. However, if the minister wishes to check up as to their demobilization I would say they are thoroughly demobilized, and very well rehabilitated, because our party made a gain of ten seats in that particular district.

The speech from the throne, which we are supposed to debate, cannot include everything the government is going to do, or that it is going to be advised to do, or that we can sell it into doing. It contains a general outline, which is purposely made broad in order that it may be varied. I think the speech from the throne has been pretty well covered by various members of our group, at least, but there are a few special points I should like to emphasize. The first point I wish to bring up is not peculiar to my riding; it is of interest to the whole country. It has to do with the nurses who are serving in a Canadian military hospital at Sogel, Germany. These nurses enlisted in the army medical corps to take care of war casualties, but now that the war is over they have been sent to Sogel to look after people, mainly Polish and Russian, who are suffering from tuberculosis. These nurses do not object to this, and we do not object to it. It is a humanitarian act. But I wish the government would look into the situation and the conditions under which these nurses are working. The patients are under canvas, and the nurses are in huts, so-called, without any conveniences. The place is muddy. They perform their duties many hours of the day in rubber boots. Nothing has been done to control the fly or mosquito nuisances, with the result that the nurses work under considerable handicaps. Up until the end of August they did not get any butter, milk or eggs, such as the patients were getting. In the final analysis, while these nurses volunteered for service to our troops, they are doing this job quite nobly for the devastated people in Europe. I would ask the government to see to it that the nurses in question have better living or working conditions. I make this plea on behalf of the Canadian nurses some of whom are from my riding. However, what I have said covers all nurses who have gone overseas from Canada. Surely we should take steps to correct this situation.

Taxation was ably discussed this afternoon by my colleague the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario (Mr. Macdonnell) in a wonderful address. This is a big subject, and it will be discussed at greater length when the budget is before the house. However, it is well to give it some thought before the budget comes down, because it is often difficult to change a budget, once it has been presented to the house. While this is my first experience in the house as a member, it is not my first experience in dealing with budgets, having been on tariff committees on various occasions. To my knowledge, the only change any committee ever saw fit to make to a budget was to make an addition of the three words "and parts thereof"—and we thought that when we accomplished that we had done something. As outlined by my hon. friend, under a system of taxation one can take only so much from the people, and raise only so much by borrowing.

I certainly would be in favour of the plan advanced by the hon. member for Edmonton East (Mr. Ashby) which, boiled down to simple terms, means old age pensions for

young people. Well, I am content to settle for $100 a month at forty years of age; that is, if they will make it retroactive.

There are some nuisance taxes which do not amount to much and which I think the government would be well advised to abolish. This evening I shall refer to only one of them, a thing called a radio licence fee, or a radio tax at $2.50 a year. When the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation was set up it patterned somewhat after the British Broadcasting Corporation. The committee which investigated the matter went to England, looked over the situation, and decided that the same set-up would be satisfactory in Canada. But they overlooked one thing, namely our geography.

England, as we know, is a country surrounded by water for many miles on each side. Beyond that water, before short-wave reception, the only stations they could get were foreign language stations, to which they did not listen. In Canada, however, the situation was entirely different. By the simple turning of a dial we could bring in all stations in the United States and get the big chain programmes. At that time the government decided to set up the corporation and to charge us $2.50 per set, so that we might enjoy the entertainment offered by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, without any advertising in it.

Well, most of us were willing to listen to a few soap operas, if we could get better comedians, with the result that we tuned in to United States stations. Later on, however, it was decided that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation would take advertising over its stations to help pay expenses. This made the broadcasting corporation in Canada a commercial venture. Now, I say it is either a commercial venture and as such should be on its own feet, or it should get out of the commercial picture, and let us pay for our entertainment.

This $2.50 is not a large amount to any individual who owns a radio set. The objection to it is the nuisance feature. You do not remember when your tax was last paid, with the result that some fellow in a uniform comes hammering on your door, and says to you, "Let me see your radio licence", and you are really sunk. Yes, you had forgotten about it. Of course you may have it but you do not know where it is. I say this fee should be abolished.

There is another tax I should like to talk about because I am vitally interested in it, in fact, all the people in my riding and in all other ridings, the people in every city and town in Canada are interested, because these plants are widely distributed. Against the industry I have in mind there has been discriminatory taxation for the past number of years. I refer to beverage plants—and hon. members need not start smiling, because it is not the kind of beverage they have in mind. I refer to the carbonated beverages, commonly known as soft drinks.

I think all hon. members have received briefs from their associations. I have investigated those briefs with considerable care, because I am in a position to know something about that industry, and I make the suggestion that some attention should be paid to their appeal for relief.

As it will be recalled, and as set out in the brief, when taxes were first brought down to raise money for the conduct of the war a twenty-five per cent tax was put on this industry, an industry which was built up on the five-cent piece, the same as those other industries offering chocolate bars, and all other commodities selling at a nickel. It was the only industry so taxed. The result was that the product had to sell at six cents while the others sold at five cents.

After considerable contact with the department and with the wartime prices and trade board, and also after communication with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley), it was considered—probably through double talk—that this would be corrected in the next budget. But when the next budget was brought down it put a one-cent tax on everything else, including this industry. The result is that they are still discriminated against, and still have to sell their product at a price higher than is asked by their competitors.

I bring this matter to the attention of the house because they are in a precarious position, since sugar has been rationed to fifty per cent of the 1941 quota. The result has been that the volume of these factories has been cut in half, and they are left out on a limb. I am not contending that sugar should not be cut to fifty per cent. I believe, from the figures we saw in the hands of the wartime prices and trade board and the sugar administrator of Montreal that there is a scarcity of sugar. Whether or not this industry should be at the lowest point in the distribution of the amount available is a matter of opinion. We do not think it should. It is our view that this industry should have as much sugar as is allowed other sweet goods, wines and other lines which receive twenty per cent more.

In other words, the basic period for the rationing of food was 1941, and the wartime prices and trade board say that everything

shall be based on the basic period. Now they come along and give some industries more than others. In other words, they are telling the Canadian public that they did not live right in 1941, that they consumed the wrong goods, and that now they should eat more sweet cakes. Well, I do not think the wartime prices and trade board is well enough versed in nutrition to issue such an order.

The sugar shortage is a world condition, and is tied up with UNRRA. Let us look at our own situation in western Ontario. Speaking for the city of London, let me point out that we have a large sugar beet producing area at our back door. In that area are two sugar refineries, one at Wallaceburg and one at Chatham, Ontario. The one at Chatham has a capacity of 80,000,000 pounds a year. For three years it has been closed down for lack of sugar beets. That lack of sugar beets arose because of a lack of labour. Selective service has been appealed to, and labour was promised, but that labour did not come. Permission was asked to advertise for the labour over a period of months, and finally that permission was granted—but too late.

The Ontario government subsidized the growers to an extent of $1.55 a ton last year, up to $225,000, which helped considerably on the beet price situation. But the growers must know a year ahead how many beets they are going to put in. One cannot tell in the spring just what the situation will be. You cannot make arrangements in the spring for, let us say, 50 acres of beets, because you have to prepare more than a year ahead, and continue to rotate the crops. You cannot go out and produce sugar beets on such short notice, any more than you can go out and get a dozen pigs when you do not plan to raise any.

In connection with this sugar situation let me tell the house that at the present time three South American countries have over 800,000 tons of sugar, or about 1,600,000,000 pounds. We cannot get our hands on that sugar because of a pool or cartel, whatever you wish to call it. These three countries in South America will not knuckle down to this cartel policy. In a way we have sort of piously condemned this cartel, but then we have our external relations department with its good neighbour policy. Because of the cartel we say, "We will not buy your sugar," and then under the good neighbour policy we say, "We would like to buy it, but we cannot get it." It is just the same sort of double talk. So much for the sugar situation. The sugar beet growers need labour. They need a plan. They need action from the government. They should know how much help they should hire, how many acres they should plant, what the price of beets is to be. They should be given a plan and then there will be relief for the sugar situation in Canada.

Quite a bit has been said about housing in this debate. I am not an authority on housing and I am not going to tell the government what to do. However, those who are trying to do that are not authorities either, and they cannot do it. When the Minister of Finance wanted to raise money during the war by means of victory loans he did not call in a bunch of carpenters to sell bonds. He went out and got bond dealers and insurance salesmen and they organized probably the best bond selling or investment selling organization that ever existed in any country. He got the men who knew how. I know that all hon. members worked on the victory loans in whatever capacities they possessed, whether it was in a desk or outside job, speaking or ringing doorbells.

In the building of houses the same thing should apply. The government should get the people with the know-how. Get the contractors and the builders; provide them with the necessary materials; make it possible for them to get the necessary finances and they will build the required houses. I am not condemning the bureaucrats or controllers, whatever name you want to call them—you cannot call them as bad a name sometimes as you would like—because I think we collected the best group of men that we could get quickly who were out of work—I beg your pardon, I mean men who were out of essential war work. We put them on these jobs as controllers.

However, the emergency is over. Let us look at some of these miracle men who are still on the job. In my district we have a tailor who is conttroller of honey. I was a member of an association of those using small steel parts in connection with domestic production during the war. A controller of steel closures was appointed. Steel closures are made by a multiple production stamping process. After a couple of meetings with this controller I began to wonder what knowledge he had of this business and I asked him, "What did you do before you took this job?" He said, "I was secretary of a horticultural society." I think the only idea of closures that existed in his mind was the fact that a morning glory closes in the night.

As further evidence of the fact that men are being used who are not fitted for their job, may I say that I noticed in a western Ontario paper this week that a production manager of a company who had been receiving a large

salary had toppled over about two months ago with a heart spell and had had to retire. It was a candy business with which he was connected but he has now been made shelter administrator for the emergency. The only thing he ever made that looked like anything connected with a house was candy which looks like a door-knob.

If we continue with this policy of not putting men with the know-how in the right jobs I am afraid that what will come about will be what was perhaps inadvertently stated by the hon. member for Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare (Mr. Baker) who said, as reported at page 97 of *Hansard,* that our men will eventually be properly rehabilitated. Eventually is not good enough; we have to have it now. These men have been overseas; they have married; they have come back and they have no place to go. They are living in barracks, old sheds; they are living three and four families in a hovel. Eventually is not good enough. Unless the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) does not take better action than he has indicated he is taking we shall not have the houses to take care of these families and with the cold weather we shall be facing a serious situation. So much for controls, although I could give the house more examples.

There is one other thing I would point out to the Minister of Reconstruction and probably the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Abbott). I have not been here long enough to be sufficiently conversant with just what each minister has under his control. Some of the ministers have been here much longer, but I noticed this afternoon that the Minister of Finance looked over to another minister and said, "Is that mine or is that yours?" As a new member, who am I to say anything?

But there is one thing I should like to point out in connection with which every minister has a responsibility. This has probably been mentioned before in this debate. There are a lot of government buildings around the country which were rented by the Department of National Defence. I have a long wire, which I am not going to read, about one in London in my riding. This building was rented by the Department of National Defence and justly so because they needed the space. The firm moved out to smaller quarters because their business had been cut down by virtue of war curtailments. But they want to get back to their building. Considerable alterations will have to be made because the Department of National Defence changed it to suit their needs. At the present time it is filled with goods in dead storage, things that are not being used and that will probably be turned over to the War Assets Corporation.

[Mr. Manross.]

There are many buildings in western Ontario which have been rented on that basis and the people want to get them back. It seems almost impossible for them to get a straight yes or no. This company states that they now employ thirty men but that as soon as they get their building they will employ eighty men. They state that they want to help rehabilitate the boys coming back. That is the situation and I think the departments concerned could well look into it to see that these civilian buildings are turned back to the owners. This should be done even if the leases have not run out. They need not pay for them, although I am not concerned about the rent. I am concerned simply with getting these buildings back into production so that we can employ our veterans who are getting out of the armed services.

There has been some talk or rumour of a national registration. I hope that is not so because that is simply another control. If it were so I would be ready to wax eloquent for a long time about it. In case it is in the government's mind I should like to say something about it. A national registration was taken in 1940. The plausible story told us at that time was that it was to get track of our man-power in order to see what they could do and what they could not do. The government wanted a sort of identification system. It started out very well; it cost a lot of money, but I do not think the cost was too great if it had done the job it was intended to do. We found out afterwards that it did not work. It was found that it would take a lot of courage to make it work and the government did not have the courage. They lost their courage and they also lost their director of selective service.

While national registration had that purpose in mind it really did not work. When the national selective service came to your factory and said, "We want some men for Central Aircraft," or some other war plant, no attention was paid to the registration cards. The employer made a list of the men and what work they were doing and that is what was used. They did not use the registration cards any more than to know that when you sent Bill Jones over to selective service it was really Bill Jones and not Sam Miller. I think the purpose of the registration card is over, although, of course, various governments still use the backs of them, and I will soon have to have a new one myself. I do not think it is the function of the federal government to supply a system of identification cards or kind of human dog-tag to help provincial governments set up their liquor business or to be used in connection with ration cards. I do not think we should take the taxpayers' money to carry on this national registration.

There is another fact I should like to mention before I sit down. Practically two hundred seats in this house are represented by hon. gentlemen, whether sitting on this side of the house or the other, who were elected on various platforms, but there was one thing common to them that stood out, and that was that all of them were against mass regimentation. The way to count the votes is not to count just the votes your party got but also the votes for the party opposing you that was also against mass regimentation. In my riding there were about 34,000 votes, and about 30,000 of them were against regimentation; that is, they were split between the government side and our side. So I would say that the public have given the government a mandate, and given this group a mandate, on the basis of no regimentation, and we should always bear in mind that having this mandate we cannot represent our people and regiment them.

Mr. H. W. HERRIDGE (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, as the new member for Kootenay West I succeed a gentleman who served that constituency in this house for a period of over twenty years, and I am certain that all those who knew Mr. Esling will join with me in wishing him a happy and lengthy retirement.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. HERRIDGE: Mr. Esling received the esteem and affection of all people in Kootenay West regardless of party affiliations. On that account possibly may I say that my advent to this house was delayed for about ten years.

I enter this house under somewhat unusual political circumstances, and I think a few words of explanation are necessary. I was nominated for the last federal election as the candidate of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation organization in Kootenay West, actively supported by large numbers of members of trades unions, farmers' organizations, veterans' organizations and cooperatives. I was elected to this house in support of the principles of the Regina manifesto and the present national programme of the C.C.F. Owing to the difference that has occurred within the fold of those who support the philosophy and the principles of the Regina manifesto, I sit in this house as a member of the people's C.C.F. group in Kootenay West. That difference, which was the result of sincere convictions on both sides, does not lessen in any degree my determination to work for the building up of society as enunciated in the principles of the Regina manifesto.

I have just mentioned that I entered this house under somewhat unusual political circumstances, and if hon. members will forgive a reference to my domestic affairs, I may say that I enter this house under rather unusual domestic circumstances. I come on the one side from a long line of Liberals. My father is a great admirer of the Right Hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and has been a long-time supporter of his, and he will be reading the papers to see exactly what I say to-night.

An hon. MEMBER: Be a good boy!

Mr. HERRIDGE: My mother comes from a long line of Conservatives and is a great admirer of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken). She will be reading the papers to see what I say to-night. My wife is a supporter of the Cooperative Commonwealth principles and philosophy and also an admirer of the political sagacity of the leader of the C.C.F. group in this house, and she also will be reading the papers and hoping that I give both the other parties hell.

One of my daughters—I have four daughters, Mr. Speaker—is a great admirer of the good work that she considers the Social Credit party has done in Alberta. I have another daughter who thinks that possibly the Labour-Progressive party is the party for youth, and I have two other daughters who are inclined to think that we are all wrong and that what we require in this country is a popular front of all progressive parties. They will all be reading the papers to see what I have to say in this debate. But regardless of our domestic political differences we carry on quite harmoniously so far as our family is concerned and form and have formed a family popular front against the vicissitudes of this life.

I have the honour to represent a particularly choice section of this dominion inhabitated by a progressive and energetic people. During my forty years of residence in the Kootenay West constituency I have seen it make a great development. I have seen there the development of a great mining and smelting industry. I have seen the development of a substantial lumbering industry, and I have seen the development of a considerable agricultural economy. My intention, while I sit in this house is to do my best to represent Canadian thought as a whole and to represent the people of my constituency who have placed their confidence in me. My intention is to do what I can to have a constructive approach to the questions that will come before this assembly, and I shall endeavour to be fair in my criticisms and in my suggestions.

So far I have enjoyed the deliberations in this debate. I listened with interest to the leader of the opposition and I must say I

listened also with sympathy to his attempt, obviously with good intentions, to reconcile a Conservative philosophy with the necessities of this time. Unfortunately, when the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation party (Mr. Coldwell) was speaking I was called out to meet an old-time resident of my home village whom I have not had occasion to see for thirty-five years. Therefore I heard only my hon. friend's concluding remarks; but I have read his speech and I congratulate him upon the logical presentation of the case he gave to this house.

I must congratulate the leader of the Social Credit party (Mr. Low) upon his able exposition of what are, in my opinion, economic fallacies unless they are combined with social ownership. I also enjoyed the—shall I say?—vigorous remarks this afternoon of the hon. member for Edmonton East (Mr. Ashby). I thought he made a virile and excellent address but I should just like to say this. When he was drawing that parallel between the freedom which he enjoyed and that which he allowed his pigs, one extra freedom above the freedoms allowed by the Atlantic charter, he painted a rosy picture but failed to include a full statement of the facts. Those gentlemen who drew the Atlantic charter and made recommendations for certain freedoms to become the rights of mankind did not recommend those freedoms looking forward to the future to cut our throats.

My remarks regarding the speech from the throne will be quite brief so far as detail is concerned. I am very glad to know that this government seeks the promotion of peace, work, and health in domestic and international relations. That is a fine statement. We are told that the charter of the united nations is to be submitted to this parliament; that the government is endeavouring to secure dominion-provincial agreement in matters essential to the satisfactory progress of this dominion; that the government is considering the maintenance of long-term markets for primary industry. That is a thing which must be considered; the farmers of this country are thinking anxiously about it at this time. We are also told that the government intends to make plans for the stabilization of international exchanges.

I think the recommendation made by the leader of the C.C.F. party was a good one. These plans should be brought before a special committee of this house to be studied and considered: plans for the extension of home construction, very necessary and urgently needed; plans for a national minimum of security, very much needed and coming very late; plans for national health insurance, which the people of Canada have been waiting for for years; plans for more generous treatment of old age pensioners. These are excellent plans so far as they read in the speech from the throne. Apparently planning is becoming fashionable, because I remember that only a few years ago, when anybody suggested planning he was accused of regimentation, bureaucracy, national socialism, and so on. But regardless of the government's basic philosophy, any government to-day, owing to the realities of the situation, the economic and social conditions, is forced—actually forced—into planning. The issue is, for whom will that planning be; will it be for the many or the few?

The speech from the throne does not deal in detail with any legislation to be brought down by this government. On reading it I was reminded of going into my orchard on a spring day when the orchard is covered with bloom; everything looks fair and beautiful. But you cannot estimate the crop by looking at the bloom; you cannot estimate a crop of fruit until the fruit is set. I approach the speech from the throne in that state of mind. I trust the blossom in the government's programme will be so fertilized by the demands of the people and the activities of this house that a crop of highly necessary and urgent legislation will result.

I was elected on the basis of rendering strong support for the urgent necessity for continued united nations' cooperation; for the principles of the Regina manifesto; in support of the general programme of the C.C.F.; and of one other major plan, the necessity of democratic mobilization far beyond the confines of partisan politics. I am sure that the principles of the Regina manifesto are known to most hon. members. It is not my intention to deal with it this evening; if any hon. member is ignorant of the principles of the manifesto I shall be only too glad to supply him with a copy. The general or national programme of the C.C.F. will no doubt receive attention at a later date.

I wish to deal specifically with the urgent necessity for continued united nations' cooperation and the necessity for a mobilization of the Canadian people far beyond the confines of partisan politics. We believe that our economic structure must be based on the foundations of continued united nations' cooperation and mutual aid. I wish to express just a few ideas in that connection.

Upon the right relationships of the British commonwealth of nations, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United States depends the future welfare of the world. Without mutual understanding and resolute action

a horrible future faces us. What a contribution those three great nations have made toward a common victory: the British commonwealth of nations, with a thousand years of struggle for peace; the Soviet Union, with its immense and recent experience in the building of a new civilization, the greatest social experiment in history; the United States, with its vast industrial machine, its magnificent organizing ability, and the vitality of its people. If we can only keep that combination together, what possibilities we have to win the peace in the days that are ahead! We have all much to learn. Unity will develop only through understanding; but with understanding I am certain we can distil from the joint contributions and necessities of the united nations an international order of justice and of peace.

I wish to deal briefly with a few possibilities of the future. Let me emphasize that at the conclusion of this war the world is different from what it was at the conclusion of the last war. We now have over one-sixth of the world's area a great socialist nation, a nation which has gone through great trials and tribulations and has come through this war successfully as an ally of ours. That produces an entirely different set of circumstances from what existed at the conclusion of the last war. From this time on the eyes of the world will be focused on the public economy of the Soviet Union. We are going to see a form of socialist-capitalist state emulation. Not all those who support the capitalist system in this country are unprogressive; but we have a core of reactionaries in all the western democracies. There are some people who support and endorse the capitalist system who are progressive in their outlook and so realize that the world of to-day is entering a new stage. The western capitalist democracies from this point on must keep their eyes open and watch the public economy of the Soviet Union. That will produce an entirely different psychological approach to current questions on the part of the people in the capitalist democracies. There will be a good deal of watching of future developments in the Soviet Union, and the Soviet Union will watch our trends in production. I believe that we can learn a great deal from one another; they will learn from us and we shall learn from them.

As I said before, we are willing to seek mutual understanding, and I am sure that out of this will come a better world order. I do not look to the future from a pessimistic or negative point of view. I realize the great dangers that face us in the days ahead, the most dangerous days the Canadian nation has ever faced. At the same time I realize the great opportunities that lie ahead, and I believe that if we approach the present situation from a pessimistic or a negative point of view we are unwise, because if we do so we may undermine the morale of the people. I say that, because, without confidence, without courage and without faith in the future, we shall not succeed. If we approach our problems from the pessimistic or negative point of view we shall undermine that confidence, that courage and that faith in ourselves which are necessary if we are to remain united.

We have these two great economies, the socialist economy and the capitalist economy. This world is growing smaller every day owing to the rapidity of transportation, and we have several factors working in our favour, factors which I would wish that more members would consider when viewing the question as a whole. Owing to the rapidity of transportation we shall have a tremendous increase in the exchange of ideas as between the western democracies and the Soviet Union and other countries in the world. In the post-war period we shall have great exchanges of literature and art and science and an enormous increase in travel as soon as that becomes possible.

In regard to the world situation, not only have governments to seek to cooperate, but we have great hope in the possibility of co-operation among peoples, the direct representatives of the peoples meeting together to discuss world problems. We have the illustration afforded by the world federation of trade unions. In London in February representatives from thirty-six allied countries and seven neutral countries representing sixty million workers met to discuss questions common to all the workers of all countries. That is a good sign; it indicates the great possibilities for the future from the use which the peoples of the world can make of available machinery to meet and discuss problems with a view to promoting understanding and ordered peace.

Organized labour can play a great part in the international field for the building up of world unity. The unity which is being forged by the world trade union federation and other organizations will anchor the united nations and keep them together. Victory on the battlefield won, organized workers are better able, in my opinion, than people in many other walks of life to realize that unity in the post-war world will be essential, a unity that will be strong enough to overcome some misunderstandings and possibly many disappointments.

Then we shall have world agricultural councils. We shall have the farmers of the world meeting together to discuss the distribution of the primary products produced by the

farmers of the world, not planning scarcity but planning that the undernourished people of the world shall receive surpluses from countries such as ours.

We must not forget that so long as there are understandard and undernourished people living in any country their condition is a constant challenge and a constant threat to our standard of living. I congratulate the Canadian federation of agriculture upon the work it has done to promote the coming world agricultural conference which I think will be held early next year. Our Canadian federation of agriculture is doing a great work for the farmers of Canada, and in this connection I should like to quote briefly from a booklet issued by them recently. I recommend it to hon. members. I think they should get it if they have not already done so. It is entitled "Farmers to Take a Hand in World Affairs," and I would quote the following from page 16, from the federation statement with regard to the world agricultural council.

More and more, from different angles, it is being brought home to us these days that world affairs are our affairs. Unquestionably the primary producer of our country—and similarly of other agricultural countries—can no longer think in terms of domestic policy without finding himself drawn into a consideration of international policy. There is widespread acknowledgment that in this interdependent world no nation can stand alone and no nation can any longer intelligently plan and direct its food and agriculture programme without first ensuring that its domestic plan harmonizes with the collective plan of other food exporting, as well as the food importing countries.

Canadian farmers are fundamentally in agreement with the declaration of the Hot Springs conference. They believe that the goal of freedom from want of food suitable and adequate for the health and strength of all people can be achieved; that we must start dealing with international problems in an organized international way; that we must replace international anarchy by international order in the field of agricultural production, distribution and consumption.

Our farmers have always believed in an economy of abundance, but they are no longer interested in a laissez-faire programme of unorganized abundance. They are convinced that the almost unlimited possibilities of an expanding world economy should be organized and coordinated on a world scale. Accordingly they believe in promoting and expanding international trade on a planned and orderly basis.

Looking to the post-war period, we believe that security for agriculture and for the farm family must be the keynote of a forward-looking programme. While we seek this as a goal for our own primary producers, we naturally acknowledge it as a legitimate and desirable goal in all other countries. Moreover, we do not believe that a substantial measure of security is possible or likely to be permanent in any one country unless it is based upon a solid foundation of international collaboration which will provide a comparable measure of security for fellow farmers in other countries.

[Mr. Herridge.]

There, in the spirit of our Canadian farmers, the spirit which is being exhibited also by farmers in other lands, lies a great opportunity for the primary producers to get together and do something in the way of working for the future benefit of the nations as a whole.

I think we shall also have a great getting together of veterans of the united nations. These men fought in this war a common enemy and they will meet together in the not very distant future on an international basis. There will be a united nations' veterans' federation embracing representatives from all countries to continue the friendships and the comradeship commenced in the war. They will continue for many years to come, and these men can play a great part in promoting world peace and world improvement.

I would suggest to the federal and provincial governments that instead of erecting memorials in cold stone throughout the country to those who have not returned from this second world war, nothing better could be done as a tribute and as a permanent memorial to the sacrifices of these men than to provide funds to see that some representatives, some of the teen-age children from every county in Canada, have an opportunity annually to visit other countries in order to attend meetings of international youth organizations. Youth can play a great part in the development and improvement of international relations.

Then again we have the coming development of world cooperative organizations, in connection with which there is great cause for hope and, I think for confidence. Also without question there will be international organizations of women in the future on a considerable scale. Through these great groups of the peoples of all countries meeting together I see a great opportunity, with the assistance of governments, for the building of a peace that will be permanent and secure.

I see my time is going very rapidly, but I should like to deal briefly with national affairs. The capitalist system is very hard to assess. Its fall has been anticipated by some people for many years. I suppose inflation might hasten it, but inflation is one of the great dangers of the days immediately ahead of us. Whatever the immediate future holds, however, I do not see the collapse of capitalism at once. As I try to study the situation as it exists in this country to-day, I believe we are in for a period of state capitalism, in which many of the chief industries of this country will be financed by state loans bearing interest. I believe we are now

just entering that stage. My point is that this will be the most dangerous period in our history. Time alone will show whether we shall move toward a totalitarian economy or toward a general cooperative commonwealth. I see that great danger. The question is whether state capitalism will become a rigid means of maintaining the system for the benefit of the few, or whether it will evolve democratically into a cooperative commonwealth. If we are to have an orderly, planned evolution to a cooperative commonwealth, I believe we must have the people of this country organized in groups far exceeding the bounds of parties and politics, to defend and improve democracy and work together to meet concrete situations and specific conditions. We have men of varying political beliefs. We have them in the labour unions, the veterans' organizations, the farmers' organizations, the women's organizations, and the cooperatives. Here are great bodies of public opinion; and if we are to preserve democracy and evolve in the right direction we must have a mass mobilization of the people, without regard to partisan politics, to meet situations which may change from day to day.

I am hurrying to complete my remarks before my time is up. The one great enemy we have is reaction, and the one great weapon that they can use is disunity. As I see it, the only way the Canadian people can be prevented from evolving a democrative cooperative commonwealth is by the spreading of disunity. That was the method used in European countries; it has always been the method of those who try to destroy the efforts of the working class. In this country they will try to arouse the enmity of race against race, religion against religion, veteran against labour, unorganized labour against organized labour, farmer against worker, east against west. That is the thing we have to watch, the thing we have to fight and defeat. The greatest danger of the future is the possibility of disunity among the Canadian people.

We have some factors in our favour. We have the hope of cooperation between the peoples of the united nations. We have a mass desire for change. We have our democratic traditions which have come to us through the centuries of struggle. We have our great natural resources, and our great capacity for adjusting ourselves to changing conditions. Finally, we have the vitality and intelligence of the Canadian people. Because the C.C.F. Regina manifesto approaches the problem with an understanding of Canadian requirements, Canadian psychology and Canadian conditions, I support it. The next step will be the control and finally the ownership of the banks and great monopolies of this country, to be followed by a great extension of social ownership in provincial and municipal fields. That will be the beginning of a wide basis for cooperative ownership throughout this country.

I see my time is nearly up, Mr. Speaker, but I should like to relate what some of my constituents in Kootenay West expect from this government. Organized labour in my constituency expect legislation to protect and advance the interests of the working class, and they expect it soon. The organized farmers expect security, and therefor endorse the proposed national natural products marketing act, a draft of which was recently presented to this government. The farmers of West Kootenay are also very much concerned about the government taking immediate action to investigate the Little Cherry disease, which may bring about the ruin of the cherry crop in Kootenay and Okanagan and possibly throughout Canada. The organized veterans expect more action in the development of the reestablishment programme. All the people of my constituency expect this government to implement its promises.

In conclusion, I should like to say that I am certain members of this house are divided not so much by the matter of aims as by the matter of methods. Therefore I urge that this thought may be with us in our deliberations in this chamber. If we strive for national unity of purpose; if we persevere to that end, we shall wrest from the hand of privilege and monopoly in this country its power to defeat the desires of the people, and will build in Canada a civilization that will justify to the full the sacrifices of the boys who will not return.

Mr. A. M. NICHOLSON (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, the new members who have taken part in this debate find themselves speaking in an atmosphere very different from that which prevailed at the commencement of the last parliament. Hon. members will recall that during the first few weeks we were in session in 1940 the low countries were overrun and the collapse of France became imminent. Now everyone is rejoicing that the nazi forces have been completely defeated and the democracies have triumphed. But those of us who are here will have during the life of this parliament responsibilities almost as great as we had during the past five years.

Regardless of where we sit in this chamber there can be no difference of opinion as to the effectiveness of the contribution Canada has made toward the allied victory. The men

and women in our armed services have matched the heroism of the fighting forces of any of the united nations.

Our people at home, in the factories, on the farms, in the mines and in other civilian occupations have surpassed all previous records established in Canada. I am sure that members of the government would not for one moment try to claim credit for Canada's magnificent performance. The people of the whole country were responsible for the achievements.

During the war years many orthodox ideas were exploded. It has been proven conclusively that a nation's war effort is in no way related to the amount of gold in the Bank of Canada or in the hills of Kentucky. The important considerations always were these: Have we the materials? Have we the man-power required?

The government was forced to adopt planning. Free enterprise was not interested in making guns, tanks or planes sufficient to meet the law of supply and demand. However, they were willing to make them on a cost-plus basis, which assured them that they could not lose. However, there is no use in quarrelling about what has been done; we must look to the future. But I think, having established during the war years that whatever is physically possible must be made financially possible, we should accept that as a suitable policy in war time.

The present Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) and his predecessor made it clear on different occasions that in no way would Canada's contribution to victory be limited by financial considerations. In other words, to establish an air training school the only questions asked were: Is there a suitable site? Have we the water available? Have we lumber and other building materials? Have we carpenters? Is there a need? If the answers were in the affirmative the job was executed, and the workers in the building trades and the lumber yards cooperated to the fullest extent in seeing that the work was done.

Since I have come to parliament the problem of housing has received a good deal of my attention. Every year I have tried to urge the administration to face in a realistic way the providing of adequate housing for the people of the country. I argued that if the government intended to spend $10 million to build a new war plant at Windsor, Toronto, or Hamilton, some consideration should be given to the matter of providing congenial living quarters where people were going to live, for those working in the plant.

There was a critical housing problem on our doorstep when war broke out. During those ten years of depression, when we should have been building new houses, our carpenters were walking the streets in idleness; our factories were failing to produce building materials because we had no money in Canada in those days. Therefore, when war broke out we had a most acute housing shortage from coast to coast. Eventually the government recognized that there was a problem and Wartime Housing was set up. However, I feel that we failed during the war years to give sufficient consideration to the problem.

I am greatly encouraged to find that at this session hon. members in all sections of the house are emphasizing the immediate job that must be undertaken in facing up to to-day's problems. I have been interested in the remarks which have come from our Progressive Conservative friends to our right. These have been observations of protest. However, I suggest they should not protest too loudly, for fear we might be obliged to inquire into just what they did when they were in office, and also inquire as to what plans they would have introduced, had they been elected to the government benches.

Let me remind the house that between the years 1930 and 1935 we had a Conservative government in office. I suggest that the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) should be congratulated upon being able to change the name of the party. Certainly it reflects credit upon his personality, and his long term in public life. But the majority of those associated with him have come from the Conservative side of the family. One might ask what was accomplished during the years Viscount Bennett was Prime Minister of Canada.

I have in my hand the report of building activities in the principal countries of the world between the years 1929 and 1937, taking 1929 as a base period, with the figure 100. In this table we find that Canada has the worst record of any among the principal countries. The following table will show building activities in Canada during those years:

Year	Figure showing activities, taking 100 as base for 1929
1930	70
1931	47
1932	16
1933	9·7
1934	12·8
1935	18·6
1936	17·6
1937	29

But while we were unable to grapple in an imaginative way with the housing problem, countries like the United Kingdom, New Zealand, the Netherlands, Sweden, Norway and others which had progressive governments

were forced by public opinion to take advantage of the depression, and to see that, instead of keeping people on doles and relief, something useful should be produced. Let me point out, in passing, that some of these governments were not labour governments; in fact, some were Conservative.

Of course, the production of houses is one of the most economic undertakings in which any country can participate. For instance, in the year that our building index was down to 9.7, in the United Kingdom they had an index of 114.5.

For many years the leader of the opposition was premier of Manitoba. I would remind him that all the time he was in office disgraceful housing conditions existed in the metropolitan area of Winnipeg. I do not think housing conditions are any worse in Winnipeg than in most other cities, but in that city they have had a public health department that was not afraid to face up to the fact.

I hold in my hand a report of the public health committee for 1942. This is what Mr. Alexander Officer, who was so well known for years throughout Canada and who was chief inspector of the division of sanitation and housing in Winnipeg, had to say about conditions which prevailed in Winnipeg:

> Surely our present housing shortage cannot continue much longer. The risk to health of our substandard housing, not to mention that of the fire hazard in our non-descript tenements, may be brought home to us with painful remorse. Already, we have much evidence in the toll of moral and mental standards, also the cost of crime in our blighted districts. Children are denied the elementary innocent amusements of youth, and are indeed often exposed to health and moral hazards.

And further down:

> The doubling up of families is one of the chief characteristics of slum areas and this condition is spreading like a cancer into some of our most exclusive residential districts. It is only a matter of time, therefore, when these districts will degenerate into blighted areas. . . .
>
> Slums have for centuries been the curse of large communities, serving as breeding places for all manner of crime and the spread of disease.

And at page 7 of the report:

> It is surely not too much to say that when our men on active service return to civil life they have a right to expect that decent living quarters for their future family life is available, or at least in process of construction.

These are the conditions which prevailed in Winnipeg when the hon. member was premier of Manitoba. If he was interested in providing housing for people in low income brackets, then something should have been done by the provincial government for the city of Winnipeg at that time.

When the Conservative party was in office at Ottawa a special committee on housing was established. But it was not until 1935, not until it was clear that they were on their way out, that the committee was set up. Witnesses were called to review the situation. They reviewed conditions in Toronto, Halifax and Vancouver; they considered the cost of maintaining slums in terms of crime, fire hazards and disease. These matters are all set out in the report, but nothing very much was done.

Something was done. I was living in northern Saskatchewan at the time and we had some assistance from the federal and provincial governments in carrying out a housing programme. I mentioned in the house at one time something of the housing achievements of the Progressive Conservatives during those hungry thirties, and in looking through my old files I found a return that had been brought down in connection with housing assistance to three veterans in my constituency. One of these is a veteran of two wars. One sent two sons to the present war, one of whom will never return. The third served during the last war.

These three men who fought for freedom from 1914 to 1918 had committed no crime. They were carpenters who just could not get a job in Regina at any price, so they journeyed to the Hudson Bay Junction district, where I lived, under a scheme financed partly by the city, partly by the province and partly by the federal authorities. According to the particulars furnished by the dominion authorities the following expenses were shared by the federal and provincial governments, both of which were Conservative at the time.

I shall not give the names of these veterans, but I have them here. Under the housing programme the governments of the day provided a payment of $6.70 for six windows. The next item is $3.80 for stovepipes, tar paper and hinges. The next item is $35.75 for lumber. The ceiling that was permitted in those days was $50 per unit, and you can see what a careful manager this settler was because his total expenses came to $49.75.

Of course, it should be remembered that all logs were free for the cutting. They were on a plot of land of 160 acres and so thick that you could not possibly drive through them with your oxen. You did not have to pay for the logs, but expert carpenters were obliged to go north; they were not forced to go north, but they came to the conclusion that nothing could be worse than living on relief in Regina. They thought that if they had 160 acres of free land, all the fuel they needed, some berries and maybe some wild game in the winter

time, if they would not be in heaven they would be better off than they would be on relief in Regina.

Here is the next case—and I want to say that I know these families very well—which concerns a father, mother and eight children. They were limited to $10 a month for food and were permitted to cut down on their lumber and put more into food. So this family spent only $31.60 for lumber. On account of having so many children they had to get along with fewer windows, and they had only $4.50 for windows. The total expenditure for the house was $36.10.

In the next case $5.45 was spent for windows and it is not stated how many. Then there was $5.85 for building material, $31.75 for lumber and $5.20 for tar paper.

As I mentioned, those were the houses that were built for heroes. These were settlers who came north in the thirties to try to get off relief. They were given $50 at a time when the governments of the day in Great Britain, the United States and Sweden were saying, "We cannot ask our people to live in $50 houses when we have plenty of lumber, plenty of building material and plenty of carpenters; our relief programme should be more ambitious".

I give this same reason for failing to support the Progressive Conservative amendment which, if carried, would amount to a vote of want of confidence in the present government. Who knows but what we might have them to take their place. Therefore I cannot support an amendment which says that the government has failed to take adequate and timely action to meet the ever-mounting housing crisis. I do not think they did that. I am going to support the C.C.F. amendment, but if that does not carry I shall not be able to support the Conservative amendment in view of their record while in office.

Coming back to the immediate problem, I must admit that the present administration has recognized that there is a problem. As I said, Wartime Housing was set up several years ago. While I was critical of the building of potential slums when permanent houses could have been built for about the same cost under some sort of plan, as I said, that is all gone and all the talking I could do would not change the situation. But I repeat that I think it was unfortunate that the federal administration should spend such large sums in building what have been called temporary houses and giving a guarantee that they would be torn down. Surely they must have known from past experience that these houses will never be torn down so long as there are less desirable houses being occupied in Hull, Halifax or Vancouver. I am afraid that at the rate of travelling this situation will last for a long time.

In 1943 a special subcommittee on housing and community planning was set up by the advisory committee on reconstruction. The terms of reference were:

> To review existing legislation and administrative organization relating to housing and community planning, both urban and rural, throughout Canada, and to report regarding such changes in legislation or modification of organization and procedure as may be necessary . . .

And so on. If hon. members have not read this report I urge them to do so, because I think it one of the best pieces of work done by the groups working on reconstruction. It is certainly the best study by far that has been done to date on the housing problem in Canada The recommendations are set forth in an easily read fashion at the commencement of the book. They review conditions in different parts of Canada; they deal with urban housing, rural housing and legislation in other countries. Nothing less than the carrying out of the recommendations of this subcommittee will be good enough in this day and age.

In 1944 the National Housing Act was brought down, supposedly to implement the recommendations in this report. This act has been in force for over a year and we must judge the government's performance by the results to date. I think it should have been recognized that housing activities would provide one of the most popular and most useful post-war activities. Sir William Beveridge in his recent book on full employment says:

> Adequate and healthy housing presents the largest single objective for desirable outlay after the war and affords the largest scope for raising the standard of life, health and happiness. Housing involves the setting up of a long-term programme of building to approved designs with the maximum of economy. The scale of the programme must be determined not arbitrarily but with reference to the total labour available; some forms of building and construction can be used as the balancing factor in the national man-power budget. The prospective importance of housing makes it vital to secure, by new methods if necessary, the maximum efficiency of the building industry. It is even more important to secure that national planning of town and country is made a reality, before permanent housing begins.

The legislation that has been passed has assumed that private enterprise would be able to solve the problem. The National Housing Act which had been in force previously was altered in several important details, but the fact is that the present National Housing Act

is just not of any use to people in the lower income brackets. What chance has the average worker in a war plant, a non-commissioned officer or a member of the armed forces who has been away from this country for four or five years to make the down payment and monthly instalments that are required?

Our National Housing Act is proceeding without sufficient consideration being given to town planning. Here, there, and everywhere houses have been built on lots without proper consideration of modern building requirements, and without consideration of the need which is everywhere recognized for town planning. Proper surveys have not been made to determine whether houses built under the National Housing Act are meeting the needs of the people who most deserve houses. According to the statistics that have been compiled eighty-five per cent of the houses built under the National Housing Act are designed for five persons or fewer. Is it the policy of this government to sponsor a housing programme designed to keep our birth rate low? The scheme operates without any large-scale administration to take advantage of reduced building costs. The programme also operates without adequate supervision of standards, without recognition of the interests of union labour, and without trying to find out whether the mortgagees would be able to negotiate the mortgages independently. There is no argument about it that those who have been able to take advantage of the national housing loans have been able to get their houses built at a much lower cost than they could have done before we had a national housing act. But providing cheap money or making lower rates of money available to those in the upper income brackets will not solve the problem in this country. That part of the programme dealing with low rental housing has been a complete flop to date. I noticed in the press yesterday a dispatch from Toronto saying that formation of limited dividend companies to finance the construction of low-rental housing projects throughout Canada would be proceeded with immediately by the Canadian life insurance companies as soon as a charter for the holding company, to be known as the Housing Enterprises of Canada, is obtained from the Secretary of State. I protest, Mr. Speaker, against a democratically elected government handing over to private corporations the responsibility of sponsoring the building of low-cost housing for the people of Canada. There is no country in the world where a scheme of that sort has worked out under private enterprise. The only countries that have dealt effectively with slum clearance and low-rental housing have recognized that it is a national responsibility, that the federal government is the only authority that can adequately finance the problem.

Mr. HOMUTH: What are those countries?

Mr. NICHOLSON: The United States, for instance. I suggest that hon. members take a trip and see what has been done in New York, Washington, and Pittsburgh. I am not suggesting that they have solved their problem in the United States, but at least they have demonstrated what can be done. In New York city, for example, one will find the Vladeck houses in one of the oldest districts, including Cherry street, where George Washington at one time had his residence. It was one of the worst sections of the city, one of its worst slum areas. New houses have been built there for 1,771 families, or nearly 6,000 people. They are living in modern fire-proof apartments, with running water, electric light, gas stove, electric refrigerator and modern bathroom. The rents range upwards from about $15 a month. The rents are a little higher in New York city; the average gross rent including services is $24.80 a month for the Vladeck houses, which is regarded by the people who live in them as a very low rental. But it would not have been possible for people to live in this sort of housing had it not been that some public authority realized that it is more costly to maintain slums than to face the problem and clear them.

Mr. ADAMSON: Has the hon. member the figures for the Metropolitan Life Insurance company's scheme?

Mr. NICHOLSON: Yes. They have a beautiful development at Parkchester, where they have cleared a slum area. The rents are a good deal higher in Parkchester. The rentals, which include both gas and electricity, are for two rooms, $32 to $34 monthly; three rooms, $39 to $53; four rooms, $52 to $64; and five rooms, $63 to $71. The Metropolitan Life Insurance company has received no funds for this work from the federal treasury. Later on, this group will have something to say as to how life insurance companies in this and other countries do get their funds.

Anyone who has visited the public housing developments in the United States, Great Britain or on the continent will agree that no private agency has been able to devise any scheme for building suitable houses and making them available to people in the lower third of the income brackets. In the United States the federal authority has popularized what it is doing. The pamphlet I have in my

hand shows what has been done, what these areas looked like before and after the projects were built; and if you go through these districts now which formerly were slum areas and see the children playing in the parks or playing in the recreation room in the basement, you will realize that for them the world is quite a different place from what it was before.

But in Canada we are passing the buck to the insurance companies. The act provides that municipalities, provinces and philanthropic organizations may contribute to a rent reduction fund—everybody under the sun but the federal government. But slum clearance should not be regarded as a charitable proposition. We must recognize that we have to pay for these slums directly or indirectly. We maintain our penitentiaries at a very high cost, and we have to provide fire and police protection for these slum areas. It has been established in many countries that it is cheaper in the long run to tear down the slums and rebuild to provide decent homes for the people.

There are those who say that the working people would not appreciate decent housing. Hon. members all know the old slander about working people using the bathtub for storing coal. But there is not a single case on record in any country where working people have used the bathtub for a coal storage. On the contrary, people living in the Vladeck houses in New York city appreciate the chance to have running hot water so that the kiddies can have a bath regularly.

Farm housing received a good deal of attention by the Curtis committee. The statistics compiled by the dominion bureau of statistics revealed shocking conditions in farm housing in Canada. To those who are interested in selling furnaces, radios and bathtubs I suggest that they should get behind those who are fighting for an ambitious housing programme. In Canada the percentage of farm people who have refrigeration, radios, automobiles, bathrooms, vacuum cleaners, is only 3·9 per cent. In Prince Edward Island it is ·07 per cent; in Nova Scotia, 3·4 per cent; and so on down the way; a very small percentage. Like the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken), I was born in a log house. Neither of us should apologize for that. Neither of us had anything to say as to where we were born. But my father and mother moved out of the log house as soon as they could, and I never once heard any suggestion that we should go back.

Mr. GARDINER: How many are there in the province that has had a socialist government over a year?

[Mr. Nicholson.]

Mr. NICHOLSON: There are a great many, but the people who elected the socialist government are not proceeding on the assumption that log houses are good enough in this day and age.

Mr. GARDINER: No; but how many bathtubs are there?

Mr. MACKENZIE: And what are you doing about it?

Mr. NICHOLSON: Saskatchewan has a poor record, I admit, but I must remind the minister that these statistics were taken in 1941, before we had a C.C.F. government.

Mr. GARDINER: What I want to know from my hon. friend is: they have been in office for something over a year, and they have statistics, what are they? How many bathtubs are there?

Mr. COLDWELL: More than the hon. gentleman's friends put in in forty years.

Mr. GARDINER: I do not think you have put any in.

Mr. NICHOLSON: The minister must know that at the present time we are very short of bathtubs and almost everything else.

Mr. MACKENZIE: So are we.

Mr. NICHOLSON: And these statistics were taken, as I said, in 1941, before we ever had a C.C.F. government.

Mr. MITCHELL: Does that argument not cut both ways?

Mr. NICHOLSON: I agree that housing conditions in Saskatchewan are the worst in all Canada.

Mr. MACKENZIE: In the last year, you mean.

Mr. NICHOLSON: We have not materially altered it in the first year, but I will stake my reputation that by the time we have been in office for a few years we shall have a much better housing record than you have now.

My time is almost gone, but before I conclude I should like to make a few constructive recommendations.

The government is now accustomed to making very large appropriations. The National Housing Act was passed on the assumption that if more money were needed it would be made available. I suggest that immediately the federal government negotiate with a view of setting up five experimental units, with the municipalities I mention: Vancouver, Winnipeg, Toronto, Montreal, Halifax. I would suggest that in Vancouver, Winnipeg and Halifax, from 200 to 300 units be built, and

that in Toronto and Montreal the number be 500 each. I cannot prove that the Canadian people would like to live in such beautiful surroundings as have been prepared by the United States government at the Green Belt, near Washington, or at Baltimore, or at Chicago, or a dozen other experimental centres which I could mention; but I think that at least the government might go so far as to spend $15,000,000, if necessary, to set up these experimental units, so that you would have 500 houses laid out, according to a town plan, in the Toronto area where you would have your schools, recreational centres and parks, all laid out by technical men who are here available and just dying for a chance to do the job. I hope no one will ask, where are you to get the money? I need not answer that. All I need say is that the Canadian government has done a magnificent job in building Shipshaw, in the construction of aircraft plants and the synthetic rubber plant at Sarnia; that when a Catalina is sent out it has cost the government $250,000, and that the young pilot who takes over the controls has been trained at a cost of $25,000, so that we need not inquire about cost. Let us approach our housing problem from the same point of view, that whatever is physically possible must be made financially possible. Have we the materials, the carpenters, and other artisans, and the imagination to embark on an ambitious housing programme, so that everyone who has fought for his country will have a home in which to live?

Mr. FRED ROSE (Cartier): Mr. Speaker, I should first like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne. It is most appropriate that both the mover and the seconder, the one from English Canada, the other from French Canada, have come from the ranks of the heroic Canadians who fought and died at Dieppe, on the beaches of Normandy, France, Belgium, Holland and Hong Kong to safeguard Canada from the nazi hordes and the Japanese fascist militarists and to maintain the rights of the people of Canada to determine the destiny of this country. But I am sorry that I cannot extend the same type of congratulations to the government because of the lack of concrete proposals in the speech from the throne to meet the present emergency situation.

On the same day that the people of Canada read the speech from the throne, President Truman sent a message to the United States Congress outlining a programme for the people of the United States, to meet what he called a great emergency. There is a marked contrast between the two messages, the speech from the throne and the message of President Truman. The president made one statement which I will quote, because I believe it is a basic statement of the type which we should have found in the speech from the throne, a statement which in a few words says exactly what is expected from governments at the present time:

> The cost of transition from war to peace is as much a part of the cost of war as the transition from peace to war, and we should so consider it.

That is, we must consider the present emergency a continuation of war, and the same government responsibility that it had in the period of war in order to supply our men with arms, ammunition and everything else, the government must accept to-day. We have proved in the course of the war that we can do as well as the United States in all respects, in the field of production, of organization, and I do not have to say also, of course, on the field of battle. We can probably say that we in Canada blazed the trail in the matter of financing the war and stabilization. On some occasions when I visited the United States people told me that they envied our system of stabilization. If we could be trail blazers in war time, why can we not do the same to-day? Unless we work to-day in that spirit and unless the government accepts responsibilities in that spirit, military victory may be followed by economic disaster.

Everyone knows that the problem of reconversion is no simple matter. There are difficulties connected with it. We all recognize these difficulties, but the government should not try to hide behind difficulties. Instead of hiding behind difficulties and explaining away everything, it is necessary to tackle the problem in the same spirit in which we tackled problems in war time. Positive steps have to be taken to-day, to-morrow and the day after. It is the responsibility of the government—and these are not my own words; they are from the white paper—to maintain full employment and purchasing power. Basically to maintain purchasing power means to maintain war-time wage levels, to raise substandard wages, to provide means of livelihood for workers and their families in the reconversion period.

As I said before, in official statements of the government it is asserted that it is the policy of the government to maintain high income and high employment; but it is not enough to say that. Steps have to be taken, and rapidly, in order to make these things possible. It is a fact that tens of thousands of workers who have been demobilized from the army, the navy and the air force, and

many thousands who have been let out from war plants, are being forced by circumstances to accept wages far below war-time levels.

Surely this is not the way to maintain purchasing power. Men and women who are released from the armed forces and from war plants are not asking for anything extravagant. They want jobs at decent wages. If such jobs are not available, it is the responsibility of this government to provide them with a means of subsistance commensurate with a Canadian standard of living. I like that phrase, "Canadian standard of living". The trade union movement is unanimous in its proposal that the worker with a family should receive the sum of $25 a week during the period of reconversion, and this is a perfectly justifiable demand. If any hon. member considers this an extravagant demand I would urge him to read the statement of President Truman on the same subject. I quote:

> During this emergency every eligible worker should be entitled to twenty-six weeks of unemployment benefits in any one year. The maximum weekly payment for those workers whose previous earnings were high enough, should not be less than $25 per week.

Hon. members will see that those people who came here the other day were not, as some newspaper editorials stated, a bunch of radicals but were workers laid off from war plants asking for something which President Truman, who is no radical, also asked for.

Where is the money to come from for this undertaking? I know there is always that question. Well, there is $300 million in the unemployment insurance fund. If the government does not see fit to make an upward revision in unemployment insurance benefits the difference can be financed out of general government funds. Many workers have told me that even if this proposal were accepted by the government they feared they would be deprived of this benefit if they refused to take jobs at low wage levels.

The only condition for a man or woman receiving $25 weekly compensation should be willingness to accept work at a minimum wage recognized by the federal government as essential to the health and well-being of people. I emphasize that—a minimum recognized by the federal government—because we have in some provinces minimum wage scales which are a disgrace to Canada.

I have in my hand a reference book for the dominion-provincial conference on reconstruction entitled, "Health, Welfare and Labour." On page 86 we find the following:

> Weekly minimum rates for experienced workers under minimum wage acts.

[Mr. Rose.]

What are these weekly rates for experienced workers? I will start with my own province of Quebec. These are the provincial minimum wages: province of Quebec, zone number 1, which we are told is Montreal and district, twenty-six cents an hour; zone number 2, which is Quebec and district, twenty-four cents an hour; zone number 3, Terrebonne and area around it, twenty-two cents an hour; and other parts of the province, twenty cents an hour. Lest some hon. members from Ontario say this is only in Quebec, I want to disillusion them by citing the following for Ontario. In the Toronto area, $12.50 for female workers.

Mr. IRVINE: An hour?

Mr. ROSE: No, a week; and $11 in towns with a population of 5,000 to 50,000, and so on. I insist that this government cannot under any circumstances accept these as just and decent wage levels. These provincial minimum wage acts will not help to provide purchasing power for our people. It is true that at the dominion-provincial conference on reconstruction this government indicated willingness to discuss with the provinces the setting up of national minimum wage scales, but this is definitely insufficient. It was the responsibility of the government to come before the conference and suggest a minimum wage which they believe is a Canadian minimum wage. In this matter the federal government should have given the lead to the country. They should have told the provinces what they regarded as decent minimum wages for Canadians. How did President Truman react to the same problem? In the United States, too, they have constitutional difficulties, but President Truman did not hesitate to tell congress what sort of minimum wages he expected in the country. He said:

> The goal of a forty cent minimum was inadequate when established. It has now become obsolete. . . . I therefore recommend that the congress amend the Fair Labour Standards Act by substantially increasing the minimum wage specified therein to a level which will eliminate substandards of living, and assure the maintenance of the health, efficiency and general well-being of workers.

That is a different sort of language from what we find in the speech from the throne. I do not believe it is too late now for the government to go before the next session of the dominion-provincial conference and state what they believe a national minimum should be. There are constitutional difficulties, it is true, but the fight for a national minimum must be started some time, and the time is now. By giving such a lead, the government at the same time will discourage certain employers from going in for some terrific wage

slashes; and if any hon. member doubts that such a practice is being followed at the present time in Canada, or that there are certain employers bad enough to think we should have wage cuts now, I want to quote a statement I found in the Montreal *Standard* of September 1, 1945, made by Victor M. Drury, president of Canadian Car and Foundry. He is quoted as saying:

> The party is over. Not only will there not be enough jobs, but wages will have to be brought down to former peace-time levels. If the employees won't take a cut in wages, the plant will have to close down. We can't afford to have our profits cut into by paying the high war-time wage levels.

At the same time, according to the *Standard*, Mr. Drury admitted that the average take-home pay of his workers at no time was more than $28 a week.

After reading that statement in the *Standard* I decided to look into the figures of profits of various companies, and of course I was interested in Canadian Car and Foundry. After taxes and depreciation the net profits of this company were as follows:

1941	$ 700,000
1942	950,000
1943	830,000
1944	1,130,000

So I ask you, Mr. Speaker, whose party was it?

It is because there are employers of this type that labour needs greater protection on the part of this government. Of course primarily it will be up to the workers and their organizations to fight for what they want, but they also need protection on the part of the government. Therefore this government should help the labour movement achieve a forty-hour week (but with no cut in take-home pay so that there will be fewer unemployed), union security, and other measures that will help to maintain purchasing power.

In the speech from the throne this government speaks of a high level of employment. Here again I wish to say that we fall short of what President Truman gives as an objective for the people of the United States. He speaks about full employment, not high employment, and he has called upon congress to pass a full employment bill now before it. I have that measure before me to-night; it is known as the Murray-Wagner bill, and I want hon. members to listen attentively while I read from it, because we can afford to copy it, and not only to copy it on paper but to fight for it:

> All Americans able to work and seeking work have the right to useful, remunerative, regular and full-time employment, and it is the policy of the United States to assure the existence at all times of sufficient employment opportunities to enable all Americans who have finished their schooling and who do not have full-time housekeeping responsibilities freely to exercise this right. . . .
>
> How is it to be done?
>
> To the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be achieved, it is the further responsibility of the federal government to provide such volume of federal investment and expenditure as may be needed to assure continuing full employment.

Here they set down the responsibility in black and white, in a way that unfortunately we do not see in the speech from the throne or in any of the other statements made by government leaders. One of the ways to maintain purchasing power for the Canadian people is through public investment. Any programme of public investment must have as its aim the greatest possible contribution to the prosperity and well-being of the people, and I can think of no better investment than in homes for the people. In my first speech after coming into this house on January 26, 1943, I raised the problem of housing, because I saw that the situation was becoming more and more acute. At that time I called for the freezing of leases, and some hon. members thought that was not necessary. Well, since then the government has been forced to accept certain measures to which it would not listen at the time, but they far from meet the situation.

I am further reminded of the seriousness of the problem every time I return to my constituency. A few months ago a number of families living on a back lane came and asked me to plead with the municipal health authorities to allow them to remain in homes that had been condemned for the past twenty-five years, and were again condemned a few months ago. They were living in the centre of the city, with no electric lights and with leaking roofs. The situation was awful. I went to see those people in their homes and wondered how they could live there; yet they pleaded with me to be allowed to stay because they had nowhere else to go. Just before the opening of school this fall a French-Canadian woman came to plead with me to find a boarding house for her children. They were living in a store; she was ill and her children were ill, and they had to get out. The parents were going to take a room, and they wanted the children in the boarding home. Incidents like this can be multiplied hundreds of times throughout the country.

In this morning's Montreal *Gazette* we find the report of a meeting of a veterans' rehabilitation housing committee in Montreal, in

which the situation in respect of veterans returning from the armed forces is described as follows:

> It has been revealed that approximately 300 men of the three services are being discharged daily in the Montreal area and that nearly twenty per cent of these are in urgent need of housing accommodation. Since this has been going on all summer it is now estimated that between 4,000 and 5,000 families are now seeking accommodation.

Without in any way minimizing the value of legislation enacted, it is obvious from these facts that the situation is not being met so as to provide homes for veterans, and for all who need homes, and to provide employment for the people. This government must decide to take the responsibility for the rapid construction of homes. This has been tried for a number of years but those who were to build homes have failed. We are not getting along rapidly enough. If Wartime Housing can build them faster, then Wartime Housing should build them.

The advantages offered to the limited dividend corporations should be extended to municipalities. The government should consider other means of cheapening the prices of houses and should make further research into methods of standardization. Experience has been gained in Great Britain and elsewhere in these matters. Perhaps the government can undertake to pay part of the taxes to municipalities in respect of newly built homes. It is obvious that much more drastic measures have to be adopted if the situation is not to become worse.

In tackling the problem of reconversion, I wish again to emphasize to the house that social security is an essential feature in any programme to maintain purchasing power. Money distributed by the government to individuals either to maintain them during unemployment or in their old age, or to maintain public health, helps the nation as a whole, as well as the individual receiving it.

From this point of view the proposals of the federal government to the dominion-provincial conference on reconstruction regarding health measures, and other matters, constitute an advance and a substantial step forward, and should be supported by all. Despite the fact that the proposals for a national health programme are not ideal, I believe they deserve support. If there is opposition from certain circles I would urge the people of Canada, through their members in the house and through their organizations, to do something about it, so that we may put out of the way those who would obstruct the application of the health programme offered by the federal government.

In respect to the problem of old age pensions I must be much more critical. I say that $30 a month does not mean a decent standard of living to anyone; and seventy years of age—that is a long time to wait. I would say that we need at least an old age pension of $50, and that it should be given without a means test at the age of sixty-five.

I know there are difficulties in connection with implementing the proposals offered by the federal government and some of those difficulties have been created by some of the provincial governments. I hope none of the provincial governments will stand in the way of the application of these health and other measures, so that action may be taken without delay. If some governments in the provinces refuse to go along with the federal government, then the government at Ottawa should be prepared to act in unison with those provinces which are now willing to collaborate.

The measures I have described might be described as domestic measures. But they are most necessary if we are to increase or to maintain the purchasing power of the people. Might I point out, however, that there are other means of maintaining purchasing power, and that one of these is the development of greater export trade. It is a fact that thirty per cent of our workers depend upon exports.

There is a great need for our products in many countries of Europe and Asia. But the people in those countries cannot pay to-day. They must have long-term credits. From press reports I have learned that the government is contemplating substantial credits to Great Britain and France. This is good. Such a policy is in accord with Canada's needs, as well as our responsibility to those people who have suffered. But it is not enough. To keep our export industries working at capacity it is essential that Canada should also maintain all the other outlets, and create new ones in a number of countries, including Belgium, Greece, Poland, Jugoslavia, the Soviet Union, China and the Latin-America countries. We shall have to "step on it" to see that we help these countries to-day in their reconstruction, so that to-morrow they may be permanent customers for our goods, thereby helping to create work for our people.

In the remarks I have made this evening I have concentrated chiefly upon problems of reconversion, because I believe they are the key problems of the day. The manner in which the house deals with these problems will be the test of our ability to meet the problems of peace as effectively as we met the problems

of war. We won the war because we allowed nothing to stand in the way of our war effort. We can win the peace if we approach the problem with the same determination.

I do not often permit myself to indulge in pessimism. I believe no hon. member can charge that I have done that. I wish to say, however, that unless the government meets the needs of the people in the present emergency we may find that we are heading back for the hungry thirties.

I should like to deal with a number of other matters, but in order not to offer any distraction from this key problem of reconversion I would simply add, in passing, that I fully endorse the idea of a Canadian flag and of Canadian citizenship, and have so expressed myself in the house on other occasions.

There is one further problem upon which I should like to touch before concluding my remarks. This one deals with destruction rather than reconstruction. Every hon. member must have been impressed with the report of the terrible devastation newsmen found in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. It staggers the imagination of human beings to realize what will happen to our civilization if this dreadful weapon should ever again be used in war between nations.

We in Canada have a special responsibility in this connection because of the great deposits of uranium which are to be found in our country. If science succeeds in harnessing this mighty power to the service of human well-being, I am sure that as a nation we will gladly share this tremendous natural asset with the other peoples of the world, but until that day the potentialities of the atomic bomb for destruction should not be placed at the disposal of any nation to use against other nations. I propose that this house and government place the uranium deposits of Canada at the disposal and under the control of the security council of the united nations organization, and under the control of that body alone. Such action will be more than a gesture; it will be a concrete demonstration of Canada's will for peace. Such action, along with policies aimed at full employment at home and generous assistance to our allies in repairing the destruction of war, will be a significant contribution by Canada toward lasting peace and prosperity in the world.

Mr. ANDREW E. ROBINSON (Bruce): Mr. Speaker, may I first offer my congratulations to you upon your election to the high office you now occupy. I am sure you will fulfil your duties as they should be fulfilled. To the mover (Mr. Benidickson) and the seconder (Mr. Langlois) of the address in reply to the speech from the throne, who like myself are new members, I offer my congratulations upon the wonderful speeches they made. To our Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) I wish, not continued success as a politician but health and longevity. To the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) I wish publicly to acknowledge my allegiance. To the hon. members of the political parties in this house I wish the best guidance.

I represent the county of Bruce and I am proud to represent that constituency. There cannot be many hon. members in this house who are not familiar with the good qualities of Bruce. During this session we have heard the Peace River district spoken well of by the hon. member for that riding (Mr. Low). We have heard about High Park from the hon. member from that riding (Mr. McMaster). I should like to tell the house a few things about my riding. First and foremost, Bruce is known over this country as one of the best, if not the best counties in the dominion. Bruce has put forth a tremendous effort toward winning this war and the war of 1914-18; in men, money and materials we have contributed a great share. In the past Bruce has contributed greatly toward populating the western provinces, those provinces which have done so much toward feeding the hungry people of the world. Speaking as a Bruce boy, I must say that I am not too proud of the political trend that has taken place in some of these western provinces. To those who are thinking along the same lines may I say that they should not worry because these people are good people and eventually will see the error of their ways.

Not the least achievements of Bruce have been the able men that the county has sent to the different parliaments of Canada, myself excluded. We are proud to claim the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) of the present government as a native of our county. There are Senators Donnelly and Marshall who are active in the senate at the present time. In our town of Kincardine we are glad to have with us yet the Hon. Hugh Clark who for many years served our riding and the government of Canada in time of war. The late Hon. James Malcolm, who in his time was Minister of Trade and Commerce, was also a Bruce boy. We have no great centres of learning in our county, but we have produced many men and women who have made outstanding records in the business and professional life of the country.

At the present time there is in Ottawa a deputation of Indians, the original inhabitants of this country. They are here to have injustices removed and grievances corrected.

In that delegation our Indian people of Bruce are represented. One of them is a sergeant and another a corporal who were in the same unit with me overseas in the last war. We had a platoon of those Indian boys in our unit and I feel safe in saying that there was not a better platoon in the Canadian army. We must remember that the Indians were here before we were, and the least we can do is to give them their just dues and the comforting assurance that their future welfare is in good hands. May I at this point read to the house a letter which I received from a corporal of Indian ancestry who is now overseas. This is from B company, first battalion, Regina Rifle Regiment, Canadian army overseas, under date of June 1, 1945, and reads:

To your letter of March 15, 1945, which I just received a few days ago due to changes of address. It took time for the postal corps to find me.

I have done you the favour asked by you. I myself have no use to, whatever party may be in. As to my status of civil life I am an Indian. I have no citizenship. All I have is a vote which is no good to me whatever. I have no voice in government, therefore my attitude to the government is poor. In the past I was looked down upon. It is what the future may bring can only change that, to change it from that. Can you give me some advice on what I could do in line of farming. Not that I want a big one. I want one that can bring me some profit, to be independent, to get by in every way. I understand the ups and downs of a farmer. Right now I am at wit's end. I am afraid to step into civic street. The setback I face is bigger than the battles of the beachhead in Normandy.

I would be very grateful for any advice I may get.

I thank you.

Why should that boy not be given the chance of settling down on a farm under the veterans' reestablishment scheme without losing his rights and status as an Indian?

While Bruce county is the finest in Canada economically, we are not in the best position that it should be possible for the people of this country to achieve. For a number of years now we have not made the progress that it was our right to expect, due partly to the fact that Bruce is principally a rural county and agriculture is not getting its fair share of national income, and due partly to the centralization of industry.

At the present time, Canada has an acute housing shortage, but let me say, Mr. Speaker, that we have no housing shortage on the farms of Bruce county, and I feel safe in saying that Bruce county is typical of most rural counties all over Canada. To save the situation we must have decentralization, and to have decentralization we must revise transportation rates and power rates. By so doing we shall keep alive those centres like Bruce which have done so much toward building the country we live in and love. If consideration is not given to these facts Bruce, along with similar counties, will decline in population and in productivity.

It is nice to see our industrial centres grow, but if they grow at the expense of our smaller urban places and at the expense of our agricultural counties, we know that such is not good for the future of Canada.

Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to mention one of the greatest problems in Canada to-day, namely unity within our dominion. I believe that every hon. member is interested in finding a remedy. In this war it fell to my lot to have charge of a platoon of sixty men engaged in loading and unloading ships on the east coast. In that platoon were men from every province. Those men got along good together, and I believe that was the case in most units. The mixing up of those men from all over Canada will, I believe, help in the future toward unity; knowing each other's viewpoint will also help. To learn one another's language will go a long way toward solving the problem.

International good will is just one step on, a step that will ensure peace for the world. With the world machinery we have to-day it should be possible to arrange an exchange of scholarships throughout the world that would help every nation better to understand that we are all human beings.

I shall not criticize the present government, but I wish to state two facts: (1) The present administration did not have Canada ready for war in 1939; (2) in 1945 the present administration has not Canada prepared for peace. We all believe that Canada is the best country in the world. Let us get together and prove that such is so.

Mr. D. F. BROWN (Essex West): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on behalf of probably the finest constituency in the Dominion of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh!

Mr. BROWN: I am glad to see that hon. members agree with me. While we have a diversity of population, we have at least honesty of purpose. We are all hardworking, thrifty and sincere, and I think all hon. members will agree that we are a dynamic people. I refer, of course, to the constituency of Essex West, and in particular to the city of Windsor.

I should like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the gentleman whom I have succeeded. I refer to the Hon. Norman A. McLarty, a gentleman and a scholar who devoted a great part of his life to his country and to his constituency in particular.

I should also like to compliment the mover (Mr. Benidickson) and the seconder (Mr. Langlois) of the address in reply to the speech from the throne. It makes me feel proud to be a Liberal to be associated with these fine young men.

I can not let this opportunity pass without paying a tribute also to the one who has done do much for Canada, one who has given, shall I say, his human sense of life to his country. I refer to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King).

I should also like to pay tribute to the men and women of the armed services. We shall never be able to repay them for what they have expended for us. We can, therefore, only make an attempt at giving some satisfaction.

To you, Mr. Speaker, I extend my congratulations. You have already shown in your conduct of the proceedings of this assembly that you are being fair and conscientious.

It is interesting for me as a child in this House of Commons to sit here and listen to this debate. It is interesting from many points of view, because in this assembly we get the thinking of all parts of Canada. I shall not say what I think of that thinking, but at least it is an expression of what is being thought throughout the country. While some of our debate may seem frivolous or not very sound to the people at large, yet it is an expression that should not and, I am sure, will not be curtailed. However, sir, I hope you will not think it presumptuous of me to take exception to a remark that was made in this chamber this afternoon. As I heard the remark, it was that politics "stinks to high heaven." Well, I agree with the speaker that probably in Alberta it does. But we in Essex county elect Liberals. I take exception to that, because I think there is nothing finer for a young man or a young woman in this country than to get out and take an active part in the public affairs of the nation. I feel sure that if we would all do that honestly, conscientiously and intelligently, there would not be so many political parties in the house. Politics to me is the science of government, and as such should be studied thoroughly by everyone. If that were done, the people, especially the younger people, would be more interested; we would get a more representative vote, and we would probably have better government.

I want to commend the proposals in the speech from the throne, in particular that with respect to the memorial by way of beautification of the city of Ottawa. Taking the dominion as a whole, and likening it to a human body or individuality, one can probably say that Ottawa manifests the mind or the soul of the nation, for a nation we are; and as such manifestation it should be beautiful, complete and perfect. From a practical aspect, beautification would attract not only the constituents whom we represent, but people from outside our country, people who would come here to enjoy the beauty and to create for us a more friendly world. If we bring about that beautification of Ottawa there would be a certain material return, for I think we shall agree that the tourist business is one of Canada's largest industries. The human anatomy cannot be complete without the manifestation of the face, the eyes, and the limbs, and so it is that the beautification of Ottawa is not complete until we have a contribution from all the outlying parts.

Speaking on behalf of Essex West, we live in a district which has in front of its door more lake fresh water traffic than any other fresh water system in the world, passing by it. We have lake St. Clair at the north and lake Erie to the south. Across the river to the north of us—this may sound strange—is the city of Detroit, for Detroit is to a great extent to the north of Windsor. Detroit, which surrounds us on three sides, has a population of about two million people. Two hundred and fifty miles away is the city of Chicago with about four million people. About a hundred miles away is the city of Cleveland; also near us are the thickly populated states of Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, and others. I do not need to tell the house of the population of that area.

We have in the city of Windsor, as I have said, a dynamic people. We have set up a town planning commission for the purpose of beautification and putting the city in proper order. The people of that constituency have an active art association, an active handicraft guild, and other cultural and literary societies and movements which express the thought of our people. What I am getting at is this: the city of Ottawa should be beautified, and I know it will be; but probably more tourists visit the city of Windsor and the county of Essex in one week than find their way to the city of Ottawa in six months. Being practical, I think we should try to capture a part of that traffic, not only for the material purpose of making money, but to let our friends see what we have, find out what kind of people we are, and cement the bonds of friendship which unite our two peoples. So that, I would recommend to this government that it consider ways and means of beautifying not only the city of Windsor but other ports of entry; because when we regard the human anatomy,

the first thing we look at is the face, the eyes; and those ports of entry correspond to the face. Therefore, let us make those ports of entry spots of beauty which may attract tourists and help our common cause.

On motion of Mr. Claxton the debate was adjourned.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Friday, September 14, 1945.

The house met at three o'clock.

WAR AND DEMOBILIZATION BILL

REQUEST FOR TABLING OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS AND AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question I had intended asking the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley). However, in the absence of the minister, perhaps the Prime Minister would answer. If the answer is not immediately available, we could have it later.

According to the orders of the day we shall shortly be considering a government bill in respect of war expenditures and demobilization. Before that is proceeded with we should have before us the public accounts for the last fiscal year. I would ask the Minister of Finance to table the public accounts and the auditor general's report for the fiscal year ended March 31 last, at the earliest possible time.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I can assure my hon. friend the reports will be tabled at the earliest moment after they become available. I shall direct the attention of the Minister of Finance to the question, for further reply.

[*Later:*]

Mr. BRACKEN: Would the Minister of Finance mind answering the question I asked in his absence a few minutes ago?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): The leader of the opposition was good enough to send me notice of the question which he asked, I believe, before I came in to-day, regarding the tabling of the public accounts and the auditor general's report for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1945. The statute, the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, provides for the tabling of these documents on or before October 31 if the house is in session, and if the house is not then in session in any year within one week after the house begins to sit thereafter. We have been trying to get ready to comply with that provision of the act, that is to have these reports ready by October 31. They certainly cannot be ready before that, and I am sorry to say that I am afraid it will be physically impossible to have them ready by that date. I am told that there is a shortage of help in the printing bureau, there is a great press of printing work, and I may have to resort to some expedient or take some measure to give ourselves a little time, even then. However, I gather it does not make very much difference, so long as we cannot get it before the discussion, whether it is October 31 or a little later.

WAR EXPENDITURES

INQUIRY AS TO SETTING UP OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE —WAR ASSETS CORPORATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Arising out of the answer given by the Prime Minister to the question asked by the leader of the opposition I should like to know if the government will again consider the setting up of a war expenditures committee to study war expenditures as well as the activities of the War Assets Corporation?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I would mention to my hon. friend that there will be a public accounts committee. With respect to setting up further special committees at this session, I shall be glad to see that his suggestion is considered, but I am not in position at the moment to give a reply.

WATER CONSERVATION

LETHBRIDGE SOUTHEAST PROJECT—ST. MARY RIVER DAM

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Munitions and Supply. Will the minister make a statement to the house at an early day telling us when he expects to proceed with the construction of the St. Mary river dam, part of the Lethbridge southeast water conservation project in southern Alberta?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): The project mentioned is receiving the attention of the Department of Muni-

tions and Supply. I am not sure that I shall be able to announce the date of commencement at an early day. However, I shall do so as soon as I can.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Is the work likely to commence this fall?

Mr. HOWE: No, it will not commence this fall.

MERCHANT SEAMEN

SPECIAL BONUS FOR SERVICE IN DANGEROUS WATERS S.S. "PRINCE EDWARD"

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. CHESTER S. McLURE (Queens): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. Through the minister the government has announced that it will pay a special bonus amounting to ten per cent of total earnings for service at sea to any seaman who has served on a Canadian ship for at least six months in dangerous waters, since September 10, 1939. My question is this: Are the seamen of the S.S. *Prince Edward* who had been sailing in the Northumberland straits in complete black-out and with an escort of planes on occasions when submarines were sighted to be entitled to this special bonus? I ask this question on behalf of Prince Edward division No. 127 of the Canadian brotherhood of railway employees and other transport workers.

Hon. LIONEL CHEVRIER (Minister of Transport): I received the hon. gentleman's question shortly before coming down to the house. I made inquiry from the director of merchant seamen but I have not before me sufficient information to give him a reply now. I shall attempt to give him this early next week.

MUNITIONS AND SUPPLY

LAY-OFF OF MEN EMPLOYED ON GUN MOUNTINGS AT NEW GLASGOW, N.S.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. P. C. BLACK (Cumberland): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Muntions and Supply. The president of the board of trade at New Glasgow, Nova Scotia, informs me that several hundred men who have been employed on the building of gun mountings have been notified by the minister's department to discontinue work and they are receiving notices of dismissal. There are eighteen gun mountings in process of manufacture, five being for Canadian needs. It is desired that these guns be completed, if at all possible, pending the supplying of other employment. Can the minister make a statement?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): I have no personal knowledge of the situation at New Glasgow. My hon. friend will appreciate that the Department of Munitions and Supply is merely the agent for the armed services. When instructions come from the armed services to cancel an order, we cancel it. If the information received by my hon. friend is correct and the order has been cancelled, the Department of Munitions and Supply would not be in a position to change the situation.

CATTLE

CARRY-OVER IN TORONTO STOCK YARDS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. C. SENN (Haldimand): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture relating to the question I asked yesterday. In view of the statement made by the president of the Toronto stock yards that the statement of the Minister of Agriculture yesterday regarding the weighing capacity of the Toronto stock yards was in error, will the minister now give assurance that further excess holdovers of live stock will not be allowed to accumulate which result in depressed prices to producers?

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): I wish to thank the hon. member for having sent me a copy of his question. I have checked the report of the president of the live stock association at Toronto. His statement is to the effect that while there were 5,700 cattle on the market on Monday the weighing capacity is 4,000 instead of 3,500. That corrects my statement to the extent of making the weighing capacity 500 more than the figure I gave yesterday, which was based on an eight-hour day.

Mr. SENN: He says "in excess of."

Mr. GARDINER: But even the president's figure of weighing capacity leaves 1,700 cattle that could not have been weighed. I have the statement I made yesterday before me and here is what I said, as reported on page 131 of *Hansard:*

> I can say that there often is a carry-over on the Toronto market at the beginning of the week but I do not think it is usually due to the fact that there are no buyers.

Cattle accumulate over the week-end. There is always a very heavy run of cattle on the Toronto market on Monday, or at

least there usually is, and the result is the weighing capacity is not sufficient to weigh the cattle on Monday. Monday of this week was no exception to other weeks. There were 5,826 cattle on the Toronto market on Monday which means that there were over 1,800 that could not have been weighed even taking the statement made by the president of the association.

The proposal we have made in order to remedy this situation—this proposal was in a document I was quoting from yesterday—is to have Mr. Fletcher himself go on the radio, along with one of our men, and make an appeal to the farmers in the area who supply cattle to Toronto to spread their cattle more evenly over the week than they have been doing in order that the marketing capacity will be sufficient and in order that buyers can take them as they come. In order to indicate the importance of this I should like to give the numbers that have been marketed on that market during the last six weeks. They are:

Week of—	Total cattle sales
August 9	4,616
August 16	5,606
August 23	7,884
August 30	8,829
September 6	6,938
September 13	8,082

It will be obvious to hon. members that if those cattle were spread over the whole week the weighing capacity and purchasing capacity of that market could be utilized to much better advantage than by simply trying to rush all cattle in on Monday. The highest number here is 8,829, and if you are going to put 5,800 of those on the market in one day it is obvious that the facilities sufficient to handle cattle in that manner cannot be maintained on an economical basis in the city of Toronto. The suggestion is to have them spread their cattle over the week and we have asked the president to go on the radio along with our man and make that appeal to the farmers. We think the proper way to deal with the question is to ask and secure the cooperation of all parties to make the best possible use of the existing facilities.

MEAT RATIONING

REFERENCE TO REPORTED SPOILING OF COOKED MEATS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): I should like to ask the Minister of Finance if representations have been made to him that large quantities of cooked meats have been spoiling because of the rationing and will consideration be given to removing certain kinds of cooked meats from the ration list.

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): No representations have been made to me, but I saw an item in the press referring to meat pies, if I remember correctly.

Mr. MacINNIS: I have another wire from British Columbia.

Mr. ILSLEY: I will bring that situation to the attention of the rationing authorities and see if any solution can be found to the problem presented.

SMALL PACKERS—TRIMMINGS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. H. HARRIS (Danforth): Yesterday the Minister of Finance was good enough to say that to-day he would answer the rationing question I raised with regard to provision for meat trimmings which are processed for sale in the larger centres of population, and unsold meat such as meat pies. Will the minister clarify the situation?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): I did not understand yesterday that that was the complaint of the packers who sent in the telegrams. I think the best way to clear the matter up is for the hon. member to send me a copy of the telegrams and I will see what answer I can suggest to them and what the situation is.

I made inquiries so as to put myself in a position to answer my hon. friend's question of yesterday, and I was informed that the meat rationing regulations provide for trimmings by naming coupon values for them when sold by anyone at wholesale or at retail. Trimmings are usually processed into sausage, bologna, cooked meat, and so on, and the consumer coupon values of these processed meats are more favourable than coupon values of fresh or processed meat cuts. That is the statement of the rationing authorities. Apparently it is not working very satisfactorily, according to the questions which have been asked to-day and the items that appear in the press, and there may be some possibility of an adjustment of coupon values or something of the kind.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): The minister has already had the copies of the telegrams, but I will give him the originals.

WAR CRIMINALS

JAPANESE—RULES GOVERNING QUESTIONS ON ORDERS OF THE DAY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. D. FULTON (Kamloops): I have two questions to put to the Prime Minister, and as they are closely related I ask the right hon. gentleman to permit me to put them together. The first is: The Prime Minister made a statement yesterday as to the trials of European war criminals but he did not cover the case of Japanese war criminals. Will he please clarify the situation in this respect and in particular will he state whether the procedure in trials of Japanese war criminals is to be the same as that which he outlined yesterday?

The second question is: According to statements recently appearing in the press, Canadian prisoners of war in Japanese hands have said that the most brutal of their captors was a Canadian-born Japanese. The individual in question is alleged to have been born or to have resided—I am changing the wording slightly—in my constituency of Kamloops, British Columbia. Will the Prime Minister please inform the house whether this person will be tried by Canadian court martial?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): My hon. friend sent me notice of his question. To the first question I would reply that the question of the trials of Japanese war criminals is now under discussion by the nations which participated in the war in the Pacific, preliminary to its being presented to the united nations war crimes commission. It is probable that arrangements will be made to have Japanese war criminals tried by military courts.

With regard to the second question, I should like to direct my hon. friend's attention to the rules that govern the asking of and replying to questions. Possibly it would be of interest to some hon. members who are not familiar with the rules if before attempting to answer this question I were to read the rule which governs the asking of questions. Beauchesne's "Rules and Forms", standing order 44 set forth is as follows:

> Questions may be placed on the order paper seeking information from ministers of the crown relating to public affairs; . . . but in putting any such question or in replying to the same no argument or opinion is to be offered, nor any facts stated, except so far as may be necessary to explain the same.

This rule, of course, applies to any question that is asked on the orders of the day instead of being handed in to the Clerk to appear on the order paper.

May I say to my hon. friend that both questions might have been handed in to the Clerk rather than asked on the orders of the day, because they are not of such an immediately pressing nature that the time of the house on the orders of the day should be taken up with the question and answer. But I am very happy to make the answer I have done to his first question.

Let me read the second question, as my hon. friend has himself stated it:

> According to statements recently appearing in the press, Canadian prisoners of war in Japanese hands have said that the most brutal of their captors was a Canadian-born Japanese. The individual in question—

My hon. friend has changed the next words from "was born, as a matter of fact," to read:

> —is alleged to have been born or resided in my own constituency of Kamloops, British Columbia. Will the Prime Minister please inform the house whether this person will be tried by Canadian court martial?

In the first place, I do not know who this person is who is referred to. May I say that I think my hon. friend will see, and the house will see, that the question as it is worded has been drafted not so much for the purpose of obtaining information as for the purpose of supplying to the country certain representations which may or may not be true. My hon. friend must assume full responsibility for the accuracy of the statements that are appearing in the press before I can begin to answer his question.

That would be the first thing. But apart from that, what the hon. member has stated in his question is not necessary at all to obtain the information that he is really seeking from the government, which is whether or not the trial of war criminals will be by Canadian court martial, even if they happen to be Canadians.

Let me read what May's "Parliamentary Practice", 12th edition, has to say in support of what I have quoted from the standing orders. It is quoted by Beauchesne, in his second edition, at page 113, as follows:

> The purpose of a question is to obtain information and not to supply it to the house. A question may not contain statements of facts unless they be necessary to make the question intelligible and can be authenticated; nor should a question contain arguments, inferences, imputations, epithets or controversial or ironic expressions.

The house will recognize that the question does contain alleged statements of fact, statements however which are not necessarily authentic. I think also that the question is so phrased as to give rise to some controversy.

I hope that my hon. friend will not think that I was not anxious to answer his question, but it is important that the rules of the house should be observed in these particulars. I would emphasize again that where a question is of the kind that has just been asked, it should be placed on the order paper rather than directed to the ministry on the orders of the day. A further reason for having it placed on the order paper is that the Clerk himself would see whether the question was properly worded or not, and if it were not properly worded he would direct the attention of the member to it privately.

I have spoken of this matter, not by way of criticism, but rather by way of explanation so that hon. members may not unintentionally disregard any rule of the house.

HOUSING

BUILDING MATERIALS FOR WAR VETERANS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. B. McKAY (Weyburn): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to direct to the Minister of Veterans Affairs. Is there a government order forbidding or limiting the sale of building materials to war veterans in the Ottawa district or elsewhere in Canada, first, under private contract, and second, under the Veterans Land Act?

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I received notice of the question just before I entered the house. The answer in both cases is in the negative.

QUESTION AS TO THE FREEZING OF PLUMBING MATERIALS IN PARTLY CONSTRUCTED HOUSES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. H. HARRIS (Danforth): May I receive a reply to my question on the wartime prices and trade board order regarding the priorities on plumbing fixtures, either from the Minister of Finance, or from the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply to whom the Minister of Finance referred the question yesterday? He has had twenty-four hours' notice, and perhaps I can now have an answer.

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction): The question was asked yesterday whether there was an order freezing plumbing fixtures. The answer was no, is no, and always will be no, I think.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): I should like to ask the Minister of Reconstruction if the order of the wartime prices and trade board giving priority to ten items of plumbing fixtures is to be rescinded or is to stay in effect and have the effect of freezing the plumbing supplies on houses which are partly finished until such time as this priority is lifted.

Mr. HOWE: I am sure my colleague who administers the wartime prices and trade board will take the second question under advisement, and reply.

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

INQUIRY AS TO PERSONNEL DESIROUS OF REMAINING IN SERVICE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. R. PEARKES (Nanaimo): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Defence for the army? Is he aware that a large number of desirable and experienced personnel who would otherwise consider remaining in the Canadian armed forces are now being discharged daily owing to lack of information as to the future size and conditions of service in the permanent forces to be maintained by this country? Will the minister make a statement on this subject?

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish to draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that he is not simply asking a question but rather is giving information to the house. I would appreciate very much the cooperation of every member in abiding by the rules of the house.

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I agree with your ruling, but with your permission, as the hon. member did give me notice of his question, perhaps I might be permitted to reply in view of the fact that the question was so framed as to purport to give information rather than to seek it.

In reply I would say that the conditions of service in the permanent force will, of course, be announced in due course. Some time ago the conditions of service in the interim force were made public, and they are now in the hands of commanding officers in all districts both here and overseas. We have not forced the demobilization of any man who has evidenced a desire to continue in the armed forces.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

LONGSHOREMEN'S RESERVE LABOUR POOL

On the orders of the day:

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the hon. members for Halifax have been inquiring about the Longshoremen's reserve labour pool, and I now wish to table copies of order in council

P.C. 5980 passed on September 11, providing for the abolition of this pool on November 3, next.

This revokes the stabilization of longshore labour order of June 25, 1943. Members are aware of how important Halifax was during the war and the necessity for the quick turning around of ships in order to rush supplies to Europe.

Under order in council P.C. 3511 dated April 30, 1942, a controller of loading operations was appointed at Halifax to supervise more efficient organizing of the working force there. What turned out to be a most effective means was the establishment of a central dispatching agency, through which longeshoremen sought and were assigned to jobs. Then came the setting up of the labour pool to assure that there would always be men on hand to handle the uninterrupted stream of war materials passing through the port.

I may say that the pool has worked out very satisfactorily in heading off labour shortages and assuring that cargoes were loaded and unloaded promptly and Atlantic convoys not delayed.

Recently I was in Halifax and conferred with employers and union leaders concerned because an undertaking had been given by me that no change would be made in the labour arrangements at the end of the war without such consultation.

I cannot speak too highly of the cooperation which has been extended to the government by both the employers and the port workers. Carrying on under adverse conditions and under great pressure, they combined to do a vitally important war job in a splendid way.

I think it is true that the unglamorous jobs of the war are not sufficiently known to the general public. Perhaps the rest of Canada has heard very little of what the longshoremen at Halifax and other ports did during the war, and it should be known that their efficient and conscientious service was a most important part of our war effort.

Consideration is now being given to continuing the hiring facilities for longshoremen, up to now carried on by the dispatching agency, as a permanent function of the national employment service.

DAYLIGHT SAVING

REVERSION TO STANDARD TIME ON SEPTEMBER 30

On the orders of the day:

Hon. PAUL MARTIN (Secretary of State): On Tuesday last, in answer to a question by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken), I stated that it was proposed to revert from daylight saving to standard time at a date subsequently to be announced. The present intention is to revert from daylight saving to standard time in Canada as and from two o'clock a.m. Sunday, September 30 of the present year.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Thursday, September 13, consideration of the motion of Mr. W. M. Benidickson for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Bracken, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Hon. BROOKE CLAXTON (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, may I first join those who congratulated you on your appointment to the highest office in this house. I do so for two special reasons, the first of which is our long association and friendship, which goes back long before either of us had the honour of election to this house; the second is that I happen to represent a Montreal division, and I am sure I express the satisfaction of all citizens of Montreal of all races at your election at this time. I feel, too, that their satisfaction will be equalled by that of members in all parts of the house in the way in which you have begun your duties and in which we are sure you will continue to carry them out.

In addition to congratulating the mover and the seconder of the address and many of the other speakers who have taken part, may I especially refer for a personal reason to the election and speech of the hon. member for Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare (Mr. Baker), because of a friendship which goes back a good deal longer than seems possible when one realizes that he was young enough to serve the country during this war for the length of time that he did.

There is another member, too, to whom I should like especially to refer, namely, the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario (Mr. Macdonnell) with whom I have had a friendship going back more than twenty years, with whom I have been associated in many good causes, and with whom I hope I shall continue to be associated in working for the good of Canada, he in his way and I in mine. Most hon. members in most parts of the house will agree that his speech was reasonable and fair. We on this side of the house say that particularly, not only because of the reasonable way in which it was delivered, but also because his views on the two concrete matters with which he dealt, namely controls and taxation, were almost exactly in accord with the policies of

the government as laid down in the white paper and in the proposals of the government of Canada to the dominion-provincial conference on reconstruction.

Might I express, also, sir, a special word of welcome to the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mrs. Strum). She said that she was the sole representative of her sex in the house. I think there are 244 members in this house who will say that that is not strictly accurate, because most of us could not have been elected without the support of the women electors of our constituencies. What is more correct, perhaps, is that she is the sole example of her sex in this house; and I hope that time will cure that condition.

I should like to express the hope that she as a woman as well as a member will take a special interest in the affairs of the Department of National Health and Welfare, concerned as it is with matters pertaining to the health and welfare of the people of Canada so far as those matters lie within the jurisdiction of the federal government. May I indeed invite the attention of all hon. members to these matters. This is a time when social security is very much to the fore, and I hope that hon. members in all parts of the house will not hesitate to bring to the attention of myself and the officers of the department matters relating to its business.

Not long ago I wrote a letter to all members of the house expressing that hope and I am glad to say that we have not been flooded with complaints. I really mean it when I say that the work of this new department can be greatly assisted, facilitated and extended if its affairs become a matter of general interest and members on all sides really take an active interest in our work for the health and welfare of the people of Canada, and give us their support.

The organization of the department has proceeded and we were in the position to begin the payment of family allowances on the day planned, namely the 18th of July. Since then, in fact, by next week over four million cheques will have been issued to 1,300,000 families in Canada. I wish I had time to put before the house and before the people of Canada some of the letters that we have received in acknowledgment of these cheques. People in all parts of Canada, in every kind of circumstance, have sent in the most moving letters saying how this cheque will be spent for the welfare of the child, how it will mean clothing, dental care, camp, education, more health, more nutrition for the members of the family.

It is quite a temptation during this debate to follow hon. members of the opposition in some of their remarks, but to-day I thought it would be better to deal with the dominion government's proposals to the conference on reconstruction, particularly, if I have time, as they relate to health and welfare. The proposals there put forward with regard to social security were not new. They were foreshadowed in the speech from the throne delivered on January 27, 1944. Many of them were implemented by legislation during the session of 1944 and then they were referred to again in the speech from the throne on January 31, 1945.

Before I go on to deal with them, however, I should like to make one or two short observations. Some hon. members have expressed concern over matters of demobilization, reconversion and housing. Every member of this house is concerned with such matters, just as everyone in Canada is concerned with them, and everyone in every other country in the world is similarly concerned over such matters. But I believe that as the facts are laid before hon. members during this session and as they reach the public, it will come to be recognized that the people of Canada have less cause for concern over these matters than the people in any other country in the world.

We must count the blessings that we have in this country when we consider that we are in a world that has been shattered and shocked by six years of war, with its unparalleled destruction of human life, of property, of means of transportation, of channels of trade and habits of association, destruction possibly of moral standards that will have to be slowly built up. When we consider the position of Canada and contrast it with that of practically every other country we should count our blessings. We should consider our resources, consider our capacity to produce food, minerals, consider manufactured goods, which has been built up during the war, consider the skills that our people have added unto themselves during the war and their ability to meet every challenge war has made.

Recognizing this, hon. members will not be surprised that Canada to-day has the standing that it has in the eyes of other countries. It almost takes attendance at a conference of other nations such as that of San Francisco or Bretton Woods or UNRRA or the food conference, meeting the representatives of other nations and hearing what they have to say about our country, hearing the admiration and respect they express for our country and its people, for us Canadians to realize that things are not so bad after all.

Then, too, it is fair to say that while the war effort has been the work of the Canadian

people working in a great partnership, it has been possible to develop administrative knowledge and the skills that are necessary to lead and direct that effort. That is perhaps shown most dramatically in our control of prices, our prevention of inflation, brought home by the fact that to-day the Canadian dollar buys more than its equivalent in any other country.

Some people during the war have exploited the difficulties and even the disasters of war for purposes of their own. We must not fall into the habit of exploiting the difficulties—and they are real—of the period of transition over to peace as if peace itself were a disaster. Let us look at the facts and let us develop them here. Let us blow away some of the smoke of battle, some of the smoke of the election, and some of the smoke-screen that has been developed from time to time.

Remember this, that the celebration of victory over Japan took place on the 15th of August, a month ago to-morrow, and that the surrender of Japan took place on the 2nd of September, two weeks ago to-day. When we consider that and then look at the problems of demobilization and reconversion and get the facts as they will be developed in this house, the Canadian people will not have cause for anything but confidence in the future.

From the point of view of demobilization I may say—and this is a fact that very few Canadians appreciate—that we have demobilized something like 400,000 men and women of the armed services since the outbreak of war. We know what we are doing. We have demobilized 100,000 since V-E day on the 8th of May.

From the point of view of housing, this house will receive assurances that every house for which materials can be made available is being planned and built. From the point of view of conversion, I think the relative figures of employment as they will be brought before the house will show that we are to-day as far advanced as any other country, if not farther.

The fact is that we in Canada have a Canadian habit which is a good one, that of judging our Canadian practice by the best that can be found anywhere else in the world. The remarkable thing is that we can usually measure up to that standard.

The government of Canada, far from being caught flat-footed with its plans for reconversion, presented in the week of the atomic bomb and the Russian declaration of war its post-war proposals to the provinces. Some hon. members seem to forget that Canada is not a country of one government but a country having one federal government with nine provincial governments. The needs of our people can be satisfactorily met only if all the governments cooperate in arriving at satisfactory arrangements to meet the needs, not of government, but of the people of Canada and of every part of Canada. Then, an arrangement, having been arrived at, it should be carried out in a spirit of cooperation and goodwill, with the recognition that what seems to have proved to the advantage of one or another instrument of state is really working to the advantage or disadvantage of the people, of people like ourselves.

I would have thought, Mr. Speaker, that the dominion government's proposals to the conference on reconstruction would receive a good deal of attention during this debate. I think they met with general satisfaction. These proposals are responsible. They were put forward by the government after months of study. A subcommittee of the cabinet was set up in February, not February, 1945, but February, 1944, to plan the work of preparation for the conference. Fifteen intergovernmental departmental committees were established, and practically every department of the government was brought into the work of preparation at one time or another. Then, too, we asked the provinces more than a year ago to send their financial experts to Ottawa to work with us in a spirit of cooperation in order to arrive at statistics and figures which would be on a fair and comparable basis. I am glad to say that the representatives of the provinces came here; they worked loyally together and arrived at a book containing figures which must be the basis of any study on this subject, and that has been substantially agreed to by the provinces represented. There has been no dispute about that. After the proposals had been passed through the expert stage they were considered day after day by a cabinet subcommittee and then day after day by the cabinet itself. They represent a considered and responsible plan.

These proposals are practical; they contain detailed economic and other information, and the detailed economic studies to support them have already been made. Engineering studies necessary to carry out the work contemplated there are already completed or are so far advanced that no work which may be decided upon need be held up for lack of adequate plans.

These proposals are liberal; they provide for greater security and greater opportunity for the individual than has ever been presented to the Canadian people and ever presented to the people of any other country.

These proposals are comprehensive; they provide in their entirety a rounded and com-

prehensive programme for high employment, income and security. No other country has entered the post-war period with the physical advantages and the formulated objectives and completed plans for a better and more secure life than Canada. These proposals are bold and imaginative; they are in keeping with the leadership which Canada has made in economic and financial matters during the war and which have been copied by so many countries.

Canada has been the first country to set forth a practical post-war policy for the maintenance of high employment and income. We hope that the proposals will be accepted. We cannot afford delay in working out satisfactory and acceptable arrangements. The transitional problems of reconversion dealing with export markets and the like will be sufficiently difficult without the added complication of uncertainty on the part of the dominion or the provinces as to what the financial and other arrangements between them are to be.

Finally, these proposals are the only comprehensive programme of post-war reconstruction put before the Canadian people. They constitute a broad pattern. The proposals themselves are contained in the document headed, "Proposals of the Government of Canada". They are supported by a number of reference books dealing with various subjects.

This document, which I should like to discuss at length but have not the time to, deals with national problems and objectives, transition measures, and finally the dominion proposals under the heads of: "public investment policy", "social security", "financial arrangements", and "conclusion".

Dealing more specifically with social security, may I say that the only comments on the social security proposals so far made in the house relate to old age pensions. These social security proposals are based on the idea of trying to achieve three main objectives. The first is humanitarian, to give the Canadian men, women and children a better chance for health and welfare and security than they have ever had. The second is economic. They are intended to provide purchasing power which will provide a steady flow of funds with which the Canadian people can purchase the things they need and help to maintain employment and national income. Third, they are national; they deal with the Canadian people as the people of a nation, and they treat everyone alike.

To deal more specifically with health, the health proposals include matters which I can mention briefly under four heads: (1) A grant for planning to the provinces to assist them to plan their health measures. (2) They include health insurance proposals which are designed to meet the needs of the provinces, of the people in the provinces in every part of Canada, and which are also designed to meet the criticisms that were directed at the proposals previously put forward, with features of flexibility so as to meet the most urgent needs first. (3) They include proposals for health grants to the provinces for purposes of preventive medicine under some eight heads. (4) They provide for financial assistance to the provinces and their institutions for the construction of hospitals.

These proposals have been discussed, and while they are subject to amendment in detail, I think I can say that they have been framed so as to meet with general acceptance by the people of Canada, and by the people most concerned in this field.

Then there are the proposals with regard to old age pensions. First, it is proposed that there shall be a national old age pension of $30 a month, payable by the federal government to everyone over seventy years of age and, second, a contribution by the federal government on a fifty-fifty basis to the cost of old age pensions, payable on proof of need to people between sixty-five and sixty-nine years of age, to be administered by the provinces.

As I said, the only criticism directed against these proposals by any hon. members in the course of this debate was to the proposal respecting old age pensions. The leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) made some remarks in that connection, but he did not make any positive suggestion. Then, three other hon. members have proposed that the rates be increased; that the age be lowered; and I think all three of them also proposed that taxes be reduced as well.

In considering social security measures we must be realistic, and agree only to what is in the real interests of the country as a whole, so that security will not be bought at the expense of productivity, the basis of all wealth, so that the generosity to some will not amount to unfairness for the many.

The suggestion by one hon. member was for a pension of $50 a month, payable at the age of sixty years. I have asked my officers to calculate what that would cost, and they tell me it would cost $850 million a year, based on the estimated population of Canada in 1948. The proposal made by the federal government in its proposals to the provinces for a national pension of $30 a month payable at the age of seventy years to everyone, without proof of need, is estimated to cost $200 million.

These proposals now put forward by the dominion government are as generous as we can make them, while at the same time keeping the whole plan in balance, and workable. We have reached a balance in our estimates; the plan hangs together, and can be made to work. But neither it nor anything else can be made to work if we create appetites that cannot be filled, and then arouse people's fears that we cannot meet things we never intended to do at all.

Mr. KUHL: That is not what you said about the war.

Mr. CLAXTON: My hon. friend has spoken for five years in the house about the war, and about the possibility of doing this and that. He has been answered on numerous occasions by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) and others. At the present moment I am dealing with social security, and I should prefer to finish, without entering into a discussion with my hon. friend at this time. However, I should be glad to discuss it with him at some later day. On this occasion the time left to me is short.

These proposals are put forward for consideration by the provinces. They are in their hands, and no doubt are being studied by provincial officials. We hope and trust, from their attitude shown at the conference, that they are studying them in the light of the observations made on the concluding page, and in particular in the concluding paragraph where we find this:

> The dominion government asks careful and mature consideration of these proposals, which it is anxious to discuss fully and freely with the provincial governments. It asks that they be considered in the light of the responsibilities which each government has to the people. Let no other advantage be considered than the advantage of the people of Canada.

They were put forward in that spirit and with that hope.

As the session develops, in the discussion of the estimates and on other occasions, I should like to lay before hon. members and to develop the proposals of the Department of National Health and Welfare for the extension of services within the field of the federal government. I can announce to the house, as has been announced to the public, that subject to the approval of parliament, the government has authorized the construction of a national laboratory within which to concentrate and coordinate activities in the field of research in public health. We have also announced a health service to the civil servants of Canada, and we hope to be able to extend services in other directions.

All this is part of an effort to meet the real needs of the Canadian people. I believe that, with unemployment insurance already in force, with unemployment assistance as proposed, with family allowances, as they are now paid—on a more generous scale than in any other place in the world—with health insurance, health grants and other health measures, together with old age pensions and pensions for the blind as they are put forth in the proposals, taken together with the measures already in force in the provinces, or proposed by the provinces, Canada will lead the entire world in matters of social security.

But the basis of this must be the work of the Canadian people; there is no other basis. Here in the House of Commons during this session we have an opportunity of meeting the challenge of peace, as we met the challenge of war. That great partnership must not be dissolved. We won the war, and with it our freedom to be and to do. We must fight to extend the areas of freedom—freedom from want and freedom from ignorance. We must fight and work together, so that we may make the utmost use of our human and material capacities, thus giving our men who are coming back from overseas that Canada of which for so long they have had a true vision.

Reference was made by one speaker to the need for action and leadership. We have had action during the war. During the war we have had leadership—leadership, I suggest, unparalleled in the history of Canada. Under the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) Canada has accomplished wonders it never dreamed possible. It is no accident that for twenty-six years he has led the Liberal party, and has been Prime Minister for a period longer than any other prime minister now in office anywhere in the world. It is no accident that this government alone, among governments in democratic countries, is the government which was in office at the beginning of the war and has remained in office at the end of the war.

Mr. COLDWELL: What about New Zealand?

Mr. CLAXTON: Not with the same Prime Minister. But this government cannot do the job alone. I believe hon. members in all parts of the house will feel that they will truly represent the spirit and wish of the Canadian people if, without bitterness or partisanship, we work together to make Canada the country we all know it can be.

Mr. E. D. FULTON (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, a great many congratulatory remarks have been made since the beginning of this session and I should like to associate myself with all the congratulations which have been extended. Particularly I should like to con-

gratulate the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Bridges) upon his election and his appointment to the high office he now occupies. I had the great pleasure of flying back from Prestwick, Scotland, with him. We had a somewhat similar experience to that undergone by the hon. member for Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare (Mr. Baker). One would almost have been inclined to think that had it not been for the fact that there were government candidates coming back in that plane the government had somehow adversely influenced the weather because we were forced up to 23,000 feet, an even higher height of democracy that the 15,000 feet to which the plane in which my hon. friend was flying was forced. Perhaps that may be taken as indicative of the fact that Canadian democracy is capable of rising to absolutely untold heights.

Next I should like to refer to an incident which took place in this chamber this afternoon and to apologize to you and to hon. members of the house for having been the occasion of having taken up so much time apparently to no good purpose. However, I should like to make my motives clear. I was under the impression that I was asking a question of national import. I recall that in my question I made reference to statements by Canadian prisoners of war in Japanese hands. I though that was a question of national importance. I made reference to their ill treatment by a Canadian-born Japanese. I thought that was a question of national importance. Perhaps we regard it more seriously in the province and the constituency from which I come than may be the case in the rest of Canada. I hope we shall be able to show the rest of Canada that even as we regard their problems as being important to us, we would like them to help us in solving this very real problem.

The third matter I should like to take up is the fact that I was called definitely to task for introducing a matter of local importance in an oral question asked in this house. I referred to the fact that the Japanese referred to was alleged to have resided in my constituency of Kamloops. Perhaps I was guilty of infringing the rules of the house and I would ask hon. members to excuse me and put it down to the inordinate pride in his constituency of a new member which did not permit him to wait until the customary time to make his maiden speech even though he was down to make it that same afternoon.

(Translation): Mr. Speaker, in addressing the house this afternoon I cannot forget that I have but recently returned from overseas. You will therefore understand that, while I intend ever to serve the best interests of all Canadians, both French and English-speaking, the interests, the welfare and the ideals of our armed forces will necessarily be foremost in my thoughts.

Let me emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that I have a special esteem for our French-Canadian friends who have served in the armed forces, and especially for those who were members of the glorious Royal 22nd Regiment, with which I had the honour of being associated for a long time in the First Canadian Division. May I pay a tribute to the record of that regiment which compared favourably with that of any other unit, whatever may have been the language spoken by its members.

Mr. Speaker, I think that one of the noblest motives for which we fought was the hope that our Canada would become a truly united country. Personally I have a keen desire to understand the thoughts and the ambitions of the French-Canadian people. We fought overseas for the same cause; it is my hope that here, in peace time, we may continue to work jointly with that object in view. I wish that we may work sincerely together, on both sides of this house and in the different parts of Canada to remove every trace of bitterness and misunderstanding.

I ask my good French-speaking friends not to judge my sincerity of purpose by the poor way in which I speak French. I hope to improve my knowledge of that language through study and practice, until my French equals in quality the friendship I hope will arise between us.

(Text): In speaking to-day on the address in reply to the speech from the throne I feel it is only fitting to say at the outset that I humbly thank God that I am here to make this speech and to serve my country, Canada, and to continue to serve my king whose representative delivered that speech. It was only in May that I returned from Europe after the end of the war there. I feel most humbly and with a certain awe that it was only due to God's grace that I am back at all. At the same time the very fact that I am back gives me the greatest determination to use my time to serve my country and my people to the best of my ability, and particularly to keep faith with those who were not so fortunate as myself, who have not come back as yet or perhaps who are not coming back at all; to keep faith with them, to build this Canada into the country they had in mind to preserve when they went over to fight for it. So I ask God's further help and guidance that even as He has preserved me, so I may be helped and inspired never to break

that faith, but always to serve my country and its citizens in parliament or out of it as they deserve to be served.

I think the keynote of my speech is the words "as they deserve to be served." As a member of His Majesty's armed forces it was my inestimable privilege to see the heights to which the Canadian people could rise when called on to serve in a great cause. No questions were asked, no mention was made by those average Canadian citizens of the sacrifices that might be involved, although many of them gave all that they had in that service. Canadians showed themselves possessed of a high measure of unselfishness, possessed of extraordinary ability to cooperate to secure a worthy end. These same abilities were shown at home by the people of Canada for the same reasons. They were Canadian people engaged in tasks which they believed to be worth while.

Now the points which I am trying to make here are two:

First, these performances, these qualities, call for a reward of the highest order. No questions were asked when the people I have described were being called upon to make their efforts and their sacrifices. No questions must be asked by this country and this government when they are called upon to see that these people get the reward which they deserve.

Second, the qualities shown and the efforts made reached their finest peak when leadership was given, which was a spark to set those qualities blazing. The Canadian people are fully as capable now as then of the same qualities. They were in the past, they are now, and they will be in the future, and for ever. But the leadership must be there, and it is because I have no confidence, and a great many others of our people—too many to be laughed off—have no confidence that this government will give that leadership or is giving it that I am speaking to this motion this afternoon.

I think hon. members will agree that this view is justified if we make a brief review of the government's past and present record in a few more important particulars. The first of these is the matter of what I might call fair dealing with the people of Canada, and by that I mean that policies should be adopted because they are honestly believed to be in the best interests of the whole country, and not because they are designed to gain votes in any one or more parts; that that policy should be given to the house and the people fairly and squarely, and that the people should be told all the facts all the time—not one set of facts to one section of the people and another set to another. What I have in mind here is, of course, chiefly the government's man-power policy. I want to make it perfectly clear to hon. members that I am not simply raising a ghost of the past and trying to draw further bitterness from it. What I am concerned to do is to examine and establish the facts of yesterday in order to draw from them lessons for to-morrow.

I wish to warn the government, and for our own part here to pledge our efforts to this end, that that sort of action which characterized the period of the man-power policy will not be tolerated by us on this side of the house, or I think by any members of the house nor by the people of Canada. I do not think the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) was justified in the remark he made in referring to the speech of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken), that it sounded to him as though the leader of the opposition was simply repeating the same sort of thing that had been repeated *ad nauseam* in the period leading up to the election. I would remind the Prime Minister that he lost a considerable number of seats in the election. I would remind him and other responsible ministers that the remarks which were made by people in possession of all the facts about the man-power situation were not without their effect upon the country. They were not without their effect in my own constituency of Kamloops, and I feel it is my duty to go on record, probably for the last time, to say what I feel about those facts.

The truth of the situation is that last November when the Prime Minister and the then responsible Minister of National Defence in this house were assuring the house and the people of Canada that there was no shortage of reinforcements, the men overseas, and I speak particularly of Italy, were at that time being overworked to the point of exhaustion on account of the lack of reinforcements. I ask hon. members to imagine the thoughts in the minds of a Canadian soldier, say a French-Canadian soldier, to whose fighting qualities I have already paid tribute, who was called upon to carry more than his fair share of the burden in the battle line because there were not sufficient reinforcements to relieve him, either replacements which would be ideal or the replacements which would be operationally correct. When these replacements or reinforcements did not exist, what was the effect on the mind of that soldier when he read the statement of the Prime Minister and the responsible minister of defence at that time that there was no shortage of reinforcements? It had a very

bad effect, one which I can assure hon. members I shall never forget. Those statements which were made, in the light of the facts as they existed at the time, have impressed themselves on my mind, and not only on my own mind but on the mind of a great many other Canadians, in such a way that we shall never be able to forget that that is just the way, in our view, that politics ought not to be conducted.

I ask hon. members not to forget those facts when accepting assurances or listening to promises of legislation or action by the Prime Minister and his government, when many members of the government to-day are the same men who sat there and made those statements in the house when men overseas were in desperate need of reinforcements.

If further justification were needed, Mr. Speaker, for referring to this man-power question I think it is to be found in the fact that the government policy in that respect is responsible for the extraordinary situation facing the country to-day with respect to repatriation and demobilization. The government has adopted strange and devious methods to try to get around that situation, and I think it is time the real reason for those methods and the facts behind the situation were outlined to this house and the country.

It may be said that the present regulations with respect to demobilization, which were attacked by my hon. friend the member for Nanaimo (Mr. Pearkes), are in some respects an effort to make the best of a bad job. I shall say nothing about the places where they only make a bad job worse, as was said by the hon. member for Nanaimo and the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. Merritt). What I want to draw attention to is the fact that the government, finally yielding to terrific public pressure for the release of personnel to fill essential jobs, has issued instructions for the immediate release of personnel regardless of their point scores. This, of course, operates to the prejudice of overseas personnel. It cannot help but do so because the overseas personnel could not be brought back fast enough. So in an effort to safeguard their rights, the regulations provide that the low-point personnel in Canada who are released can only be released to return to their former jobs; they can only be given long-term leave—not discharge. This is a complicated and confusing procedure and is only an attempt to make the best of a bad job. The proper method, the fair method, of course, would be to bring back the high-point overseas personnel and discharge them first. The answer of the government is that this is not possible owing to lack of shipping facilities. Reserving our right to criticize that statement, and I shall refer to it shortly, I say that we will for the time being accept that answer. But what I want to point out is this: The fact that overseas there are only high point personnel, while back here in Canada there are only low point personnel with little or no overseas service, is the result of the government's man-power policy. It is as a result of that policy that that bad condition has been brought about. The proper course would have been to keep the reinforcement stream flowing, to keep men as they were called into the army or any of the armed forces in Canada proceeding overseas, ready when necessary to replace casualties, and available as indicated to take the place of men with two or three years' front line service. That, I submit, would have been the proper course, and then those old long-service veterans could have been brought back in the same stream of shipping and would be back in Canada now, ready to accept their discharge. That would have been the proper course. Then none of this dallying, confusion and prejudice would exist—none of those circumstances which are so irritating to all and which characterize the present regulations. These characteristics I submit, are part and parcel of the government's every policy, and there is in that government no promise and no likelihood of action. I ask hon. members to bear this in mind in voting on the amendment moved by the leader of the opposition.

As I say, for myself I hope and believe that this is the last time that I shall refer to the man-power question. Sufficient bitterness was created throughout this country, and my efforts from now on will be devoted to trying to heal that bitterness and to understand the opposite point of view. But I want to make it perfectly clear for myself, and I believe sincerely I may speak for the whole of our party, that we are not ashamed of our stand on the man-power policy.

Mr. ABBOTT: What was the stand?

Mr. FULTON: I should like here to point the lesson which is to be drawn from the facts to which I have just referred, by a reference to statements which were made by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Abbott) and by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). Speaking with reference to remarks made by the hon. member for Nanaimo the Minister of National Defence implied that instead of criticizing the present demobilization difficulties we should be praising the government because they have brought back so many men from overseas and demobilized them. The Prime Minister did the same thing. He said that we have brought back 120,000 men since V-E day to demobilize them. I should like

to read the words of the Minister of National Defence as reported in *Hansard*, page 101:

The hon. member—

Referring to the hon. member for Nanaimo.

—made some reference to the reduction in the point score from an original figure of 150 or 160 to 130. One reason for the reduction in the point score is that since V-E day we have repatriated from overseas over 120,000 of all three services.

The inference there is that those men were brought back since V-E day as part of a repatriation and demobilization programme.

Mr. ABBOTT: They were.

Mr. FULTON: Yes? I took the trouble to telephone the minister's office and asked how many of that 120,000 were personnel who came back as volunteers for the Pacific force. The answer was that in the army, of 75,000 personnel repatriated, 25,000, or one-third, had volunteered for the Pacific force and been brought back on those grounds, and that it would be fair to say, although no definite figures could be given, that the figure of one-third represented the proportion of the whole number that had come back as volunteers for the Pacific force. So that out of 120,000, 40,000 came back as volunteers for the Pacific force. That was an operational commitment; and actually, of that number, the majority are short-service personnel who had recently proceeded overseas and had volunteered there for the Pacific force. So in fact we have brought back a large number of personnel who actually would not have been eligible for discharge on a pure point score; yet the minister and the Prime Minister tried to take credit in this house for having brought back 120,000 for discharge, when actually out of that number 40,000 were brought back for an entirely different reason.

I should like to refer next to the second paragraph of the amendment moved by the leader of the opposition, that this house regrets that His Majesty's ministers have failed to provide adequate measures for reconversion from war to a peace-time economy. This was no idle motion. We on this side honestly feel that the government of this country has forfeited the confidence of the people in this respect. It is all very well for the Prime Minister and certain other ministers to sit over there and shake with laughter and scoff and say, "Oh, but we won an election three months ago. When you mention these things you really must be wasting our time because after all we won the election three months ago." I am not given to strong language, but I rather feel that that attitude smacks of hypocrisy, when we consider that at that very moment there was in this House of Commons a labour delegation some hundreds strong who were here because they did not have confidence in the government, and because they were out of work. They were not agitators, they were not bad citizens; they were just ordinary average Canadian citizens who had come up here to see their government to try to get some reassurance that the jobs which they had been promised would actually be forthcoming. Those are the reasons why they were here, not because they wanted to find any minister in his golf club, but because they came to the House of Commons to see him, where they ought to see him, because they wanted action; and they were not even seen by the government. They were, however, seen the next day. They were received on the day they arrived by a delegation from the other parties represented in this parliament. I think that the reception of that labour delegation was typical of the state of affairs in this country to-day.

Mr. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, if I may—

Mr. GREEN: Oh, let him alone.

Mr. MITCHELL: Wait a minute. I just want to tell the truth—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MITCHELL: From my point of view. I wish to say to my hon. friend, in a friendly way, that that delegation was met by the government.

Mr. CASSELMAN: A couple of days later.

Mr. MITCHELL: No, the next day.

Mr. FULTON: I said it was met the next day.

Mr. MITCHELL: But prior to that the chairman of the delegation had been wired. I am sure my hon. friend does not want the impression to go out to the country that the government do not meet delegations. We were very glad to meet them. We met the two congresses.

Mr. FULTON: That was certainly the impression in the minds of the delegation. I admit that the delegation was met the next day by the government, but I simply say that I think the reception of the delegation in the vicinity of this parliament was typical of the situation throughout the country. They were spoken to and addressed by a C.C.F. member of parliament who said, "What you want is a new social order." That is what he said they wanted,—not jobs, not homes, not meals, but a new social order. They were addressed by a member of the Social Credit party, who said,

"What you want is a new kind of money." They were addressed first, however, by a member of the Progressive Conservative party.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member does not want to misrepresent what was said. Not a word was said about a new kind of money. If the hon. member knew a little more about social credit he would know better than to say that. What was said was, a new source of money.

Mr. FULTON: I accept the correction—a new source of money. What was said by the Progressive Conservative member who addressed that meeting was, "Gentlemen, I have just received your proposals and I shall study them at the first possible opportunity. I intend to take immediate action on those of which I approve." On that day there was no action and no representation from the government. I think that is typical of the situation in this country to-day. I looked at their signs carefully and these people did not ask for a new social order or a new source of purchasing power. They asked for jobs, for a continuation of present wages. I do not remember exactly what it was, and I do not want to lay myself open to a charge of misquoting, but they wanted jobs and security. They want that now, and this party is the only one that proposes to take action to give it to them now. The government met them the next day, but only after their hands had been forced, and that again, I suggest, is typical of the situation.

Mr. MITCHELL: That is unfair.

Mr. FULTON: I suggested to the minister—

Mr. MITCHELL: It is not correct.

Mr. FULTON: If I am in error in making the suggestion, it will be open to the minister to correct the impression later. It was a suggestion that that was the impression that was left in the minds of the people.

Mr. MITCHELL: Once your story has gone through the country; once you have got your story over.

Mr. FULTON: I should like to refer further to some remarks made by the Secretary of State (Mr. Martin) in dealing with the question. His remarks I think are typical of the government's attitude on the question. At page 60 of *Hansard* he is reported as having said:

> I am frank to admit that difficulties attend other countries, as well as our own; and the fact that we have now in a number of localities a situation of surplus labour is perhaps not all that one might desire.

[Mr. Fulton.]

I suggest that it is very far from what one might desire. I regret very much that my remarks appear to have been misinterpreted, but I am anxious to impress upon the ministers the fact that, like the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. Merritt), the member for Nanaimo (Mr. Pearkes), and the leader of this party (Mr. Bracken), as well as most of the members of this house, I want some assurance that action will be taken now. We certainly know that the situation is not all that might be desired, but we feel more strongly than that and we want to know whether or not the government feels more strongly than that. I am pointing out to the ministers that their actions have not to this date inspired in the minds of the people of the country the belief that the government does feel more strongly about is than that. That is the only point I am trying to make.

When we come to the third paragraph of the amendment as moved by the leader of the opposition, criticizing the lack of action on housing, again I say it is very difficult to understand the attitude of members of the government when they sit there and say, "Well, after all, we won an election three months ago and you are really wasting our time coming here and talking about housing because it does not matter." I do not care, nor do the people of the country care, whether the government won an election three months ago. What the people want is houses, and so far, I maintain, they have received no assurance from this government that they are likely to get houses very quickly.

This housing problem is one that affects my own constituency in the same degree, though not exactly in the same measure, as it affects the constituencies in Vancouver, one of which is represented by the member for Vancouver-Burrard, who made the strongest plea for government action in this respect. I will not attempt to go over his observations again, but I bring them to the attention of the government and ask them whether they are now prepared to give the country that factual and actual assurance which it desires, that houses will be provided. There has been a statement from the Minister of National Health and Welfare, a reassuring statement, as to the government's intentions with respect to social security, but the problem of housing has not been tackled. All we have is a measure of disagreement as to whether or not refrigerators and plumbing are frozen.

One other question with respect to housing which I should like to bring to the attention of the house is this. As I have said, the

responsible ministers of the crown have failed to give that assurance which they are called upon to give the people. The question of housing was mentioned by the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Nicholson). At the time he was making his remarks I had a certain feeling of disagreement with him and lack of support for his views. Somebody near me informed me that the member for Mackenzie was the gentleman who at one time made a speech in this house opposing the sending of beer to the troops in Italy, and I knew then that I certainly had no sympathy or support for his views. I do not know quite what was the official government pronouncement or policy on the question at the time the hon. gentleman was stating his opposition, but I assure him that he need not have worried in the slightest, because, whatever the government said about it very little beer got to the troops in Italy and I felt that he was wasting his time on that occasion as much as he was working to no purpose on this.

It will be recalled that the hon. gentleman devoted considerable time at the beginning of his speech to a criticism of the then premier of Manitoba for his failure to solve the allegedly desperate housing situation in Winnipeg, and devoted an equal length of time in the latter part of his speech to a bitter criticism of the suggestion that anyone but the federal government is responsible for housing measures, attacking this party for suggesting that anyone else might be entrusted with solving the housing problem. You cannot have it both ways. You cannot attack the provincial government for not taking action, you cannot attack its leader for not taking action, and then attack that same gentleman, who is now leader of this party, because he suggests that somebody other than the federal government might take action.

The responsibility is clearly a nation-wide responsibility, a responsibility that devolves upon municipalities, provinces and the federal government and private enterprise. What we ask for on this side of the house is action and leadership from the government to coordinate the efforts of all those who are only waiting and anxious to do what they can to solve the problem.

I am running short of time, and I realize that so far I have made but passing reference to my own constituency of Kamloops. I hope that hon. members will realize that this is not because I am not proud of my constituency of Kamloops, British Columbia, but because at the moment I felt, as I still feel, very strongly and very much disturbed about certain national problems which are as common to my constituency as they are to the rest of the Dominion of Canada. That is why I put these problems first, without making any reference to my constituency. I know that the people of Kamloops feel possibly no more seriously, but certainly no less seriously and no less strongly about these problems than the people of the rest of the Dominion of Canada, and they have asked me as their representative to come down here to see if I can do something in this house, working in conjunction with all other hon. members, to solve them.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that some of the criticisms directed at the government by hon. members of the opposition have been severe. I do not agree that they were bitter, although they have been severe. This is simply because we feel that the problems which confront the country are terribly serious and action is not being taken to solve them. In all these things we fear we see a lack of sincere determination. What we call for is action. These are difficult but not insuperable problems. The Canadian people have shown what they were capable of in war. They put forth that effort in order to preserve Canada as a better place. Now we must make it that better place they had in mind; and it can be done with intelligent direction and action.

As a member of His Majesty's Loyal Opposition I realize it is not my duty and function merely to criticize. For myself I can promise that whenever the government shows signs of action, of producing a solution of the Canadian problems, based on honest effort to solve them in the best interests of Canada, and whenever they introduce any legislation for the purpose of implementing such solution, they will find us honestly and sincerely cooperative. But whenever we see signs of dallying and delay, when we see a danger that Canada's welfare and the potential realization of our highest ambitions will be frustrated by any other consideration or by lack of sincerity or lack of confidence in action, then we will exercise our constitutional prerogative of criticism and opposition. We will not allow the confidence, the high reward, the ideals and expectations which the Canadian service men and citizens have earned by their valour and endurance in this war to go unfulfilled, because we feel that they can be fulfilled if action is taken now.

Mr. HARRY LEADER (Portage la Prairie): I rise to take part in the debate which is lengthening out and perhaps getting better as it lengthens. If that is the case, I shall be sorry if I do not live up to the standard which has already been set by pre-

vious speakers. I have quite a lot to say this afternoon and I hope that I can get through in the allotted time.

I am not going to take up the time of the house by offering congratulations to the different hon. members who have been elevated to rather exalted positions, but I want them to take it for granted that they have my very best wishes in the work which they will be called upon to do. I should like to address a few remarks to the younger and new members of parliament, and perhaps it will apply to the older members as well—I know it certainly applies to me. First, I wish to say that it is a great honour for anyone to be the advocate and the representative of his district in this great dominion of ours. When you think that you were chosen out of perhaps forty thousand other citizens in your district you can understand that you have quite a weighty responsibility, and while it is an honour it carries with it huge and consistent responsibilities. My advice to the younger members is to take stock of themselves once in a while. That is what I do, and then let them ask themselves, what are we here for? As I said, it is a great honour and a great privilege but it carries with it great responsibilities. I do not want to tender any further advice than that, but I think it is good advice to give to the younger men, and the older ones, including myself, always remember the people back home.

My main reason for rising to-day, Mr. Speaker, is to deal with a question which has been up on previous occasions. I think I have addressed this house four times on the matter which I intend to reintroduce to-day. It is something that is left over from previous sessions, and therefore it might be called a matter of unfinished business. Perhaps some hon. members have already guessed that I intend to bring once more before the house the matter of Doctor Davidson's research work in endeavouring to find a preventive or a possible cure for cancer. What I wish to impress upon the house to-day is the necessity, if we are to clean up this matter once and for all, of the government of Canada taking upon their own shoulders or in cooperation with the provinces the responsibility for a clinical test of not only Doctor Davidson's work but of every other medical practitioner in Canada, there may be others who have worked as hard and as long as Doctor Davidson of Winnipeg, and who may have some clue that, if followed to its logical conclusion, would lead to something that would benefit mankind.

Hon. members may think this subject is monotonous. Well, at the risk of having them bored, may I say that I believe it is a worthy cause. In my opinion, if I have done nothing in my thirty years and more of public life but press for more research work in regard to cancer and other ills that affect the Canadian people, then I would be content to leave this as my only reason for being in parliament.

Cancer, statistics tell us, is second on the list as a man-killer; but in actual suffering and untold sorrow and huge expenses it is away out in the lead, and it is increasing. Therefore it is a matter that is worthy of consideration.

Perhaps the house will bear with me if I outline briefly some of the activities which I attempted in previous sessions in this house on this very important matter. I believe in Doctor Davidson and in his work. While I do not claim I am cured of cancer, neither does Doctor Davidson. But I know he has helped me. Not only do I believe that; I know it. Therefore, if the remarks I am about to make to-day come from my heart, hon. members will understand the feeling I have for other cancer victims who might be in the position in which I am, and would have a chance for a hope of recovery.

I asked our government if they could help Doctor Davidson in his research work by making a grant so that he might carry on his work. He has no money, and very few friends in the medical profession. I knew what he did for me; I knew of dozens of others who believed in Doctor Davidson. I said his work was worthy of a grant, and asked the government of Canada if they would assist Doctor Davidson financially if, after making an investigation, they thought his work merited assistance.

As hon. members know, that matter was referred to the medical committee of the research council in Ottawa who, after a farcical investigation, advised the government that no money should be granted to Doctor Davidson. He never wanted a dollar. What he pleaded for was some young medical men from across Canada who would come to his office, listen to his story, understand his investigations, and carry on where he will leave off in the very near future.

His one ambition was to hand over what he has found to the medical profession of Canada, in the hope that it would be of some benefit to humanity. The money was denied him. At times I might be accused of being somewhat too aggressive; perhaps stubborn would be a better word. However, I asked the government if they would institute a more comprehensive investigation into Doctor Davidson's work. I know that the government

was concerned in the matter and that the then minister was in deep sympathy with the project. The result was that they asked the province of Manitoba if it would cooperate with the federal authorities in making an investigation, on the understanding that the federal government would make a grant.

To make a long story short, officers of the crown decided that the making of a grant to any province for health purposes was not within the jurisdiction of the federal government, with the result that the investigation fell through. Following that, the government of Manitoba undertook to conduct an inquiry of its own, with the result that a cancer commission was appointed.

After about ten months of investigation they decided—the report has just been published—that Doctor Davidson's work did not warrant a money grant. The verdict was against the doctor and his work. I should not say that it was against Doctor Davidson personally, because the commission did add that, although its report was negative, it did not in any way reflect upon the integrity and good faith of Doctor Davidson.

Yes, and it comes to my mind that there was another investigation, before that of the commission to which I have just referred. I believe it was the secretary of the railroad associations of British Columbia who undertook a private investigation in regard to this doctor's work. With that in mind this secretary journeyed to Winnipeg and, while there, met many of the doctor's patients.

In a letter written to me recently this gentleman expressed his disappointment regarding the report, and the fact that the commission saw fit to find against the doctor and his work. He pointed out that he remembered vividly those eight hopeful patients he had met while investigating in Winnipeg, that he could still see the light in their eyes, and their hope of renewed health. He cannot believe that these people are either dead or doomed. The idea behind it all was that he expected their cases had been reviewed by the Manitoba cancer commission.

Some hon. members have, from their places in the house, stated that Doctor Davidson's treatments have been investigated on previous occasions. Well, I have mentioned one of those investigations, namely that carried out by the medical committee of the research council, an investigation which was nothing but a farce from beginning to end.

May I be permitted to cite an authority higher than some of those who have set themselves up as critics of Doctor Davidson and his methods. I shall quote in a few moments from page 4864 of *Hansard* for July 14, 1944. These will be the words of Doctor Howden, who was then the member for St. Boniface. He believes in Doctor Davidson, and that this doctor has something which, if properly explored would benefit humanity. Hon. members who were in the house at that time will remember the story that the then hon. member told, the story about the lady in the hospital in Winnipeg. It had been stated that the doctors could do no more for her, because she had cancer, and that following this pronouncement Doctor Davidson had taken her case, given her his treatments and brought her back to the hospital for examination. I do not know whether at that time Doctor Lehmann, to whom reference was made by Doctor Howden, was president of the hospital, or consulting physician. However, this is what the then hon. member for St. Boniface said in his speech on that occasion:

> He called in Doctor Lehmann to look at the woman and he said, "I thought you were dead."

Remember, these are Doctor Howden's own words. Then the quotation from *Hansard* continues:

> She said, "No, I am very much alive, thank you." Lehmann said to Davidson, "I think you have got something; you had better go ahead and work on it."

So I am telling the house to-day that Doctor Davidson was advised by the medical profession to carry out this work.

The work of this doctor was assisted earlier not only by the medical association, but by the late James Richardson, by the Winnipeg Kiwanis club, and by other organizations the names of which do not come to my mind at the moment. The quotation from *Hansard* continues:

> That was the beginning of experimentation with rodents. Doctor Davidson has definitely established two principles. He has definitely established that he can retard the advance of cancer by a high nutrition diet. That is something definite; that is a principle. Let me explain the experimentation with rodents. They take a mouse and shave the hair from the back of its neck. Then they put a little spot of tar on the shaven place, and the mouse scratches away at that tar until he causes an ulcerating sore, which eventually becomes cancerous. As I told this house previously, Doctor Davidson experimented with two families of mice, one on ordinary nutrition and the other on high nutrition. He discovered that the mice fed on the high nutrition diet did not develop cancer after they had tar put on the back of their necks. Then he went a step further; he decided to experiment with the serum of the healthy families of mice in the unhealthy families of mice, and actually discovered that when the unhealthy families of mice were injected with the serum from the healthy families, their cancerous sores cleared up. So that another principle was established. Those two principles cannot be denied by the research council of Canada or anyone else, because they have been definitely proven and shown.

I want to get back to the cancer commission again and direct the attention of the house to the fact that I put on *Hansard* on June 27, 1944, letters which I had received from twelve patients. They all claimed that they had been benefited by Doctor Davidson's work. One would need to look at the evidence submitted to this cancer commission before one would know how they dealt with these several cases. The following item is clipped from the report:

Note: Of the 376 names listed in exhibit VIII, twenty-three are listed again in exhibit IX. The twelve cases cited by Mr. Harry Leader in House of Commons debates are also included in exhibit VIII.

As I say, I do not know what conclusion the commission came to in regard to these people, but I want to tell the house that I have kept track of these patients. I wrote to them and, while they did not all answer, six or seven answered and I have the letters here. I know the house does not want me to take up time in reading them, but they all state that they were either helped or cured by Doctor Davidson. When I wrote to them last spring they replied that they were well on the road to recovery and yet, when we come to read the report of the commission, we find that they were classed as non-cancerous. I wish I had the time at my disposal to read these letters, but they are available should any hon. member want to see them. Surely the old biblical saying of a prophet having no honour in his own country is true in Doctor Davidson's case. The commission made the following finding:

Five other cases are unusual. Their numbers are 19, 32, 60, 88 and 113. All had been definitely cancerous and all took Doctor Davidson's treatment. Apparently they all were cured, so far as the time lapse permits of that statement. However, in none of these cases can credit clearly be given to the treatment under investigation because other treatments had been applied shortly beforehand. These included surgery, X-rays, radium and electro-cautery, either singly or in combination.

No credit allowed to Doctor Davidson at all. I am sure hon. members have in their minds the same question I have in mine, the question that was in the mind of a lady to whom I was talking not long ago: if these people were cured through the regular channels of the medical association, why did they go to Doctor Davidson? According to the cancer commission they went to Doctor Davidson after they had been treated by other sources and apparently were cured. Is that fair? I ask that question of every hon. member. I will give the answer: it is not fair to Doctor Davidson, and I think hon. members will agree with me.

I come now to a case which I never wanted to bring before this house. The record will show that I had arranged for two other hon. members to bring up the case of Doctor Davidson in this house after I had gone home to continue my treatment with him. That was two years ago. No real action was taken, so I deemed it my duty, even though a layman—I can speak from practical experience—as a public man to tell the story of my own condition to hon. members in the house and people throughout the country.

As I said, hon. members will have to look over the evidence before they get the full picture of even my case. However, I recognized it when I saw it in the report. It is the sixth case referred to as No. 70, and I quote:

The sixth case (No. 70) has a very low grade tumour. To quote Mayo clinic—"it is a very low grade tumour and slow growing type of cancer and we know of instances where patients have lived from twelve to fifteen years after it had been found to be just as extensive as yours was.

There is some hope in a statement of that kind and I am glad to have that hope. If it is the will of God that I should live many more years I shall be truly thankful. But they could have said this, and this is what came direct from the Mayo clinic: Leader's case was impossible after careful exploration of his abdomen. There was no guesswork about that. They said they could not attempt a colostomy operation, which might prove a matter of life or death for me if I were threatened with a bowel obstruction. They said my case was impossible and they could do nothing for me.

The commission did not quote that, although they had the full story. The Mayos wired me, asking me if they might send it to them. I told them to send it by all means and let me have a copy. So they got it and this would appear to be a hopeful sign. I ask hon. members to think of that because of what is coming next. The commission continues:

Also his own doctor writes—"I have prescribed morphine for pain on several occasions this past summer (1944). There may be subjective improvement but objectively there is no evidence of retrogression of the tumour." Your commissioners do not consider this case as cured or even arrested, as the attending physician clearly points out that the tumour and some of its accompanying symptoms have shown no improvement after two years' treatment and the continued need of morphine to allay the pain shows that the disturbing factor has not been arrested.

In the first place there is a promise that I may live for many years; next, my goose is cooked. It reminds me of the song that Gracie Fields sometimes sings. She is referring to a refractory or lazy husband and she says, "The old man is dead but he won't lie down." The worst factor in regard to my case is the fact that the secretary of the commission told many patients as she visited

them that Harry Leader was very ill and that he had to take the strongest drugs to deaden the pain. She made the picture as bad as she possibly could.

I am afraid I am going to exceed my time, but that will be in the hands of the house. Information was presented by my doctor in Portage la Prairie. I want to say here that he is a clever young man. I would place my life in his hands any day as a medical practitioner who is following a careful and capable father. But he did not know all the circumstances. He prescribed the medicine all right but he did not know whether I took it. I am going to give the house some information in regard to that. He prescribed what I later found out were morphine pills. The number is 55200 and the prescription was filled on July 26, 1944. I never took one of those pills. They were morphine pills. My wife told me that she had stronger pills for me, but I did not want to take them. I did not know they were morphine, but I thought I could get along without them. That was July 26, 1944, and the commission's report was printed I think on August 2, 1945. In other words, about fourteen months afterward, the report comes out that I have to take the strongest drugs to deaden the pain.

Now I want to give the complete story. The next prescription was No. 48521, filled March 16, 1945. Another prescription, No. 47526, was filled on the same date. That would be just about six months ago. I have not taken a pill since. Those were sleeping pills. There was another pill which I have learned had codeine in it. I took those pills more to put me to sleep, not to deaden pain although there were times when I suffered intensely. But I have not taken any of those pills for six months. And the real morphine pills which had been prescribed for me, I did not take one of them. Another doctor from Portage was sent out, substituting for my own doctor, and I really had pains at that time. That was perhaps fourteen months ago, and in the fall of last year. He gave me morphine, a hypo, and left some pills with my wife. She admits she gave me three, all in a very short time, because I was suffering intensely. This bears out the fact that some of the morphine pills prescribed for me I never took at all, and the others I have not taken for six months. Yet the lady doctor, the secretary of this cancer commission, Doctor Lautsch, has gone up and down this country, not building up their morale, not giving them hope, but telling suffering cancer patients, when they asked how Harry Leader was getting along, that he had to take these drugs constantly to deaden the pain. When I showed this to my doctor he said, "Isn't it true?" I said, "Yes, Jack, it is true but I did not take the prescriptions." Then he said, "The conclusion of the commission is not fair. A better word for 'constant' would be occasional", and I agreed with him.

I have an affidavit here, and I am going to tell the house from whom I got it. I got it from Mr. Stubbs, a member of the provincial legislature of Manitoba, one of the members for the city of Winnipeg, a man who is deeply interested and entirely sympathetic to the work of Doctor Davidson. He made a speech in the Manitoba house not long ago and produced affidavits from some of these patients and presented them to the house. He has a keen legal mind, is a skilful debater, and I believe a man of integrity. Does the house wish me to read all of this affidavit or just that portion of it that deals with my own condition and the fact that the secretary of the cancer commission had made these statements to other patients throughout the province?

Mr. COLDWELL: Read what you think is necessary.

An hon. MEMBER: Put it on *Hansard*.

Mr. LEADER: I will read part of the affidavit of Victoria Wilson, of 367 Kensington street, St. James, Manitoba. She made a sworn affidavit before a notary public on July 3, 1945, and from it I quote:

That the said Doctor Edith Lautsch—

That is the lady doctor who is the secretary of the commission.

—interviewed me for about an hour and a half and made lengthy notes. She talked a great deal about Doctor Davidson, his patients, his methods and his treatments. She made the definite statement that there was nothing in Doctor Davidson's supposed cure for cancer; that his serum treatments did more harm than good by postponing operations which ought to be performed at the early stages of cancer.

7. That the said Doctor Lautsch asked me whether I thought that Doctor Davidson had helped me. I replied that I certainly thought he had; that I had been greatly benefited and my health much improved since coming under his care and taking his treatments and gave him the credit for it.

8. That the said Doctor Lautsch said, among other things at the said interview, that it had been proved that some of Doctor Davidson's patients whom he claimed to have cured of cancer had never had cancer at all; and that out of about 400 of his patients over 300 had died.

9. That the said Doctor Lautsch further said she considered Doctor Thorlakson one of the best cancer doctors in Winnipeg, that she would

recommend me to go to him, except that he was so strongly prejudiced against Doctor Davidson.

There are some good features in the commission's report. If I have not already done so, I want to say now that I believe that every man on that commission was a man of integrity. I only know one of them personally, and that is Doctor Savage, the chairman. I know he is a capable pathologist. He is a man of integrity for whom I have the utmost respect. The other members are medical men whom I do not know personally, but I ascribe nothing but honesty to their motives. But when we remember that these men are steeped in the old orthodox doctrines of medical men it will be understood that there might be a little prejudice there, and while I am willing and glad to admit their absolute honesty, it may be that their reasoning is not so good as it might have been. Here is another extract from the report which gives us an inkling that there is really something to Doctor Davidson's treatment, because it says:

> Approximately seventy per cent of the patients living at the time of the investigation claimed subjective improvement and gained weight at least for a time. Many testified that they felt better than they had for years, in spite of evidence that the disease was extending.

Mr. Speaker, are we to continue to combat the greatest scourge of mankind, the disease of cancer, by following the old orthodox methods? Is it not time we looked around for something that might prevent cancer? This was Doctor Davidson's ambition since he started this work. Curing cancer was only a secondary consideration. He was advised, as I said, by at least one medical practitioner to carry on his work, and his idea was to find a preventive for cancer. If you can prevent disease you do not need a cure. Just think of what they have done with diphtheria, typhoid fever and smallpox, and imagine what they are going to do in the future, both our older doctors who remained home in Canada and those who are overseas. Great improvements will be instituted with regard to all diseases, and I am looking for some great improvement in regard to cancer.

But I am dealing with the commission, Mr. Speaker, and I want to give you one of the conclusions to which they came:

> 2. That no public money be voted to aid further experiments of the general kind carried on by Doctor Davidson with mice unless it be for an extensive and prolonged programme of experimental work conducted by an adequate personnel.

That is exactly what Doctor Davidson has been asking for; not a dollar of public money, not a donation, although he has received some, and was glad to receive the help. But he asks for a clinical test. There is the ray of hope; there, gleams out the fact that if the dominion government will play ball with the province of Manitoba a clinical test will be made. Why should there not be? They are making them in other lands. I read the other day that a pathological institution, I think it is the university of Cleveland, Ohio, is now carrying on a clinical test in regard to a serum discovered by some Russian. This investigation or test is going to be carried on over a three-year term, and they are getting $30,000 to help conduct the test. We want something like that in Canada, and this matter will never be cleared up until we get it. I received a letter from the minister of health of Manitoba, who stated in the concluding paragraph that if the matter is to be carried on further he will be glad to lend his cooperation in whatever action is taken. We expect action, and I think we are going to get it. If you will permit me sir, I will read a statement made in this house by the Prime Minister himself. Speaking on July 14, 1944, as reported in *Hansard,* at page 4885, he said:

> One point should be made perfectly clear. From the discussion here to-day it may be assumed throughout the country that, because of decisions given as to jurisdiction, the dominion government is preventing Doctor Davidson from making certain investigations which might be made at the instance of government authority. What I cannot understand is this: Doctor Davidson having the reputation which he has, hon. members from Manitoba believing him as they do, why the province of Manitoba itself does not undertake the work of research in relation to cancer and retain Doctor Davidson for the purpose. It should be made perfectly clear that the province of Manitoba, if it wishes to do so, can undertake all this work of research so far as Doctor Davidson is concerned. In Ontario the provincial government has undertaken similar kinds of research.
>
> To show at least the sympathy which the federal government has had with research in a case where success has been proven, I recall very well that, when Doctor Banting had found a cure for diabetes with insulin, I myself had placed in the estimates and headed a discussion in this house to have Doctor Banting given a life endowment of $7,000 a year, and it was so voted by this house. That surely is an indication of the sympathy which the federal parliament has with the work of research where it has reason to believe that matters have proceeded sufficiently far to justify making a special

grant and special endowment. If the province of Manitoba were to have Doctor Davidson undertake to make a research into cancer at the instance of the province, and he were as successful in his subject as Doctor Banting was in his, I for one would be prepared to ask this house to adopt toward him by way of endowment the same course which it adopted toward Doctor Banting.

I want to advocate here to-day, as I have on previous occasions, that we spend more money for medical research. I think we spend less than $50,000 a year on medical research—which certainly is no compliment to the ability of the Canadian parliament. I think we should spend hundreds of thousands of dollars on research work, and in this connection may I quote the statement of the authoritative journal of the American medical association:

The only hope of solving fundamental problems of cancer lies in research.

I will support any amount of money the government sees fit to grant in cooperation with the provinces, which the Department of National Health and Welfare allows them to do at the present time, for the work of Doctor Davidson and other men who have given their lives to this research.

In conclusion I wish to say that this is not the end. We must have finality in this matter. Casualties of the war have ceased, but the death toll of cancer victims goes without an armistice. I do not believe the Canadian people are satisfied with conditions as they are. They will insist that something substantial, perhaps radical, be undertaken to combat this terrible disease. It seems to me that if we do not undertake this we shall break faith with those 14,000 people who died from cancer last year; we shall dash the hopes of the 50,000 people who are now suffering from cancer in Canada; the death toll will go on, and over 14,000 people will die from cancer next year, with a constant increase in the years to come. I believe that the people will demand action, and that the government will fufil their duty. This is not a partisan matter, and I ask every hon. member on all sides of this house to support me in the appeal which I have made this afternoon.

On motion of Mr. Knight the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie the house adjourned at 5.43 p.m.

Monday, September 17, 1945.

The house met at three o'clock.

WHEAT

INCREASE IN EXPORT PRICE—INITIAL PAYMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ROBERT FAIR (Battle River): I should like to address a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. In view of the increase in the export price of wheat announced on Friday last, will the board increase the initial payment to producers at time of making delivery?

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): The hon. gentleman gave me notice of his question. As he well knows, the increase in the price of wheat will increase the participation certificates, but no thought has so far been given to increasing the initial payment, and I do not think that will be done.

HOGS

INQUIRY AS TO INCREASE OF BEEF AND PORK CEILING PRICES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ROBERT FAIR (Battle River): I should like to address a question to the Minister of Finance. As the wheat board has announced an increase of nine cents per bushel in the export price of wheat, will the government immediately consider an upward revision of the ceiling price of beef and pork and by so doing help to check the present decrease in the hog population?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): So far as my own attitude is concerned, the answer would be in the negative, and I have every reason to think that will also be the attitude of the government as a whole.

HOUSING

QUESTION AS TO FREEZING OF PLUMBING MATERIALS IN PARTLY CONSTRUCTED HOUSES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. H. HARRIS (Danforth): Has the Minister of Finance anything further to add with regard to the directive on priorities for ten sets of plumbing fixtures, the request with respect to which was made on Friday?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): The priorities officer of the Department of Munitions and Supply has issued priorities to certain contractors who are building houses for Wartime Housing Limited, for the Department of Veterans Affairs under the Veterans'

Land Act, and for certain other government-approved housing projects. These priorities apply to various building materials and among other things to plumbing supplies. A number of plumbing supplies are in short supply, and in order to ensure an equitable distribution of the balance of the supplies which may be available after satisfying the priorities, and in order to ensure that deliveries to priority holders out of current production do not exceed their current monthly requirements, a plan of distribution has been worked out by the administrator of distributive trades in cooperation with the Department of Munitions and Supply and the priorities officer of that department.

Particulars of this plan were announced to the wholesale plumbing trade by letter on September 10, 1945, and at this time the administrator of distributive trades requested certain information as to the stocks on hand. He considered that in order to protect priority users until the plan became fully effective, stocks in the wholesalers' hands had to be frozen, except for priority users. The question as to advisability of such a freeze was further considered and the decision taken that the freeze was not necessary. On the afternoon of September 11, telegrams were sent out to all the persons to whom the administrator's letter had been addressed instructing them to ignore the freezing direction. These telegrams, in many cases, were received by the wholesalers prior to the receipt of the administrator's letter so that in fact the freeze occurred only in a limited area and there only for a period of not more than twenty-four hours.

There is no order of the wartime prices and trade board conferring priorities with respect to the purchase of plumbing supplies. As stated above, priorities on building materials are being issued by the priorities officer in the circumstances indicated above. Issue of these priorities may mean that persons who have commenced building houses may be unable to complete them through failure to obtain certain materials in short supply, of which plumbing supplies are one, and it may be that it is that feature of the matter to which the hon. member is really addressing himself. That, however, is a matter which is exclusively under the jurisdiction of the Department of Reconstruction and Supply.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL IN MONTREAL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. F. P. WHITMAN (Mount Royal): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Veterans Affairs. Is it the intention of the government to proceed with the construction of a hospital on Benny Farm, Montreal? If so, when will construction begin and what class of patients will be treated?

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): It is our intention to proceed with the construction of a hospital in Montreal. The type of treatment and the date of the commencement of construction will be decided this week.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Friday September 14, consideration of the motion of Mr. W. M. Benidickson for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Bracken, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Mr. R. R. KNIGHT (Saskatoon City): Mr. Speaker, I feel that I should first thank hon. members of this house for extending to me the courtesy which they did on Friday night, a courtesy which was a greater one than I realized at the time. I know now that hon. members were willing to give me an opportunity as a new member to speak without having to make a break in my remarks to an audience which is if anything even more distinguished than the one I was to address on Friday night.

I take it to be a great honour to speak for the first time in this place. I know that hon. members will not have the faintest idea who I am, but I speak here with the consent of the constituents of Saskatoon City. I hold this privilege not, I believe, through any ability or virtue inherent in myself, or because of any failure on the part of the former representative, who was a very popular member of the Progressive-Conservative party, one who was universally esteemed by his constituency, and one who I am sure had won the favour of all those in this house who knew him.

I would say that the C.C.F. candidate was elected in Saskatoon City on a basis of principle rather than personality, because the constituents of that place, like those of many other places in the commonwealth of British nations, realize that progress is on the march to-day, and we cannot stand still in a changing scene or, as the great master of English himself expressed it;

> . . . God fulfils himself in many ways,
> Lest one good custom should corrupt the world.

I was astonished to hear my hon. friend the member for Regina (Mr. Probe) describe Britain as old Tory Britain. I wonder if I might be allowed to digress for a moment to bring before the house a matter about which I feel deeply, and that is with the respect to the participation of school teachers in the public life of this country. May I offer to my hon. friend my sincere sympathy in that the collegiate institute board of the city of Regina has refused to grant him leave of absence while he serves his country in this house. This captain, who for four years, three of them overseas, served his country in His Majesty's uniform, is thus subjected to petty persecution by what are often little men. Hon. members will understand that I can sympathize more readily with my colleague because I myself have suffered to all intents and purposes the same treatment from the high school board of the city of Saskatoon. I say that without any personal animosity, because I say in tribute to that board that its relations with its teachers have always been extremely cordial, and that includes myself. But I am fighting for a principle, for teachers across this land, and I would ask the members of the high school board of the city of Regina whether that is their idea of cooperation with this government or any government in the matter of rehabilitation of our returned men. I wish to go on record as protesting most strongly against this tradition which I am afraid is fostered by school boards across this country, that teachers should be denied the right to take part in public affairs. I protest against this idea that teachers should be regarded as intellectual sissies or mental milque-toasts, in whose veins runs skim milk instead of red blood.

That gallant battalion, the Saskatoon Light Infantry, for all I know is returning to its native city to-day, though it may still be on the water. I do know that the man at the head of that gallant battalion, which fought its way through Sicily, Italy and Holland, Lieutenant-Colonel Walker, was decorated at Buckingham Palace by the king the other day. He is a man beside whom I had the honour to teach; for he is history teacher in the institution from which I come.

I crave the indulgence of the house in speaking of this matter; for I know that it may not be of particular interest to many members, but I wish to get on record the naive statement of the high school board of the city of Saskatoon in regard to myself, in a clipping which was sent to me. I shall read a part of it. The heading in this newspaper clipping is: "Knight granted leave of absence." It goes on to say:

> However, it is stressed by the board that this did not imply he would be reengaged, which matter would depend upon the recommendation of the school principals and the approval of the board and—

Note this:

> —competition with other school teachers at such time as the request for reengagement is made.

Hon. gentlemen can judge for themselves whether that comprises leave of absence.

I noticed in the Winnipeg *Free Press* a few days ago that Doctor Carlyle King, a professor at the University of Saskatchewan, was attacked by a gentleman by the name of Mr. Paul Prince for participation in political activity. It does turn out, although I do not think this has any political significance, that Mr. Paul Prince happens to be chairman of the Liberal Association in the province of Saskatchewan. I say I do not think that has any political significance, because I would not accuse gentlemen on the other side of the house of condoning any such action. I am pleased to say that the Winnipeg *Free Press,* which could hardly be considered a non-partisan paper, roundly takes Mr. Prince to task for his attack on Doctor Carlyle King.

As I look round me here I see in this house many ex-schoolteachers, some of them distinguished members of this house. I shall name three. First, my leader, the member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell). He himself has had some experience with Regina school boards. Second, the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken), and third, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner), sitting on the government benches.

But à nos moutons. I was saying that the hon. member for Regina City had described Britain as old Tory Britain. Well, Tory Britain she has been, but many members of this house, particularly those of the French race, will remember that little incident in "Le Médecin Malgré Lui" de Molière—and en passant, Monsieur le Président, je regrette depuis longtemps que je ne puisse pas parler trés bien cette belle langue—the incident you will remember where the quack doctor, on being taken to task, and that by a lady, for saying that her heart lay on her right side instead of her left, said, "Ah, madame, nous avons changé tout cela!"—and so Britain, too, has had a change of heart.

May I say how much I have enjoyed listening to the speeches in this house? I think the speech with which I was most delighted, that is to say from the point of view of oratory, was delivered the other day by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Lalonde). His speech, of course, was one with the subject matter of which I am not able altogether to agree.

That, I suppose, would be natural, seeing that we sit on opposite sides of this aisle. May I suggest to him that there is much to be said for tradition, of which he spoke a good deal; so long as it does not stand four-square in the path of progress. His viewpoint, I hope, is not betrayed by an expression which he used, perhaps a little loosely, as reported in *Hansard* of September 11, page 76:

. . . from the highest rank to the humblest labourer. . . .

That a labourer, sir, should necessarily be humble is not a part of the philosophy of this group to which I have the honour to belong. I suppose that the remark was merely a trick of vocabulary; I have no idea that the hon. gentleman intended to put any significance in it. But it shows a tendency to which we are all subject. Another expression which he used, and to which I can heartily agree, particularly in its application to our day, was his remark in French, at page 80, that "il faut enfin, ouvrir les yeux." We must indeed open our eyes, particularly to the inevitability of the social advance of which I have spoken.

I had intended to draw to-day three things to the intention of this government. I do not know whether I have time to cover them, but I shall begin with the subject of housing, which seems to be a particularly popular subject in this house—naturally enough, because it reflects the importance of the subject in the minds of the people. I doubt whether badgering further the minister responsible for this matter will serve any useful purpose. The government seems to be powerless to do much about housing. I say, sir, that it is again a matter of "too late." I would suggest that the housing of the heroes who fought in this war is, or should be, a war measure and should have been acted upon contemporaneously with the war itself. Now we find ourselves in short supply of lumber, plumbing materials and other necessary articles. I do not know the figures, but I do know that you cannot dry lumber overnight; and I will venture a guess—you may correct me if I am wrong—that in 1944, forty per cent of the lumber cut was exported for sale outside this country. To my mind, sir, a part of that—yes, all of it, if necessary—should have been stored and dried for our present-day use.

An hon. MEMBER: What about helping Britain?

Mr. KNIGHT: I doubt, sir, if it all went to Britain.

Mr. COLDWELL: It went to the United States.

Mr. KNIGHT: No one in my hearing in this debate has raised the question why so many people need houses who did not need them before the war. Is it explained upon the basis of an increase in population? I submit that the chief reason is that because of the war people have money in their pockets with which to rent and purchase houses, and they are not prepared to crawl back into holes in the river bank, nor are they willing to go on the marginal farms to which they were sent out of the cities to get rid of them. Having emerged into war prosperity they are not inclined to go back to where they were when a government of the same complexion as this one was in power, or when, for five years previously, the government which was sponsored by the party of the hon. members who sit upon my right was in office.

Much of the discussion with regard to this housing question has been general; I want now to turn to a specific case, namely, the condition of housing or the lack of it in my home city of Saskatoon. There we have those heartrending and lamentable conditions which I have heard described here in relation to other cities. I could tell this house harrowing tales of people living in shack, in granary, in tourist cabin. I know one young woman, whose husband is overseas in the service of his country, who has been living with her little children for two years in a family garage in our city.

I have here an extract from my home paper which a messenger brought to me to this desk the other day. I noticed this:

Great Activity in Housing Deals. Selling Boom. Fifty to 150 per cent More than Normal Selling Price.

For houses. Below that we find these words:

Harder hit, however, are persons in moderate or poor circumstances who have to buy a house in which to live. Nearly thirty per cent of the residences have changed hands in the last year. One hundred and thirty-eight home owners in Saskatoon City are seeking to dispossess their tenants in order to occupy their own houses.

That will give you something of the general picture. In the city of Saskatoon there are some houses being built for returned men under the Wartime Housing Act. When they were in course of construction it was realized that the houses were not at all suitable for, shall I say, that invigorating climate. I have in mind particularly the plans for plumbing. Specifications for these houses did not include any basement, nor did they include plumbing which would comply with the provincial statutes. The city council of Saskatoon discussed this matter sympathetically. They even went so far as to say that on account of the fact that the houses were needed for the returning boys they themselves would pay the small difference required to make that plumbing fit

to live with, if I may put it that way. A delegation of members of the city council with the city commissioner came here and interviewed the competent authorities. They urged them to change the blue-prints. They pressed for basements. The committee was told that it was impossible to make any concession in the case of Saskatoon. I would like you to observe the reason: they were told that basement would be too much added expense, and that a man should not be living in a house which was worth more than $1,200 if he were paying only $20 a month for rent. The committee then asked for an extension of, I believe, two feet on the surface wall so that the soldier by his own industry and work could construct a basement for himself; but that too was refused on the ground of setting a precedent for Saskatoon. Of course I was not here, I did not hear this being said; I am merely quoting from clippings which I have before me. Recently the council, when it discovered that the estimate which had been submitted to it was low and that the work would cost more money, refused to put in the added improvements. That was quite within their right, and I heard one of them say at that meeting that the dominion government would have to shoulder that responsibility and the onus of blame for any inconvenience that might be occasioned these men. I suggest that the whole business smacks of unimaginative bungling on the part of the present administration.

The plumbers of Saskatoon now enter the picture. They refused to work on these homes, new ones already built and others which had been planned, and they gave as their reason, quite correctly, that they were anxious to see the finest standard of work put into the houses for these returning men. They did not wish to see the families of these men inconvenienced by reason of bad plumbing, and they refused on that basis and not because of self-interest. At any rate, they refused to do the work. Unfortunately that refusal held up the work in connection with houses into which these people would have gone, people who were anxious to get accommodation under any conditions so long as they had a roof over their heads. And so the plumbers after a short time capitulated, in the knowledge that these houses were needed by these people, who would accept any kind of shelter and who in fact had been living in such places as I have described.

There is one point to which I would call attention particularly, and which to my mind backs up the accusation I have already made, that this government lacks somewhat in imagination. The reason this request was refused was, forsooth, that you could not give Saskatoon something that you were not giving someone else. I would ask this question. If you were sending a contingent of troops away, dividing it and dispatching half to Australia and half to Iceland, and you were not issuing woollen underclothes to men going to the tropics, would you *ipso facto* refuse to issue woollen clothes to men going to Iceland? If basements are not necessary in Victoria, or for aught I know in southern Ontario, they are necessary in that western climate in which I have lived for the last thirty-five years.

The government boast about their enterprise, about the rights of individuals and about individualism. Well, I would say that we have here an example of uniformity and regimentation. I am afraid that tradition, to which I have previously referred in this speech in another connection, is again apparent. I refer to that tradition which unfortunately has always existed, particularly in regard to the private soldier after a war is over, which tradition was stated, in better language than I have heard elsewhere, in Rudyard Kipling's Barrack Room Ballads:

> It's Tommy this, and Tommy that, an' 'chuck him out, the brute!'
> But it's saviour of his country when the guns begin to shoot.

The subject to which I am now going to refer, and it is a complete change of subject, is one about which the people in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and to a less degree Alberta are seriously concerned. I refer to the Hudson Bay railway and port at Churchill. The people in the western part of the country are disappointed in what looks like government apathy towards this railway and port. For the information of hon. gentlemen here who are not so well acquainted with the situation, I might say that this apathy, or at least this lack of action, has caused the people in the west to form a new association called the Hudson Bay Route Association, with the object of promoting action in regard to the use of the railway and port.

This association and its energetic secretary, Mr. Frank Eliason, have done a great deal of valuable work in the matter of research. The secretary has constantly been demanding action from the Minister of Trade and Commerce in connection with trade for this port. We know the difficulties, of course. We know about the tie-up and so on. But it seems to be difficult to get information about this particular situation.

The Hudson Bay railroad baby seems to have been disowned by the board of transport commissioners and laid on the doorstep of the Canadian National, and so far as I can see at the present moment it seems to be rather

a rickety and undernourished baby. Let me warn the government that while I am making no accusation at the present time, there is a distinct and vocal opinion in the western prairies that there is a nigger somewhere in the Hudson Bay railway woodpile.

The latest information I have on the matter with regard to shipping wheat overseas this fall is found mostly in communications from ministers of various departments of the government to officials and private people in the west. I gather that the Park ships with which the government might come to the aid of the project are not equipped with gyro compasses, or are engaged in essential services elsewhere, and I understand that the season is now too far advanced to do anything about it. The absolute limit of sailing is October 10, and, in the next place, any British ships that might have been available have either been sunk or are not properly equipped with gyro compasses. Again it is a question of being too late. Whether the latest in compass equipment is necessary for sailing into this port is open to debate, but if the old pioneers of the country had waited until they could get the latest gadgets there would have been no pioneering and no discoveries.

The question has been asked whether the *N. B. MacLean* could not be used to lead in sister ships equipped with ordinary compasses through the area of magnetic disturbance, and some people wonder why one mile of slob ice cannot be kept open later than October 10, say to October 31. Whatever the answers to these questions may be, I know that if one hundredth part of the energy and research was put into this matter that was put into certain matters in connection with the war, that route would be in full operation and a solution to most of these difficulties would already have been found. I think it is a case of where there's a will there's a way. We cannot say too much about it now. I realize the season is getting on, but we will look for the government to do something definite about that situation in the year to come. It will be coming up on the floor of the house and in discussions throughout the whole western country.

We should link this matter of the Hudson Bay route with the matter of cooperative trade. Cooperative enterprise is increasing by leaps and bounds in the province from which I come, and I have the honour to have had some connection with it. Cooperative enterprise in Great Britain, Scotland and England, is particularly anxious to promote reciprocal trade. Hon. members scarcely need to be reminded that after this war Britain finds herself in a particularly difficult situation. Before the war years she was greatly dependent upon two things, one being export trade and the other, interest upon her foreign investments. In the great cause in which we have all been engaged, Britain has freely sacrificed her foreign investments, and it is more and more important that she be dependent upon a good export trade. In that, sir, I think we should be very ungrateful if we were not prepared to assist her.

With a view to promoting such reciprocal trade a delegation of cooperatives came to this country some time ago. They were very anxious to ship to us some of their fine goods in exchange for our primary products. And these goods could very readily be shipped—and perhaps this is the nigger in the woodpile to which I alluded before—to them through the Hudson Bay route in the ship which took over to them these primary products. We could all do with some of those fine British textiles at this time. I do not know how other hon. members of this house are equipped for certain items of their wardrobes, but I could do with a couple of shirts myself. I have not had time since the session opened, but for four days before it opened I walked the streets of Ottawa in an attempt to buy two shirts, and was unsuccessful. I think it is about time we had some good British textiles on the Canadian market.

Mr. HANSELL: We cannot afford to lose our shirts.

Mr. KNIGHT: I hope you do not take mine; you cannot, because I haven't any.

I appeal to the government to do something about this matter of reciprocal trade to encourage cooperative trade through Hudson bay. If they are not prepared to do it—and even if they are prepared to do it—I suggest that the better plan would be to accede to the wishes of the Hudson Bay Route Association, to allow a western board to be set up to control the railway and the port, in conjunction with the governments of the western provinces.

Now, sir, being a tyro in the matter of speaking, I have no idea when I started or how many minutes I have left. If I have time enough left I shall go on to another subject which lies very close to my heart, namely, the matter which was introduced here the other day by the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Zaplitny) when he said that there should be some federal aid to provincial education. We have in late years revised many of our ideas in regard to the responsibility of the state to supply this education. To my mind, sir,

equality of educational opportunities is the greatest single factor in the promotion of a true democracy. For instance, I believe that the implementation of the new education bill in Great Britain will result to a degree in the lessening of the class idea, in a destruction of the class system which has been for generations the bane of old country life. The solution for the problem of the old school tie, sir, is to make the old school tie available to everybody.

Hon. members are aware that the average per capita taxable wealth of the people of the provinces of this country varies very greatly. This means that in some provinces they have less money to spend on education of the children than in others, and therefore there is inequality of opportunity. The result of the difference is, of course that some children do not get a very good education. I find, for example, a statement in 1944 that one of our Canadian provinces spent $31.70 per child on its education, while another province spent $83.38, a ratio of two and a half to one. We who come from Saskatchewan have had some idea of how that operated during the last depression. To my mind education should not be altogether a provincial matter in so far as finances are concerned. I would not interfere with the study or with the curriculum in the different provinces, nor would I interfere in the administration; but in the the ultimate manner of providing finances for equality of opportunity in the provinces, the dominion government should be standing squarely at the back of the departments of education in the provinces.

In the report of the royal commission on dominion-provincial relations we find this statement:

> The quality of education and welfare services is no longer a matter of purely provincial and local concern. In Canada to-day freedom of movement and equality of opportunity are more important than ever before. These depend in part on the maintenance of at least minimum standards for national education.

Will hon. members note these two words: "freedom" and "equality"?—because education can bring freedom in more ways than one. To us in this little but increasingly larger group, freedom means more than the negative thing of freedom from domination by other people. To us it means the freedom to have the opportunity to live a full, free and happy life. Only by that method can equality be brought about. We believe that all men are equal in the sight of God, not in physical stature, not in intellectual ability, but in the same inherent right to the enjoyment of life.

Equalization of educational opportunity has been achieved in a smaller way in our own province of Saskatchewan with the larger school unit. There, a child who is unfortunate enough to be living on a farm that is infertile or on a farm which is temporarily dried out, has the same advantages provided for him as the child of the wealthier farmer in the same district. He has the same opportunities. That, of course, I shall mention with bated breath, because it is an example of the awful thing which the hon. members in this house so dread. I shall now read a clipping about education; it is as follows:

> Rural Students Get Aid to go to High School
>
> Fifty cents a day living allowance, payment of fees and free text books and exercise books for pupils in rural areas who attend town or city high school is what the . . . school unit does to aid country youngsters in getting a high school education.

I shall give hon. members one guess as to what province is referred to in this clipping.

Mr. GILLIS: Quebec.

Mr. KNIGHT: The idea that we are responsible for the education of other people's children is still new to some people. I remember just before the war, in the city of Belfast in Northern Ireland, talking to a cabinet minister in the Ulster parliament. We were discussing free secondary education, and I, of course, was advocating it. His position was this. He said: "Why should I educate the children of those people?" Hon. members know the implication contained in "those people." He said: "I have paid for the education of my own children. Why should I give to those people anything more than a mere public school education?" There are more implications there than appear upon the surface. His children went to a different type of school. They received a different and better class of education, and they grew up to belong to a class much better equipped in life than the children who went to the other schools or who did not go to any.

We in this group believe that the answer to the age old question: "Am I my brother's keeper?" is a resounding "yes". We believe in equal state financed education—note, I said, "financed"—both primary and secondary for all the young people in this land.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me add my voice to that of those who have expressed the view that this government is not unwilling but is actually unable, in spite of its good intentions, to bring in the new social order it has promised. It is not prepared to make the economic changes which alone can support the

social services which are essential and reasonable. This government represent the wrong party to bring about any vital social changes. They will only bring in halting and grudging reform, compelled to do so by the public will. The task will have to be entrusted to those who have long had the new social order as a vision and a dream, a thing for which they have long striven and prepared.

If you were employing a gardener—and that is spelled g-a-r-d-e-n-e-r—to beautify a piece of ground, would you employ a man who did not like being out of doors, a man who was allergic to the pollen of a daisy, who shuddered before the beat of the wind and the rain in his face, or would you entrust the task to one who loves and cherishes the growing things, who sees in the face of a little flower the very hand of God?

If we wish to write into the book of history the poem of economic freedom and social justice we shall have to choose as its authors those who have long wooed that muse, who have given of their devotion and their toil, like the one of whom Longfellow wrote:

> Who, through long days of labour,
> And nights devoid of ease,
> Still heard in his soul the music
> Of wonderful melodies.

Mr. G. RUSSELL BOUCHER (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, may I join with other members of this house in congratulating you upon your election as first commoner of the country by being chosen as Speaker of this honourable house. Then I think it would be but proper for me, as the member for Carleton county, to make some reference to the passing of a very esteemed colleague who sat in this house for a number of years. I refer to Hon. Norman McLarty, whose untimely death occurred over the week-end. In common with some other members of the house, during sessions of parliament and at other times Mr. McLarty was a resident of Carleton county, and I think perhaps that fact was in part responsible for his good judgment, popularity and pleasant personality, because I think we will all agree that he was an extremely popular member of this house.

I am pleased to see two of my old university and law school colleagues on the treasury benches, in the persons of the Secretary of State (Mr. Martin) and the Minister of Transport (Mr. Chevrier). I well remember, during law school days, taking my good friend the Secretary of State aside and urging him to mix political judgment with legal learning and become a member of the Progressive Conservative party. I was not very successful. My friend, I believe, chose the easier way, the way in which there was less competition to reach high rank, the insecure way, and, I feel, the unsound way. He chose the Liberal party. Another colleague of the class of '28, Osgoode Hall, the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Fleming), chose the wiser way, the sounder way, with the Progressive Conservative party. Then we are all pleased to see in the press gallery a fourth member of that class in the person of Mr. Frank Flaherty, who has distinguished himself with the Canadian Press.

The war is over now, Mr. Speaker, and we owe our first tribute to our fighting men and women and our war workers. They have won the war; our task is to win the peace. The men who fought our battles overseas and our war workers at home did not choose the easy or secure way. Let us in this house decide now to choose opportunity rather than security and ease. I believe that in the past we have done altogether too much holding out of security, without paying sufficient attention to the opening up of opportunities. We live in a country with vast resources and a comparatively small population, a country where security may not be the greatest thing but opportunity certainly is. Given wise leadership and progressive government, with our energetic people we can have opportunity, and security will follow.

In the speech from the throne mention is made of dominion-provincial relations. We all realize that Canada has become a vast nation and has outgrown the situation that prevailed in 1867, when dominion and provincial rights, duties and responsibilities were dealt with. Reconstruction is needed in our political institutions as well as in the social and economic spheres. I believe a new alignment of powers, responsibilities and duties is long past due. As the premier of Ontario said in his opening remarks at the dominion-provincial conference last month. It is not a question of whether or not this conference will succeed; it is a certainty that it must succeed.

As a member of this house may I first express my hope that the adjustment, modernization and reconstruction of dominion-provincial affairs will be carried out at the earliest possible moment. In that reconstruction I believe we should take it as a first principle that a government should itself raise the money it spends. To me it seems a sound principle of good judgment and common sense, as well as of political economy, that the institution spending the money of the people should raise it from the people and accept responsibility for its expenditures. We have gone through five years of very extensive

expenditures, during which both our budget and our taxation have mounted higher and higher and more and more of the income of the people has been taken from them by sources beyond their control, to such an extent that individual enterprise has been stifled and impeded and individual ambition has been impaired. Therefore I believe our first responsibility should be to see that not only in this house but in all the other institutions throughout the country we proceed in the spirit of economy and thrift, instead of keeping in mind the great expenditures we have made in the past.

In connection with dominion-provincial relations I believe we should take careful note of the great work our municipal councils are doing, and should leave them to carry on within their own spheres. I do not believe there is any other elected body in the Canadian or British economy so close to and so well acquainted with the people they represent as our municipal councils. In matters of administration, social reform and economic activities our councils can do a great work, from the humanitarian, the economic and the social viewpoint. Therefore I say that in reframing or rearranging the powers under the British North America Act the municipal councils should play a prominent role.

As a result of the war, and particularly as a result of war production, we in Canada have seen a great centralization of power and authority, not only in the dominion government but also in some of the financial, industrial and economic institutions of the country. Small business men, those seeking to establish themselves in new businesses, undertakings and professions, have found the way difficult. I believe one of our first responsibilities should be to discourage any tendency to greater centralization or to over-centralization, to see that authority, power and opportunity are spread over the lower financial brackets of our people rather than the higher. I believe individual enterprise should be given precedence over corporation control and that the small business man should get much more consideration from the parliament of Canada than he has been given in the past.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is my view that one of the first tasks to which we should proceed in our post-war reconstruction is the cutting down of the heavy taxation enactments which impose such great burdens upon our people, and at the same time we should give greater opportunities in the sphere of individual enterprise than we have given during the war. Production for other than war purposes has been greatly curtailed and, as the hon. member for Saskatoon City (Mr. Knight) said a short time ago, many of our people desire to have a little more and a little better clothing and other commodities. There are many things our people would like to have, and I believe the time has come when we should see to it that they have those commodities. Production in Canada should be increased as it has never been increased before, as long as we can couple with that increased production a proper distribution of the commodities produced. Distribution has been a problem for the last fifteen or twenty years. During war time we were able to achieve a much more equitable distribution than might otherwise have occurred, and I think we should continue to give our attention, our energy and our efforts to providing a more equitable distribution of these world goods than we have had before.

Research has done a wonderful job in connection with war production. Canadian research is deserving of our highest praise. In increasing intensity the research energies and achievements of the past few years will gradually permeate to the good of the Canadian people. We did not realize the lack of these advantages, but I believe we have now won a name for ourselves in connection with our research enterprises. We know now how lacking we were in proper research endeavours prior to the war. In my opinion this work should be extended very considerably at the earliest possible day. Experimental areas should be set up throughout the countryside. Small experimental plots should be established where the training airports used to be, and there trades, professions and different techniques could be taught to the people in the area.

One of the greatest difficulties in Canada for a good many years has been seasonal unemployment. We should endeavour to cure this difficulty by providing seasonal employment rather than unemployment insurance. I believe a great deal could be achieved if this and other governments within Canada embarked upon the development within the country of little trades, little handicrafts and little endeavours that could be undertaken by these people when their main occupation is not being practised.

This afternoon I should like to dwell upon the idea of a federal area. I regard the proposal as one having to do with a federal area rather than a federal district. I trust that this will not be looked upon as just a city of Canada; it should be looked upon as an area containing the national capital of Canada and demonstrating Canadian aims, Canadian endeavours and Canadian achievements, not only

to Canadians but to those who visit our country either as tourists or businessmen or as members of the staffs of the many embassies situated in Ottawa.

I trust that this national area will be considered as an exemplification of the national pride of Canada, as a stimulant to national consciousness of Canadians. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has announced the setting aside of something like nine hundred square miles in the Ottawa valley for a federal area. When we are setting up a federal area I hope that we go cautiously as far the the franchise of the people in concerned. I hope that the franchise will be kept for all the people within the federal area. The franchise is one of the fundamentals of a democracy, and as the government of Canada we should encourage the greater exercise of that franchise and a greater appreciation of its value. In any scheme of federal district or federal area the franchise should be retained for the Canadian people within that area.

The Prime Minister has announced that Jacques Greber is coming to Canada at an early date. This town planner who resides in Paris is to be asked to make a further report on a federal area. As a Canadian I submit that this federal area should be typically Canadian. It should demonstrate Canadian planning to the Canadian people. I believe we have within Canada many outstanding town planning experts and landscaping experts who could give valuable assistance to any person seeking to set up a federal area, possibly even greater than that which could be given by Mr. Greber himself.

In any federal area that is set up, the dominion, provincial and municipal governments should be working hand in hand with the utmost harmony and cooperation. If this parliament sets up a federal area, particular attention should be paid to the exemplification of Canadian art, Canadian ability, Canadian aims and Canadian achievements.

I do not think it would be wise for me to dwell upon the advantages of the Ottawa valley, the Gatineau valley and the Rideau valley as a federal area. The wise judgment of our predecessors who chose Ottawa as the national capital shows that they appreciated the economic, social and scenic advantages of this area. In the Rideau valley, some ten or fifteen miles south of here, there is a fine farm, beautifully landscaped, called I believe Rideau Bend. It is the home of the distinguished leader of the official opposition (Mr. Bracken). I could also take you across the river and show you at Kingsmere the summer home of the Prime Minister, which is not quite so important.

[Mr. Boucher.]

This proposed area of nine hundred square miles will take in portions of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. In setting up this federal area I urge that consideration be given to the differences that exist in the two provinces in connection with property rights, educational administration, customs, and so on. We should retain to each province all its provincial authority and rights and use only its cooperation in the development of this federal area. We should not look upon the federal area just as a city; it should be an exemplification of Canadian life. If we go through the valley, you will find that it is one of the greatest cheese producing and dairying sections in our country. That should play a prominent role in any scheme for a federal area. This area should be segregated into three classifications according to the territory. There should be a park area, retaining the natural beauty which has been bestowed upon this country. There should be an urban area, representing man's moulding of nature to his requirement for homes and habitation. There should be a rural area representing man's moulding of nature to the production of the necessities of life.

It will be noticed that I have not mentioned an industrial area. The Ottawa valley has abundant resources in power and raw materials; it has great transportation facilities, and with its nearness to larger centres it could become a great industrial community. But whoever chose Ottawa as the capital of Canada did not contemplate the development of an industrial area. Ottawa and the Ottawa valley have willingly forgone industrial development so that they might fit properly into the sphere of a national capital, and they wish to continue so. I shall not dwell at greater length on the industrial advantages or disadvantages of this area.

The beauty of the Gatineau park area can best be appreciated, as well as the beauties of the Gatineau and Rideau rivers, by taking a drive in any direction from Ottawa when the leaves are turning in the fall. Hon. members will be astonished by the gorgeous beauty of the landscape, the beautiful foothills of the Laurentians and the scenic beauties of the three streams. I think that the park area, in these days at least, should remain in the background until more important developments are undertaken in our federal district.

I do not intend to dwell on the urban area. Suffice it to say that all members of the house realize the congested condition within Ottawa. The city has outgrown its present boundaries. It is confined within altogether

too narrow a space. It badly needs expansion. The housing situation is acute. Our transportation and water services should be extended into the suburban areas. Then take the railways. It is a disgrace to any nation to permit railways to cut across a city as they do across the capital of Canada, dividing it, interfering with its traffic, interfering with its planning, interfering with its development.

In Ottawa the government have built numerous temporary war buildings on some of the finest sites in the city. But we have not improved the old buildings. If any hon. member will go through the west block or the east block or the Langevin block or the Daly building he will notice that there is great room for improvement in the conditions under which employees, yes, of the government of Canada, have to work. I shall not elaborate on that.

We in Ottawa are proud of our war memorial. But if you walk down to the war memorial at almost any hour of the day you will observe a scene of traffic confusion and congestion where one would expect to find a scene of peaceful, reverent memories and reflection. I believe that right now something should be done to improve conditions around the war memorial, built as it is of stone and brass and bronze, so that we could commemorate our heroes of the last war in a more fitting atmosphere. Let us take a lesson from that, and in future build a memorial to the achievements of our heroes of this war and our war workers and their contribution to the cause of individual liberty and of peace by demonstrating within the federal area what Canada as a growing nation is and aspires to be. We have a great community here. We have ambassadors from nearly all the countries of the world. We have trade commissioners, industrialists, distinguished visitors in all walks of life who come to Ottawa for a little while and then go back, taking to the various countries of the world their impressions of Canada and Canadians. Let us think of that in the planning and developing of our capital city.

I should like to discuss for a few moments the development of the rural sections of the federal area. The dairy industry is one of the greatest industries in our rural sections. But we have found that with the development of mechanized farming, the one-hundred acre farm,the efficient unit of bygone days, is now being replaced by larger farms. In our suburban areas we find also small holdings of from one to five or twenty-five acres. I think we could do a great deal to develop small holdings around our Canadian cities, and particularly around our national capital. With the increased knowledge of soil productivity that we have to-day, and the increased use of commercial fertilizer, and improved farming methods, I am confident that many families in our suburban areas could earn a substantial livelihood close to our cities, where labour is convenient, and there could successfully grow various fruits and vegetables and raise pigs, poultry, eggs and other farm products.

We could also do a great deal to counteract the present tendency of people in the agricultural areas moving into the congested cities, leaving the farms vacant and adding to the housing shortage and labour surplus in the cities.

I believe that trade schools should be established in the federal area. Many of our returned soldiers—and this part of the country has contributed generously to the armed forces—could be settled on experimental stations or on small holdings or established in trade schools, teaching and receiving instruction. That would be a good example of what Canadians can do in post-war reconstruction. We have in Ottawa, the seat of the national capital, many skilled technicians and many members of the learned professions, arts and sciences working for the dominion government who could assist in building up this federal area and developing it along truly Canadian lines.

Our reward would be great. There is no question about it that tourists would compensate us adequately for any expenditures made, and there need not be any great expenditure. The tourist trade could be attracted to Canada and be much developed. Canada needs a national consciousness, a national pride. But something is required to develop a national spirit within Canada. How can we do it better than by properly planned development within the federal area? I believe that the development of a federal area is a matter to be considered and planned for now. The actual development would be spread over the years to come. We cannot have it all now; we would not want it all now, but I do believe that with the location we have here and with the national capital here we should plan wisely, plan now and plan well. I believe that we could establish a fitting memorial to our war heroes and our war workers much better by demonstrating and promoting a new Canadian nation at peace and in prosperity than we could by commemorating their achievements in any monument of stone and mortar, brass or bronze.

Mr. L. A. MUTCH (Winnipeg South): Mr. Speaker, as this is the first opportunity I have had to address the house since the conclusion of hostilities, it is perhaps most natural and certainly most fitting that my first remarks should express the pride of the community from which I come in the achievements of her sons and daughters during the long period of the war, and in particular to express the thought which I feel sure is in the hearts of everyone from Winnipeg and Manitoba particularly, and that is the gratitude that we all felt in the realization that the survivors of the Hong Kong expedition, the Winnipeg Grenadiers, are for the most part once more in the hands of friends and in the process of being restored to their families at home. I could easily elaborate on the theme of the contribution of the community from which I come, but that story, the story of four gallant regiments serving in different fields and in all the ancillary services, is one which is written in the hearts of everyone who comes from Manitoba and the west, and is one which through history will be made known to generations yet to come. It so happened that in the early stages of the war regiments from that city were early engaged—at Dieppe, at Hong Kong, and then with the first division in Italy, and the impact of casualties came quickly and fell heavily on that area, more so perhaps in proportion to the population than elsewhere. However, the war is over and the problems which confront us today, while they are connected with and complicated by our experiences in the war, are separate and distinct.

Before proceeding, however, I think it is a good practice, and one which has been honoured during my time in the house, at the beginning of a session to say something about the constituency from which one comes. There are those who think of their constituency in terms of its scenic beauties, of its manufacturing capabilities, of the raw materials it produces. But during my period in public life my interest has been chiefly concerning persons rather than things material; and when I think of the constituency which I have the honour to represent I confess I think of it in terms of the people who inhabit that constituency. Perhaps it is worth mentioning that in the last election no less than eight of my own constituents were candidates for membership in this house. I am glad that some of them were elected—not, of course, the ones who opposed me; I could not have welcomed that with the same enthusiasm. I might even say quite frankly that I am glad some of them who contested other ridings were not elected. But I think it is indicative of the type of citizenship in that community that so many were found suitable as candidates in the province of Manitoba.

The constituency has been indirectly honoured in at least two other ways. I think it most fitting that I should mention a former constituent of mine who has been signally honoured by the people of Canada since he left that constituency, and I take the first opportunity I have had in this house to tender my personal congratulations to the leader of the opposition for his election to a seat in this house. I have never in my political experience, so far, indulged in personalities, and very seldom in pleasantries at the expense of individuals; but I see no reason why one should not pay tribute and acknowledge anything he may owe to anyone. For that reason I think I should say to the hon. gentleman who now leads the Ontario party in this house that I am under a sense of personal obligation to him, perhaps in two ways. When he accepted the leadership of the Progressive Conservative party and left the city he relieved the housing situation to such an extent that I am now comfortably esconced in the house in which he formerly lived. In the second place, I think his contribution to the leadership of that party materially assisted me in my return to this house.

I should like to refer also for a moment or two to one other former constituent of the constituency of Winnipeg South, the brilliant young gentleman who moved the address in reply to the speech from the throne. Back in 1935, when first I was a candidate for the House of Commons, the gentleman who now represents Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Benidickson) was one of the exceedingly bright young men who interested themselves in that campaign for the return of the Liberal party. I was the fortunate beneficiary of his enthusiasm; and perhaps—I do not say this too solemnly—when he decided to move to Kenora-Rainy River and help to spread the leaven of western liberalism in the province of Ontario, it may have been—I do not say it was—a fortunate circumstance for me, because even at that time he was obviously one who was ticketed for a career in politics and eventually membership in this house.

I have in the constituency of Winnipeg South an organization which from time to time has been prominent in the news and for a long period of years has been prominent in the economic life of the west. I refer to the Winnipeg grain exchange. Some days ago, when the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Fair), in seeking leave to introduce a bill, spoke of his enthusiasm for doing away per-

manently with that institution, I resolved to do something which I have not done during the period I have been here—to refer to an institution specifically and say something on its behalf.

The Winnipeg grain exchange has been investigated by royal and other commissions more than a score of times within my own memory, and without exception it has been held to be making an important and worthwhile contribution in the marketing of the products of the prairies. During the whole of that period it has been a simple matter in some sections, and in some areas it still is, to get an audience and a sympathetic hearing by detracting from that institution. It is made up of business men who know their business and perform a useful service. Whether the method under which they operate is one which commends itself to all citizens of Canada is a matter of opinion; but certainly I for one am serving notice that, while I do not appoint myself a defender of the institution, I get a little tired of the suggestion that there is something reprehensible about a type of organization which has performed a useful task, which has taken its share of the community load in every enterprise for community welfare, whose members have been doing a legitimate business and have endured without undue complaint very considerable sacrifices not only in this war but in one other war; who have gone on and made a contribution and have kept their contracts. I suggest that we might do well, with respect to any organization, to attribute to those who are doing a business which they believe in, conscientiously and honestly, at least the same sense of public service and the same sense of morality which we attribute to ourselves.

It is only a short time since the election, and I do not propose to repeat here for the benefit of hon. members who were not able to take part in my campaign, or to hear it, my campaign speeches. I know it is a time-honoured practice at the opening of a new session, and there are a large number of questions in which other hon. members, my constituents and theirs, are particularly interested. I might conceivably use all the time at my disposal to speak to the house on housing, on old age pensions, on reduction of taxation, on rehabilitation, on reconstruction, but at this time I feel that the constituents of Winnipeg South are well aware of my views with respect to each of these admittedly important questions.

During the campaign I argued for, expounded, defended and upheld the policies of the present administration with respect to each of these questions adding from time to time those qualifications or extensions which I myself felt should be added to or subtracted from that programme. I am not prepared, two or three weeks after the house has met, before we have had an opportunity to assess the problem in the light of the sudden termination of hostilities, and before the legislative programme of the government has had an opportunity to be tested, to elaborate on each on any of these at the present time. I mention them simply because, before I pass on to the one subject which I do wish to discuss for a few moments, I do not wish to be reminded that I rose in my place in the house without giving any indication that I was aware that these problems did exist. I gave plenty of indication of that during the campaign. I think perhaps I have given ample notice to ministers concerned both of my own interest and of the interest of my constituency in these matters. I shall be here continually and I shall be reminding them continually both of the needs and of the aspirations of that constituency and of the province from which I come.

I was and am primarily concerned in the problem of the highest possible degree of employment in the dominion and the maintenance of the highest possible standard of living. I was struck, when the member for Carleton was speaking a few minutes ago, by his relationship of two words, because I wrote down three or four words to guide me when I speak to you to-day, two of them in the same relationship in which he used them. Those words are opportunity and security.

I have been concerned throughout the whole period of the war, during my association with thousands of young men, with the degree to which particularly the younger people of our country had become what I dislike to call security minded. I had always thought of Canada in much the same way that my father thought of it when seventy-four years ago he left Scotland as a boy to come to Canada—that is, as a land of opportunity. I know it is the policy in some quarters, with some types of politicians and with some parties, to ridicule the idea of the country as a land of opportunity and to magnify the pitfalls that lie ahead of us, and to exaggerate, if that be possible, those dark days behind us and to capitalize continually upon the natural fear which such conditions have engendered in the public mind. I wish it were possible for those earnest, hard-working souls who do that, to be patriotic enough and unselfish enough to devote to the rebuilding of confidence, particularly in the

young people of the country, something like half the energy which they now devote to frightening people so that the emphasis might once more be placed upon opportunity rather than security.

I was struck by the fact that this goverment, committeed to the highest possible employment and the highest possible standard of living, had omitted to mention in its first speech from the throne, a question which I think is inextricably interwoven with the possibility of carrying out that programme, namely, immigration. I am convinced, from my knowledge of the development of Canada as well as of the United States, that it is for ever impossible to maintain the standard of work and of living which we as Canadians demand for our people and ourselves under the condition of settlement which exists in the dominion to-day.

In 1937, standing in this house, I said, if I quote myself correctly, that ten million people could not forever hold half a continent in a land-hungry world. Since that time we have engaged in the most devastating war in all history. Since that time we have seen areas formerly prosperous and populated destroyed by war. We have millions on the march, incapable of easy reestablishment where they are. At the same time we have something which we did not have when I spoke in 1937, and that is the experience of the last five years in our relationship with the United States.

I can go to areas on the Red river in Manitoba where men engaged in various types of farming, small-holding farming, have always their best years when they have a poor crop, a short crop, which is easy to handle and when prices are high. The capabilities of developing small holdings have been considered and experimented with by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and the possibilities which should be a real part of any high employment and higher standard of living have been explored; yet many areas which are suitable for the purpose are ruled out from the probability of successful large-scale development by virtue of the paucity of population.

I believe that we in Canada to-day have the opportunity to do in twenty or twenty-five years something which it took England seventy-five years to do, and which under the open-door policy, it took the United States fifty years to do, and that is to double our population and multiply many times our national income. I believe we should be thinking about it and should be doing something about it now, because I do not believe that if you separate from the present day programme a very much broaded policy of immigration and a realistic attitude towards export trade, you are going to achieve the goal towards which we have set ourselves and which is demanded of us.

In Canada we are singularly fortunate in some respects from the point of view of the resumption of immigration into this country. We have an over-all labour shortage in Canada to-day, we are told. Certainly there is a labour shortage in the unskilled labour group, and if anyone thinks there is not a labour shortage in the highly skilled groups I suggest that he consider some of the trades which are currently operating in Canada and which have not been able, through the apprentice system in the last ten or twelve years, to train any considerable number of men. If you go into the composing room of any publishing concern in Canada and count the number of men in that trade who are under fifty or even fifty-five and compare that number with the group who are fifty-five or over, you will realize that that is one trade where there is a real shortage and where there will be a greater shortage of skilled men. If you want a cabinet maker, as sometimes one did when materials were available and adequate, a man capable of doing a finish job—I am not talking about someone who can wield a saw and call himself a carpenter but one who can do a finish job—I believe that if you found out how few men of that type there were under the age of fifty-five you would probably be shocked.

I suggest that there is plenty of room both at the lower level of unskilled labour and at the top level of those who are highly skilled. That being so, we can easily begin at an early day a much accentuated immigration which will not only not deter those at present living in the country from proper rehabilitation but will assist them very materially, because it is established in the experience of the world that immigration does not result in lower wages.

We are fortunate in another respect. Those of us who are old enough to remember the days of mass immigration and the policy of the open door know that there was a waste of natural resources, that there was failure to utilize to the fullest extent those very lands and those natural commodities which were sometimes uneconomically developed. In Canada to-day the natural resources of the country are in the hands, not of the dominion government sitting down in Ottawa far away from somewhere, but of the provincial governments who are on the spot and who know or should know the probabilities in their local provinces. In addition to that, we are not faced with, as were the earlier pioneers and

the immigrants, the problems of transportation and supply which were great deterrents in those days. In Canada to-day we have multiple systems of transportation spanning the country east and west and in the air north and south, providing all the facilities which are required for greater development. We have government facilities, we have transportation facilities, we have our undeveloped natural resources, and we have those who are responsible for stewardship of them on the job on the spot.

In addition we have a condition in labour which is out of balance, because we have a superabundance of what one might call semi-skilled labour. There are those who say when men walk out of an aircraft plant or some other place where they have been doing semi-skilled work at high rates of wages for a considerable time that they have to go back and take what they can get in some other place. That is not always possible. It is not always possible for this reason: during the period of that development—some of it mushroom—during the war, unskilled workers came because they were required. They found employment in the industries of war in which they worked. It is true they were paid higher rates of wages than they were able to obtain as unskilled labourers in other places; but these men have made commitments. In the city from which I come it was impossible during the last four years of the war for a man coming in there to do a job such as I mentioned to find adequate housing for himself anywhere within the limits of where he would be required to work, unless he bought a house. Many of these people bought houses at prices which were perhaps higher than the property was worth in terms of the type of money that that man might hope to make in the work he formerly did. It may be all right to say to a man who has been laid off in a plant that he will have to go to work for less money in another area, but it is no use saying it to him that he can sell his house. If he can sell his house he may recover what he has put into it. But does anybody know where he can get shelter for his family unless he purchases another house in the town to which he goes? Certainly that is true of the west, and where would he find it?

It must be realized that many of these men are not so much victims of the fact that they refuse to work for lower wages than they were getting during war time, as they are of the fact that it is economically impossible for them to maintain the existence of their families at the present time at that rate. Yet, if we are to assume that it is the responsibility of governments—or even of society, to make it more general—to see to it that a man gets a job which will provide for his family—and it will be a contract whether society is represented by the municipal, provincial or federal government—then that man must accept the converse of the picture. A man who admits that society should provide him with a job must be prepared to go where he is sent and accept that which is given. If that is not done, then the contract falls down.

I do not think it would be possible to return immediately, or perhaps ever, to a policy of open door immigration; but I do believe a larger population is essential for the long-term success of that which is the ideal and hope of every decent Canadian in parliament and out of it, namely, the maintenance of a high standard of employment. A decent standard of living and high rate of employment will not be realizable until our population has increased to the point where we have a better balance between the home market and the foreign market. We live, and we may as well realize it, in an unsettled world. We have had to rely on conditions over which we had no control for too much of our prosperity which comes from outside markets through the medium of trade. Therefore I urge on the government and on those who understand the situation in Canada that we begin to think about it. I urge that we not only think about it but that we talk about it and that we do something about a policy and a programme of immigration. To-day Canada is recognized as something more than one of the small nations, although we are not yet in the secure economic position of a great nation. If we hope—and we do hope—to preserve our place, if we expect to be able to play the part which destiny seems to have cast for us among the nations of the world, then I think that to-morrow is not too soon to begin to think about that development.

I remember with pleasure and I recount with pride the record of thousands of sons of immigrants from all the different nations of the world who played a part the equal of that played by anyone else in the war which has just ended. One has only to look over the casualty lists or the roster of any unit going from that part of Canada which I know best, the west, to realize that in their thousands the sons of our immigrants of the last thirty years played an exceedingly important part in the war effort of Canada.

I was pleased when the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Stewart) delivered his maiden speech the other day, designed, and

properly so, to bring a measure of comfort to representatives of minority groups, many of them the first generation children of immigrant parents, and to strike a blow, perhaps not as necessary as he appeared to think, and to go on record for the strengthening of the position of all minority groups within the fabric of Canada as an individual nation. The speech was calculated, and commendably so, to please those who in large part sent him here. Despite the fact that we disagree on so many other things, I have no hesitation in associating myself with the sentiments of his remarks, namely, that it is important at this time that we develop a real Canadianism. It is more important at this time than it has ever been, because we have engendered in Canada during the war a sense of appreciation of each other, a sense of comradeship, a sense of citizenship, which was not possible before; and if it slips away from us now it may not be easily redeemable in the near future.

I dissociate myself from some of the criticism in the hon. member's remarks of specific institutions. I dissociate myself for the reason that I have not certain knowlege. I have, however, no hesitation in saying that as a Canadian I will be found associating with anyone, in whatever party he happens to be, who does anything he or she can do to make of Canadian citizenship a living, vital thing in the life of this country, perhaps because I had the opportunity to teach in days gone by; I escaped sooner than some of my hon. friends; perhaps because I have had some association in business and in politics with original immigrants themselves; perhaps because I am, as I have said, the son of an immigrant. I have knowledge of the contribution these people have made, and I have a profound belief in their possibilities for the future. I have the most devastating contempt for people who try to draw the line in any sense as between citizenship of one group of Canadians and that of another.

What has this to do with immigration? Simply this: that when we come to face that question, as we shall have to face it; when we come to the time when we want to make this a real, vital department which will contribute materially to the development of the Dominion of Canada, I hope we shall not resort to the subterfuges to which all parties have resorted in the past, in an effort to draw a line between races on the basis of occupation or for any reason other than their health, their ability, their readiness to work and their desire to become Canadians. I think of those people who stood at the borders of Mexico in years gone by, refugees if you like, seeking to escape into the United States and Canada. That is the attitude of mind which I think we must cultivate toward this country.

I have spoken longer than I had intended, but there is nothing in which I am more interested than in this question.

I have noted with gratification the plans of the government with respect to a national flag and a national anthem. I do not have that gratification because I personally feel the need of either. As far as I know I have not in my veins any blood but Scots, and the present flag and national anthem have been adequate for me during my lifetime either as a soldier, or as a civilian. But I think there is something more important, whether or not I have been able to make it clear this afternoon, and that is, the welding together of the people of this country and the millions who I anticipate will come here. I believe a national flag and anthem can be a focal point for the drawing together of all our people, whether or not I like it or some of our confreres from other provinces like it. I believe the matter transcends personal feelings. I think it is something to which we can anchor the sentiment and feeling of the people who are here and those who are yet to come.

One final word and I am through. In spite of the better judgment of most Canadians there still exists in this country a racial prejudice and discrimination which I utterly despise. It has raised its ugly head in one particular manifestation against which I wish to protest at this moment, not to this house but through this house to the people of Canada. There is a tendency in some districts and some places, in some firms and, I am sorry to say, in some professions—I am particularly sorry to include the professions because we expect a higher standard of humanity and understanding on the part of professional people than from ordinary mortals engaged in business—toward an exclusiveness which has never been understandable to me and which I do not believe is in keeping with British or Canadian traditions. It is being extended even to keep out those who have served this country on the field of battle, in the air and at sea. It has arisen and is still arising with men and women being excluded from certain professions and businesses because of their racial origin. I believe the people of Canada should take steps to end that sort of discrimination right now. We have an opportunity to do so in this parliament, not only because many of us are new and have nothing behind us to live down; not only because some of us have been here for a while and have seen these problems arise, but because throughout the country there is an awareness of the fact that things cannot

be as they were and a desire that all may share in the building of a better Canada.

When I commenced my remarks, Mr. Speaker, you were not in the chair. Before I resume my seat I should like to extend to you my congratulations and to express my personal satisfaction on your elevation to the position of first commoner.

Mr. G. A. CRUICKSHANK (Fraser Valley): Mr. Speaker, first of all I should like to offer you my congratulations on having assumed your high office; it is indeed a pleasure to me, having been a personal friend of yours for some time. Perhaps I am more interested than some other hon. members. Some two years ago, when you represented the constituency of St. Mary, I remember that you came to me, as representing a farm riding in British Columbia, and asked if I could find employment in my riding in far off British Columbia for your son during his school vacation. At that time I could scarcely understand why you should want to send your son at tremendous expense to a farm in the fertile Fraser valley, and asked for the reason. You explained to me that you wanted your boy to be among the finest Canadians and in the finest part of Canada. I wondered why the boy should be sent across Ontario and the vast prairies to the Fraser valley, and only the other day I discovered the reason. We in British Columbia are very fond of fruit. The other day I went down to the market here in Ottawa and bought a basket of peaches. Now, having seen the peaches they grow in Ontario, I can understand anyone crossing this province to get to British Columbia, where we have the finest of standards not only for fruit but for all farm produce. That is why the best markets in the world are open to British Columbia. If any hon. members dispute that statement I want to show some of the peaches I bought in Ottawa for $1.25, marked "grade No. 1."

An hon. MEMBER: Pass them around.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I should be glad to pass them around to hon. members from Ontario. Here they are, covered with beautiful pink gauze. They look lovely; they look ripe and fresh. But let me take off the pink gauze and show hon. members from Ontario what you are selling as No. 1 peaches, and I think you will understand why anyone would want to move to British Columbia. These are not from the bottom of the basket; they are from the top. Fortunately for me this morning a friend of mine sent me a crate of peaches from Keremeos, British Columbia. There we do not sell them covered with pink camouflage, in an almost fraudulent manner; we sell them by the crate. I want hon. members to look at them; these are the smallest ones in the box.

I should like to congratulate the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) on the forceful way he read his address. I am glad we now have a leader of the opposition who at least can be heard in this chamber, and I hope the cabinet follow his good example. I want also to sympathize with the hon. gentleman on the poor material which he had to read. Bracken House must have had an off day that day.

Now I want to speak to the leader of the C.C.F. party (Mr. Coldwell) and to congratulate him on the very fine way he delivered his address. I am in a good humour to-day, congratulating everybody. He spoke in the manner we expect of him; always fair, always courteous and always interesting. I also extend my congratulations to the leader of the Social Credit party (Mr. Low) on the forceful way he delivered his address. As usual, and after having listened to his predecessor for some years, I still have not the faintest idea what his platform is.

I will move on to the mover (Mr. Benidickson) and the seconder (Mr. Langlois) of the address in reply and congratulate them on the honourable positions they hold and the right they have to represent their particular forces in this house.

I should like to say a word to the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Pearkes). We in British Columbia are proud of the fact that so many winners of the Victoria Cross during the present war come from that province. Five out of the eleven winners in Canada come from British Columbia. It is an honour to this house, not merely to the opposition party, that two winners of the Victoria Cross share the same desk. I am sorry to add that this is the only parliament in which they will have that unique honour.

The hon. member for Nanaimo is a gallant soldier and I believe he will always fight for the rights of the soldier. I agree with what he said the other day that it was not fair, just or sporting for a soldier in Canada to be discharged so that he could shop around and secure a job while other men were still serving overseas. I agree entirely with him, and no one in this house is better qualified to speak about that than the hon. member for Nanaimo. That is exactly what he did.

Mr. GREEN: Pretty cheap stuff.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: With 245 seats to choose from he decided to contest the seat of a member of parliament who had distinguished himself in this war by winning a

decoration for gallantry and who was still serving overseas. That was the position when the hon. member secured the nomination in that riding.

I should like to say something about demobilization. I have heard about demobilization all across the country. I believe and always will believe that the fairest way is to demobilize on the basis of first in, first out, except on extremely compassionate grounds. I presume it is the policy of the opposition, as it was the policy of the leader of the opposition before, to want to have every one in uniform and at the same time he was complaining bitterly because fishermen's sons and farmers' sons were being called up.

They also put up a fight for housing and housing immediately. I commend them for that and I am willing to support them in every way possible. However, I cannot understand their attitude in demanding housing and housing immediately and then attacking the government for discharging skilled tradesmen from the active army in Canada in order that they may go to work constructing these houses. That, in my opinion, is not consistent.

I should like to make a suggestion to the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Abbott). When he starts demobilizing I think he should consider demobilizing all the brass hats we have parading around this country. They are really not parading because these admirals and generals and air commodores are generally being driven around by beautiful C.W.A.C's. When they are discharged I know of an excellent place for them to retire to in British Columbia, one of the most beautiful spots in the country, a place called Duncan. There is wonderful scenery, wonderful fishing and the climate is magnificent. It is an ideal place for them to retire to, because as you drive along you will see that each and every mail-box has the name of an admiral or a general on it. There is no one beneath the rank of major. I remember after the last war a man from my company retired out there and he painted his mail box "Private Roy Brown" and immediately there was an investigation into what he was doing there.

I should like to compliment the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) upon having brought so many outstanding young men into his cabinet. I am sure the other members of the cabinet will forgive me when I say that in my opinion the present Minister of National Defence is one of the most outstanding young men we have had in the public life of Canada for a long time.

I want to commend the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. Merritt) for making one of the very few good suggestions we have had from the other side in connection with housing. I consider it is the only good suggestion we have had. He pointed out that there was a bottle-neck in connection with housing. We in British Columbia have heard about that bottle-neck. Whether or not it is true, the story is that certain mills have in storage large amounts of flooring and other lumber being held for higher prices. We are told that certain firms have plumbing fixtures and electrical equipment which they are holding. I agree with the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard who suggests that some authority should be sent in there to go to these firms and, if it is found that they are holding back supplies, order them to release them at once.

There is another thing this authority could do. Many individual contractors who are building houses for soldiers find that they are unable to get priorities. I think a soldier's house should be given every priority, whether it is being built by private or government contractors.

I wish to say a word about labour, in which I am very much interested. In this connection I am speaking particularly for the benefit of my C.C.F. friends who seem to think they have a monopoly of the desire to work or cooperate with labour. There are in my riding some 2,000 members of a local union. I know every one of their leaders and organizers personally and I have always found them willing to cooperate. They have always been ready to sit down with me to work out any problem. I do not always agree with them and they do not always agree with me, but we have always been able to get together to try to arrive at a solution. I cannot understand why firms and individuals cannot adopt the same attitude. I am proud of the fact that the labour political action committee in British Columbia endorsed George Cruickshank, the only member that was endorsed by organized labour in that province.

I should like to show the house how our employers are ready to cooperate. While mine is mainly a rural riding, I have one logging company that produces one million feet of logs a day. Any hon. member who is familiar with logging knows that is real logging, and that is just one concern. Every man in the employ of that company was hired at the union hall, and the member for the riding had something to do with that.

I should like to commend the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie) for what he has accomplished, and in doing this I realize I may be antagonizing a little support

in my own province. I think I speak for the benefit of hon. members and certainly for the benefit of the members of the legion in my own riding. When a member comes here he sometimes forgets that he is just one member out of 245; he feels that he is going to set the world on fire, that he is going to accomplish wonders. Even the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton) thinks that, but he will be disillusioned before very long. I want the members of the legion to realize that the Minister of Veterans Affairs, or any other minister, is merely one minister out of twenty and sometimes he cannot accomplish all the things he wants to accomplish on behalf of the veterans or anyone else. When you have been a minister of the cabinet for a short time you realize that there is another little select committee to be considered. I do not know who they are and I do not think they know who they are. It is called the treasury board. If you can overcome the treasury board you will get what you want. They have a committee over there called the Graham Towers Gordon committee, and that must be overcome.

I started out to commend the Minister of Veterans Affairs for consolidating all veterans' legislation into one act. This will assure that the orders in council will all be carried out so far as veterans are concerned. However, I should like to suggest to him that he has not gone far enough. During the election campaign he stated that a committee would be set up to study the Pension Act and other matters pertaining to veterans. I hope he will see to it that the War Veterans' Allowances Act is discussed and that the means test is abolished.

I should like to refer briefly to old age pensions. While there has been a move in the right direction, there is still a long way to go. I do not believe it is sensible, wise or economical for the country to wait until a man has one foot in the grave before he is given a pension. It has been suggested that the means test will be abolished in connection with old age pensions, and I repeat it should also be abolished in connection with veterans.

I wish to say on behalf of my riding a word in connection with meat rationing. I do not know whether it is necessary or not, and I should like to hear some explanation from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley). I think I know as much about it as the *Globe and Mail*, and I am certain that I am looking at meat rationing from a different viewpoint from that of Mr. McLean of Canada Packers. I believe that this country is justified in asking for an explanation from the Minister of Finance as to the actual need or otherwise of meat rationing. The hon. member for London (Mr. Manross) commented the other day on the lack of ability or knowledge of many of the officials of the wartime prices and trade board. I can agree entirely with him because I noticed that many of them offered themselves as Conservative candidates and were to become cabinet members if that party were elected to power.

I believe that we have a sufficient market for some time to come for all our farm produce, but I believe it is the duty of every member of parliament, whether he be a supporter of the government or of the opposition, to see to it that farm prices are maintained at a reasonable and stable level. I believe that it is the duty of every member of parliament, and I hope that members on the other side of the house will follow through on this, to see that co-operatives' development is not hindered by taxation or in any other way and that every effort at cooperation be encouraged and assisted in every way.

I believe that one of the things in which the government has fallen down is that too little attention has been paid to our greatest source of income, a source that can bring us in a tremendous amount of money with very little expenditure. I refer to the tourist trade. Probably I am prejudiced, coming from British Columbia, but I believe that there is nothing that we can sell so easily to our good friends to the south as our tourist attractions. I do not think the federal government has yet done its duty by the various provincial governments in connection with the tourist trade. Let me mention one small way in which the federal government can help, and this affects my riding and probably every riding in British Columbia. That is by contributing, and contributing heavily, to any highway leading into British Columbia from the international boundary, to connect up with the transcanada highway, which must be completed as a postwar project.

I wish to say one word in connection with the party I support, and the principles for which it stands. I believe in free enterprise. I believe that free enterprise can and must succeed. I believe that if free enterprise fails, it will not be because the soap-box orators cause it to fail, but because of the abuses of free enterprise itself—the actions of such concerns as American Can, Canada Packers and other monopolies. It is the duty of the government to see that free enterprise is given a fair opportunity, and such monopolies as I have

mentioned should be treated as a contagious disease and be quarantained by government order.

In conclusion, I wish to commend the Prime Minister for having set such an excellent example in the brevity of his speech, and I hope it will be followed by all my fellow members from British Columbia.

Before I sit down I would remind the house and particularly my own party and the government that the people of British Columbia will not permit the return to the province of the Japanese.

Mr. G. S. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I should like to extend my congratulations to you on your elevation to the high office you now hold. I am sure you will fill this office with dignity, distinction and merit. I should also like to congratulate the mover (Mr. Benidickson) and the seconder (Mr. Langlois) of the address in reply to the speech from the throne. They are new members of the house, lately members of the armed forces, and it was only fitting and proper that they should be chosen for this signal honour. It was a fitting tribute to them, one which I hope will be followed in this country. There are many members of this house who have seen service in world war I or world war II. This is all to the good because it assures that the house will have many members who will see to it that the rights of the returned soldiers are fully protected.

Several speakers taking part in this debate have made reference to the supremacy of parliament. They have asked that the supremacy of parliament be restored to this parliament. It is a subject in which the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has always been much interested. On many occasions during the last parliament he made reference to the supremacy of parliament. He said that parliament was supreme, that only the people themselves were supreme over parliament. Yet only a few days ago, in this very session, the Prime Minister rose in his place and tabled another large batch of orders in council, one of a succession of thousands of orders in council which have been tabled in the house on previous occasions. Many of these orders in council were passed while the house was in session. Many of them even changed the provisions of statutes which had been passed by the parliament of Canada. Hon. members who were in the last parliament will recall that on occasion after occasion this parliament was denied information on many subjects, and always there were standard excuses: first, it was not in the public interest to give the information; second, it could not be given for reasons of security; third, the British government did not wish the information to be released. I will cite only one example.

The war expenditures committee sat behind closed doors for several years. The members were sworn to secrecy, so that nothing could be discussed in the house. I would ask the Prime Minister to state on an early occasion whether or not it is his intention again to set up a war expenditures committee. If so, let its meetings be open to the public and the press.

In the short session of last March we had another example. Everyone knew it would be necessary to call parliament; yet the call was delayed and delayed and parliament was not finally summoned until March. Surely, after the retreat of General McNaughton from Grey North parliament could have been called. When parliament was finally called, no opportunity was given for any debate on the address. The session was very short. Absolutely no opportunity was given for any discussion or examination in detail of expenditures under the war appropriation bill or under the civil estimates. Despite that, huge sums were voted. But, Mr. Speaker, there was plenty of time to discuss whether or not Canada should accept the invitation to attend the San Francisco conference, an invitation which everyone here was most willing and anxious that Canada should accept.

Only a few days ago the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) asked the house for the appropriation of a very large sum, again without any examination of any of the expenditures. No doubt next month he will again ask for further appropriations, still without examination. Surely, now that the war is over, the time has come when all the rights and privileges of parliament should be restored to it, and government by order in council should cease. No longer should this country or the Canadian people be regulated and controlled by boards and commissions not responsible to parliament.

We had an example during the last few days in this house. We read in the press that the wartime prices and trade board had passed an order whereby certain plumbing fixtures had been frozen. The Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) said on Friday in the house that there was no such order. That was repeated to-day by the Minister of Finance. But we have read in the press that there is such an order and that such an order is here to stay. Surely, Mr. Speaker, if the Prime Minister who has always paid so much lip-service to the supremacy of parliament, really believes that parliament should be

supreme, by his own actions he should restore these rights and privileges to this parliament.

Much has been said in this house with regard to housing. I concur in the remarks made by the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Fleming) who so well presented the facts in that regard. To-day we see in Canada the tragic result of government planning as far as housing is concerned. Thousands of veterans are returning daily, with no suitable housing available. We hear much of what is known as low rental housing and housing at moderate costs. Frankly, in my opinion there is no such type of housing; because when you consider the huge increase in the price of building materials, the high wages paid to members of the building trades and the great scarcity of building materials, it is simply impossible for the returning veteran or the average wage-earner to build a house for himself or to buy a house which can be referred to as under low housing. Many of the houses being constructed for veterans are too small, and lack many conveniences; yet the prices, which range from four to six thousand dollars, are certainly beyond the purses of a great many of our returning veterans.

Here I should like to say a word on behalf of that much-abused person known as the landlord. Apparently it is almost a crime for anyone in Canada to own and rent housing accommodation. Landlords have been held up as being almost monsters; and I would point out that the traditional rights of landlords both in equity and in law have in many cases been ignored, because they have lost all control over their property. They cannot deal with their property in any way without first obtaining permission from the rental board. The landlord cannot raise his rent because the rent is frozen; yet in many cases tenants will sublet part of the rented property. The poor landlord then can only apply to the rental board, and any increase he receives is very small. The landlord is bound to keep his property in a proper state of repair, and yet no attention is paid to his pleas. Building materials are not only scarce; they have also greatly increased in value. Wages are high. If he repairs his property he is then in difficulty with his income tax return, as to whether the repairs will be classed as such or treated as a capital expenditure. To-day a man purchasing a house in Canada for his own use and that of his family cannot obtain possession; and I would point out that this is a typical example of the bureaucratic methods of this board.

This order applies to all Canada, even to small villages and hamlets. It may be necessary in some larger cities, but I say frankly that in many towns and villages no such order is necessary. Under a former order, where the tenant was given six months' notice during the summer months, he was amply protected. Apparently the board forgot that owners of realty and landlords are the pillars that support the municipalities with their taxes. I suggest to the minister that he give serious consideration to an amendment of this order whereby, in places with populations of less than ten thousand, any man who purchases a home for his own use shall be allowed to obtain possession of his property within at least a reasonable period.

The speech from the throne refers to the beautification of the city of Ottawa as a "national" war memorial. Well, perhaps it is commendable to beautify the capital city, but to consider such a scheme as a national war memorial is entirely another matter. I point out that this is a typical example of the methods adopted by the Prime Minister. His announcement of the proposed plans to beautify the city of Ottawa as a national war memorial were made just on the eve of the opening of parliament. According to press reports the French architect who devised the plan started some years ago has already been communicated with and asked to come to Canada to further these plans. I might pause and say here, Mr. Speaker, that if a war memorial is to be erected in the name of Canadian soldiers, surely in this land of Canada there can be found an architect clever enough to devise and carry out such a plan. I would ask the Prime Minister whether, before he made this decision, he consulted the legion or any other veterans' organization, or if he consulted any body of citizens whatever. Certainly he never consulted the members of this house. The citizens of Canada who have to provide the funds for this plan should have at least something to say as to what shall be the nature of the war memorial. No one will attempt to deny that at any rate the war veterans should have something to say in these all-important matters. After all, the city of Ottawa is a very small part of this great dominion. Millions of Canadians have never been to Ottawa and never will be here. And, frankly, what benefit will the beautification of Ottawa be to the veterans? They will never be here to see the beautiful scenic drives which will be planned around the city of Ottawa and the suburbs. Such a plan will not help to reestablish the veteran in civilian life; it will not help him to get a job, obtain proper housing, educate his children or earn a living. I am sure that if the voices of the Canadian boys who were left behind at Hong Kong, in Sicily, in Italy, and on the continent and other spots of the world could be heard in this chamber they would be raised in condemnation on any such war

memorial to be erected or carried out in their name.

Any national war memorial should be of such a nature that all the citizens of Canada will benefit from it; that the youth of our country, the children of veterans, will benefit and that generations yet unborn will receive some advantage.

No sum has been announced by the Prime Minister as the probable cost, but one may judge from pictures that have appeared in the press, the sum that will be expended will run into many millions. I would suggest to the Prime Minister that whatever sum he has in mind to be spent on a national war memorial for Canada, this money be placed in a trust fund and that the income from that fund be used annually for scholarships in every university in the dominion, these scholarships to be open to all Canadian boys and girls. From the modest sum of $5 million, which is probably only a fraction of what this memorial will cost, the annual income at three per cent would exceed $150,000, and even this small sum would be the means of assisting from 150 to 200 boys and girls each year in furthering their university education. This fund would continue in perpetuity, and in the years to come thousands upon thousands of young Canadians would benefit from Canada's national war memorial.

Who can say but that from among these young Canadians who would be benefited in this way there might emerge some young scientist, some medical man who might happen to find the magic key to unlock the secret to the cure of cancer and many others diseases which to-day baffle the medical profession? Who can say but from among these boys and girls in the future there might emerge a surgeon whose skilful hands would bring restored health to many? Such a plan might produce a composer who would write a symphony that would outrival those of all the old masters, or an artist whose skilful fingers and whose brush might leave behind a legacy of beauty in colour for the whole world. Such a plan might produce a musician or a singer whose trained hand or voice would bring pleasure to millions.

The possibilities of such a plan are unlimited, and I am sure that the boys whose names this proposed memorial is to be erected to commemorate would approve it. I say to the Prime Minister, in all sincerity, I hope that before this plan is made final he will consult not only veterans organizations but all the Canadian people and the House of Commons as well; for, after all, Mr. Speaker, this is not a pressing matter. Even as late as last week the daily press of Canada was still publishing casualty lists.

I wish to concur in the remarks made by other speakers in this debate as to the need for a reduction in the present income tax, and I would point out to the new Minister of National Revenue (Mr. McCann) that under the system which has grown up in the district income tax offices they send to the taxpayer an assessment form in which they merely set out the amount of assessment, the amount of extra tax, the penalty, the interest and the date on which it must be paid. They give no explanation, nor do they show in any way how the assessment is arrived at. Furthermore, in many cases these assessments are not made for years, and when the poor taxpayer does receive the assessment he finds that the income tax people do not believe in three per cent; they charge five or eight per cent, and there are certain penalties.

I contend that in all cases where there has been undue delay on the part of the department in making assessments, the taxpayer should not be penalized either in interest or in penalties; for it is not enough for the department to say that it is the duty of the taxpayer to make out his income tax form correctly before it is filed. To-day, with the continual changes in income tax and the complicated form and the various regulations, who can say when he makes out his form that it is correct? I have found in my experience that in many cases I have had chartered accountants make out income tax returns which have come back as incorrect.

I suggest that the exemption for single men should be raised to $1,200 and the exemption for married men to $2,000, with increased exemptions for dependents.

The speech from the throne mentions a charter for veterans. As my leader well pointed out, the mere amalgamation of the acts and regulations affecting veterans will not improve or change in the slightest degree the operation or the benefits of these acts. If there is to be a veterans' charter of even the slightest benefit to the soldiers I would be all for it, but I say to the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie) that if we are to have a veterans' charter, that charter must mean something. I suggest to him that the very first clause in the charter should provide that every returned veteran shall be given a decent job at a scale of wages that will enable him to support himself and his family with a good standard of living. Let the second clause of the veterans' charter provide that the veteran shall be furnished with proper housing at a

cost within his means. If we are to have this charter for veterans, let the charter amend and rectify the many inequalities that exist in matters relating to veterans' affairs. Let the so-called preference in the civil service for veterans really mean something, and let it apply to veterans who have actually seen service in the field of battle. Let there be an adjustment in the matter of clothing allowance whereby veterans shall receive $100 clothing allowance irrespective of the date of discharge. Let there be provided an adjustment in the difference of the amounts paid officers to purchase outfits. Let the scale of pensions, which has not been revised in years, be brought up to a proper level to measure up to 1945 conditions. This grateful country still pays a veteran with 100 per cent disability $75 a month, and anyone who has had dealings with the pension board will bear me out when I say that when the Canadian pension board rules that a veteran has 100 per cent disability he certainly has 100 per cent. Let this charter provide that the pension board shall accept the category of the soldier on enlistment as his true and correct category and that any lower category on discharge, or any disability, be taken as due to war service. Let the charter provide for a speeding up in the handling of pension claims, and let it provide for an end to the continual fight by the private soldier against the pension board to establish his right. Let the charter provide that in all cases of doubt the benefit should be given to the returned soldier. I know the minister is probably thinking there is such a provision now, but let it be actually put into operation. Let the charter provide that the insurance principle will be reinserted in the act. Let the veterans' charter provide that the Pension Act will cover all men in the armed forces who receive injury, that such men be entitled to the full benefits of the act, and that no one should receive a pension at the discretion of some official of the board or subject to any regulations. Let all the charitable provisions be struck out of the act, and in particular I refer to section 11. Most important of all, let the veterans' charter proclaim that the veteran is entitled to these provisions and benefits as a matter of right and by statute.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, if we are to have a veterans' charter, let us have something more than a mere amalgamation of the various acts. I would point out, as I mentioned before, that it is the duty of all hon. members who have served in either war to see that the rights of all veterans are fully protected.

The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) stated, as reported at page 39 of *Hansard*:

> . . . only one government remains in power which dares to admit that it is Conservative, and that government can be found in the province of Ontario.

Well, I hardly need to remind the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar what happened in the Ontario election of June 4 to the party that he leads. That demonstrated plainly that it had no place or room for socialism.

An hon. MEMBER: Good old Trestrail!

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): The methods adopted by the socialist party, along with their communist friends, in the provincial legislature was just too much for the province of Ontario to swallow.

On the same page the hon. member made reference to his pleasure in referring to the vote that his party received in the dominion election of June 11. Speaking for myself and my own riding, I can tell the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar that my riding did not vote for his candidate nor did the soldiers vote for his candidate. When the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar was making those remarks I wondered if there did not run through his mind the speech that he made on the floor of this house in September, 1939, the day that war was declared, when he advocated that there be no participation by Canadian troops overseas; that our efforts be confined to economic aid. I wondered if he recalled the day that the vote was taken in this house on bill No. 80, the bill which would provide that our troops overseas would have proper reinforcements. On that occasion the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar and every other hon. member of his party voted against the bill. I wondered if the same hon. member recalled that in the short session of November of last year when the reinforcement crisis was at its height that he and his party supported the half-hearted measure of the government. Was he more interested then in the fact of seeing that the troops overseas were adequately supplied with reinforcements, or was he and his party seeking and trying to obtain votes in the coming election from members of the N.R.M.A., the pacifists and other isolationists?

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer briefly to the amendment moved by my leader. I would point out to hon. members, and especially to soldier members who conscientiously have the interest and welfare of their former comrades at heart, that they cannot vote against this amendment because, if they do, they will clearly show by their

vote that they are content, that they approve and uphold the method and manner in which the government is demobilizing the men and women of the armed forces; that they approve the lack of planning by the government to provide jobs at fair wages for service personnel and war workers, and, further, that they are content with the housing situation which confronts Canada to-day. If you, soldier members, vote against this amendment, how can you then face or attempt to explain to the service personnel in your own riding your absolute disregard for their interests? I intend to support the amendment.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. F. D. SHAW (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, before proceeding to the discussion of certain issues which I consider to be of vital and immediate concern, I should like to make brief reference to a statement or observation made by the hon. member for Hastings-Peterborough (Mr. White) during the course of his address this afternoon. In referring to the proposed beautification of our national capital as a fitting memorial to those who sacrificed and died during this war, the hon. member declared that in his opinion we should give some consideration to utilizing the services of a Canadian architect. That suggestion brought to my mind the thought that the memorial we have in this city to those who gave their all in the last war was designed by Englishmen, the March brothers. Possibly I should say first that the site for the memorial was selected, as we know, by a French town planner, Greber by name. The stamp commemorating the unveiling of the memorial was engraved in New York by an American. It is said that Canada's part was the pouring of the cement and the paying for the memorial, with interest. Since the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has frequently indicated his interest in the advancement of Canadian art, I would suggest that we might give consideration to the suggestion advanced by the hon. member for Hastings-Peterborough.

This parliament, Mr. Speaker, now faces that world for which the toil, the sweat and the tears of six savage war years were expended. This twentieth parliament is assembled at a time when the thoughts of Canadian men and women are turning away from war and being centred upon that new freedom and that new security so often referred to both within and without this house. It has been said, and I concur in the view, that it is a time of new life and new hope for which millions fought and died. I realize that no man can properly foretell what the future may hold, but those of us in this group believe one thing is self-evident, namely, that within the hands of those here assembled rests the power, or better still the means whereby most if not all the hopes and aspirations of our people can be translated into realities. Once that translation is complete, we can truly say to those who have sacrificed, suffered and died, "It has not been in vain." Those lads who went forward from our constituencies did not go to preserve that way of life which all too many of them knew. In my estimation they went to do battle that we might have one more opportunity to build for peace, for security and for real happiness. Each member who sits in this house does so by virtue of the acceptance of a certain challenge, and I say that challenge is to assist in making this country a nation worthy of their magnificent courage and heroic sacrifice. This is a collective responsibility, and I believe we should all appreciate that fact no matter where we may sit in this house. The task will not be an easy one, but certainly there is no one here who would say it is insuperable. Time alone will answer the question whether we are worthy of the confidence placed in us.

Before proceeding to the main subject I propose to deal with, namely certain policies of the War Assets Corporation in the disposal of what is sometimes regarded as surplus, obsolete or valueless equipment, I desire to devote a moment or so to another matter which arose at the time of the election and which, by virtue of the circumstances surrounding it, we found ourselves unable to answer at the time. I have no particular desire to endeavour to exhume certain things from the past, but where those things have a direct bearing upon the future I feel quite justified in bringing them forward. I have in my hand a clipping from an Alberta newspaper dated May 19, and headed, "Social Crediters assailed by King." I am informed that this is the report of a closed meeting, a meeting attended by invitation only. I would ask if the applause at that meeting was rehearsed, as I am told it was on another occasion. According to this report, in connection with our so-called opposition to government financial policy the Prime Minister said:

> I do not hesitate to say that the policies of the Social Credit group, if followed by any government would, in no time whatever, lead to a worse depression than we had in the 1930's.

In that connection I have before me a statement made by the Prime Minister just ten years ago, relating to those so-called proposals which we have advocated in the field of finance. We agree with the correctness of the statement made at that time, when he said:

> Once a nation parts with the control of its currency and credit it matters not who makes the nation's laws. Usury, once in control, will wreck any nation. Until the control of the issue of currency and credit is restored to the government and recognized as its most conspicuous and sacred responsibility, all talk of the sovereignty of parliament and democracy is idle and futile.

Nothing much more than that is required in defence of social credit monetary policies. Sometimes we are obliged to wonder what has happened to the Prime Minister during the last ten years. Who have been responsible for changing his mind and his views, because we feel that he was quite sincere in his beliefs in the observation he made at that time.

Another statement included in this press report is as follows:

> In the years they have been in parliament, the Social Credit members have consistently ignored—I might go so far as to say they have denied—the vital necessity of external trade to the prosperity and welfare of Canada and particularly of Alberta.
>
> In a world that is steadily shrinking and where the interests of nations are becoming increasingly one, they continue to preach national self-sufficiency and economic isolation.

May I say with all the vehemence at my command that we have never in this house or out of it preached national self-sufficiency or economic isolation. It is true that during the early years of the war we protested most vehemently about the shipments of scrap metal and wheat to Japan. Surely the Prime Minister would not regard that as a denial of legitimate trade. We also protested about the shipment to Germany of planes, plane parts, air engines, automatic pilots, compasses and so forth by certain countries which were called our allies, such materials being used to bomb Chinese women and children at a time when governments were patting the Chinese upon the back and commending them for their magnificent struggle. We condemned such shipments. Surely that is not regarded as a denial of legitimate trade. I could give other instances.

At the same time we condemned the fact that the financiers within Britain, within the United States and undoubtedly within our own country were advancing the financial means that made it possible for Japan, and for Germany, to produce many of those commodities which were used against us, against the Chinese and against others. That cannot be regarded as any denial of legitimate trade. When this report in which this accusation was made appeared our leader, who is now a member of this house, issued a statement to the press. That statement contained the stand which we have taken, do take and will continue to take with respect to this matter of trade. May I be pardoned while I read this report, which is as follows:

> "It is not true, as the Prime Minister said, that Social Credit members have consistently ignored and denied the vital necessity of external trade to the prosperity and welfare of Canada and particularly of Alberta," Mr. Low asserted. "The Prime Minister is well aware of the many times Social Credit members have put themselves on record in straightforward, single barrelled language—a thing he never does—as favouring the development of Canada's trade with other nations to the utmost of our possibilities and that with an eye to the peace and welfare of Canadians as a whole. Social Credit members have always advocated making it possible for every nation to have access to a fair share of the world's trade and have consistently supported any fair and honourable attempt to extend Canada's cooperation into the shrinking world community of nations that this access might be made possible.
>
> "It is quite understandable, of course, that a training in the psychology of scarcity has made it impossible for the Prime Minister to understand that what Social Crediters have always fought for is the proper evaluation of foreign trade. We are determined to see to it that the standard of living of the Canadian people is not kept down to a poverty line level —as it has been in much of the time under Mr. King's ministry—by gearing our whole economy to the needs of foreign trade. We will continue to fight for keeping production high, for the release of the abundance we do produce, so that our own Canadian people can enjoy as much of it as they want; and for trading the real surpluses of our production to other nations for their surpluses on a mutually satisfactory basis. We are quite well aware that trading as freely as possible with other nations will add to the variety of things Canadians can enjoy and will make possible more steady employment for our people, provided exports are matched by imports. But in our cooperation with other nations, Social Crediters hold that Canada must not part with her sovereign integrity to any centralized, 'supra-national' government, such as the Prime Minister seems to wish to do.
>
> "Thinking Canadians are becoming more and more convinced," Mr. Low continued, "that the volume of international trade for Canada which Mr. King talks about so much can never be maintained for any length of time at all unless Social Credit monetary reform is applied in our dominion by a thoroughly democratic government. Further, the Prime Minister is not the only person in Canada desirous of peaceful cooperation among the nations. We are all heartily sick of war and the terrible carnage it has wrought throughout the world. But Mr. King somehow overlooks this fact—peace cannot be built by force. It must be induced. Its foundation must rest in the well-being and happiness of every human family. No form of

internationalism, power politics or dollar imperialism can possibly compel human satisfaction and therefore peace among human beings."

I regret taking the time to read all that, but it certainly denies the accusations made at a time and in a place where we could not answer them. There is only one other reference I wish to make to this press report. It states:

He did not believe Social Crediters had spoken the true voice of Alberta in parliament.

I wonder if he realizes, now that he has lost five out of the seven members he had in the province, that we are quite justified in saying that we do voice the views of the people of our province?

A matter to which I wish to give some attention is the disposal of certain crown assets. During the past year or eighteen months there have emanated from different sources a number of reports having to do with the wanton destruction of useful and valuable crown assets purchased during the course of the war and disposed of later. We had complaints with respect to the Alaska highway. The people out west are still not satisfied that they got the facts as the facts should be presented with respect to what happened there. Certain reports came out with respect to the destruction of air frames and other parts of aircraft in Calgary. I cannot say that I am completely satisfied with the nature of the so-called investigation that may have been conducted, or with the statements that the government issued from time to time from certain of its offices. The Alaska highway was some distance from my constituency; Calgary was a matter of eighty-five or ninety miles away, but I woke up one morning to find that there was a complaint with respect to this same thing happening in my own constituency, namely, at Penhold No. 2 technical signals unit. I received delegations of civilian employees from the Penhold air school and I received reports from service personnel at the airport. Not desiring to seek publicity with respect to the matter, not desiring to embarrass any department of government or the government itself, I did not run to the press to have this thing carried across Canada. I worked very carefully and conducted a personal investigation. When I was satisfied that all was not well I wired the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe). Three days later, on August 28, I received the following wire:

As no report of surplus involving radio equipment at Penhold has been made am referring your telegram to the Department of National Defence for Air.

[Mr. Shaw.]

That made me wonder because I recollected that War Assets Corporation was set up under the guidance of the Minister of Munitions and Supply, who piloted the measure through the house, bringing the corporation into legal existence.

On August 31, I received a wire from Royal Canadian Air Force headquarters in Ottawa, advising me that a senior officer from headquarters in Ottawa had proceeded to Penhold to make a thorough investigation—I emphasize those two words "thorough investigation"—and report back to headquarters here. I considered it strange that an officer of the Royal Canadian Air Force should be sent out to investigate the Royal Canadian Air Force. It does not seem to me completely correct.

On August 28, I was advised by one of the service personnel at Penhold that an order had been issued to halt the destruction. After all, that was the thing I was concerned about, plus what I hoped would be a proper type of investigation.

Quite unknown to me the M.L.A. for Banff-Cochrane was also conducting an investigation into certain reports which he had received respecting Penhold. I did not meet him until after I had wired the Minister of Munitions and Supply. Mr. Wray advised me that he had wired almost everywhere but had become entangled in what appeared to be the spider-web of government red tape. No one seemed to know who enjoyed, if I may use that word, the responsibility of dealing with this matter. The local office of War Assets Corporation at Calgary disclaimed any knowledge of there being surplus goods or that destruction was going on at Penhold. Mr. Wray gave his statement to the press because he did not seem to be able to get to the bottom of this after endeavouring to communicate with responsible officials in the east. He was anxious to have destruction halted.

Mr. Wray in his statement to the press charged that the destruction of materials having a value, let us say, in educational and other fields was going on at Penhold. He charged that J. H. Ross, who had been appointed liaison officer between War Assets Corporation and the provincial departments of education had not been consulted. He charged, moreover, that the local officer of War Assets Corporation was not aware of what was going on.

The Minister of National Defence for Air (Mr. Gibson) gave out a public statement in answer to the charges contained in the paper, and his answer in actual words, was:

Perfect nonsense. The air force destroys nothing of value.

Possibly others would have given a similar answer. But the answer was not correct, as was subsequently shown.

On August 28, Mr. Wray received the following telegram from Northwest Air Command, in Edmonton:

Air Commodore Tackaberry proceeding from this headquarters to Calgary by air to-night. Will contact you within few days.

Air Commodore Tackaberry, I understand, was on the special duties list at Ottawa. On two occasions Air Commodore Tackaberry himself stated in Calgary that he was not out there to make an investigation at all, that he was there merely to visit the station, look around and report back to his minister, and then an investigation might or might not be ordered.

Air Commodore Tackaberry proceeded to Penhold and stayed there a very short time, surprisingly short, as a matter of fact. I should like to know the exact nature of the investigation that he made at that point.

Later, on September 5, the Minister of National Defence for Air issued this statement, which was carried by the Canadian Press:

Air Minister Gibson announced he had received a report from Air Commodore Tackaberry concerning peace-time destruction of certain air-borne equipment at No. 2 Technical Signals Unit of the R.C.A.F., Penhold, Alberta, and said that though the original value was approximately $600,000 the actual serviceable parts would not exceed a few hundred dollars. Mr. Gibson said surplus was turned over to War Assets Corporation, and War Assets Corporation gave the order to destroy.

I believe he also stated at the same time that the cost of extraction exceeded the recovery value. But this is the point. I am not concerned whether it was one hundred dollars worth, one hundred thousand dollars worth or one million dollars worth of equipment. It is the principle which I think is the extremely important factor. The Minister of National Defence for Air had stated previously that it was perfect nonsense to say that this material at Penhold was being destroyed. But his own statement later indicated that materials were being destroyed at Penhold. For that reason alone I believe that the general public demand which existed out there for a proper investigation into what was going on should certainly have been met.

I have a couple of editorials here one from the Red Deer *Advocate*. The city of Red Deer is very close to Penhold airport.

An hon. MEMBER: That is a social credit paper, isn't it?

Mr. SHAW: I would not say that. I do not always agree with its editorial policy. It is not an official C.C.F. publication but the editor throws his weight that way. It is not a social credit newspaper. The editorial says:

Will the Government Never Learn?

There just doesn't seem to be any way to teach the federal government that the people of Canada will not stand for usable goods being destroyed by service units on instructions from Ottawa. We had it on the Alaska highway, we had it again at Currie barracks, a few months ago, when aircraft were burned, and now we have it again at Penhold. Mr. Wray's statement, which the *Advocate* reprints in part on another page, with its own story of the Penhold activity, is but a further indication of the complete lack of perception shown by the highest authorities. What Ottawa cannot seem to grasp is that the people of Canada, who paid and paid willingly for the best possible equipment for their fighting forces, are determined that any of that equipment no longer useful in the service must be made available for civilian purposes. They are not prepared to see it destroyed. This is not to say that any large sum of money is involved in the present destruction of unrepairable instruments at Penhold. The second thing that Ottawa apparently cannot understand is that the public are entitled to know what is being done with the equipment they paid for.

They go on to suggest:

Much, if not all, of the present bother at Penhold could have been avoided if a small group of people, which might have included F. D. Shaw, the federal member; David Ure, the provincial member; J. H. Ross, the liaison officer between War Assets Corporation and the department of education; a commercial radio engineer, and a few newspapermen, who represent the public much better and more often than the said public ever imagines, had been invited to visit Penhold first.

I agree with the Red Deer *Advocate,* not necessarily with the personnel suggested, but that the public should be fully and completely informed whenever destruction of this sort is to take place. The editorial goes on to say:

If this group or one like it had been given the opportunity to look the stuff over and hear why it was being destroyed, and had seen the job done, they could have and certainly would have told the public exactly what was happening. But no, Ottawa just couldn't do it that way. They have the thing done privately where none of the public can see what goes on, and naturally there are fireworks. The government attitude is wholly indefensible. They have had warnings galore, and yet they persist in doing just what the public rightly dislikes. The guilt does not lie at the door of the air force, the *Advocate* believes—

That should give the minister for air some comfort:

—as it knows for certain that a large number of officers and airmen deplore the present action just as much or perhaps more than those of us outside the service. The responsibility lies higher up, and in this day of representative government, the man who must carry it in the last analysis is the Prime Minister (Mr.

Mackenzie King). Hon. Colin Gibson's reply of "perfect nonsense" to Mr. Wray's charges is not an answer, nor will any air force inquiry do. Nothing short of a royal commission, where service men can give their evidence under full protection, will meet the situation, and it should be set up at once.

There is another editorial here from one of the Calgary papers, very much in the same vein.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are two or three questions which I should like to put to the minister at this time, without of course expecting an immediate answer. Maybe it is fate, and maybe something else, but one of the ministers happens to be following me this evening. I should like to know:

First, whether or not all airforce contracts with manufacturers contain the clause that this equipment would be destroyed and not allowed to flood the markets.

Second, are all so-called surplus goods, or goods without commercial value or obsolete goods, inspected by a representative of War Assets Corporation? If not, what is the exact procedure in all cases of disposal?

Third, what claim have educational institutions to materials declared surplus, obsolete or without commercial value? What procedure is carried out with respect to such institutions acquiring these materials?

Fourth, since, as was demonstrated at Penfold, branches of the service are granted authority to dispose of crown assets, is a complete inventory of all surplus assets retained by War Assets Corporation?

I might add one more: do they also keep a complete inventory of the goods which have been destroyed?

It was asked in the house the other day if a committee would be set up during this session for the purpose of examining into the operations of War Assets Corporation. I believe the Prime Minister indicated that he would give consideration to the proposal. I am not objecting to the setting up of a committee to examine into the operation of War Assets Corporation; in fact I welcome it, although I must confess that I cannot be extremely enthusiastic about what might come out of these deliberations. On behalf of those I represent, because of the feeling which has grown throughout the west with respect to certain destruction, I would urge on their behalf that a royal commission be set up, and that destruction be halted. There is no need for any great rush, with respect to the destruction of a great many of those commodities.

I consider it my duty to bring this matter forward, because evidently it has been closed by the authorities that be, and we are not at all satisfied that the Royal Canadian Air Force should investigate the Royal Canadian Air Force and report in favour of it or in any other way, and then have the matter regarded as closed. I am going to leave it just at this point, because I have one or two other matters with which I should like to deal.

Much has been said in this house with respect to controls. The view is held in my part of Canada that we recognize and appreciate the necessity of the government proceeding with caution in the removal of certain controls which have been in effect during the war. But there is also this feeling that, with the war once successfully concluded, new controls and restrictions, with the army of civil servants necessary to administer and enforce them, should be avoided at almost any cost. Canadian people are heartily sick of government controls and what is often referred to as bureaucracy. During war time—I think I am fair in making a statement of this kind—those whom we presume to be our servants have in effect, become our stern masters. This is a position which I am afraid many of these individuals will be loath to see reversed. New controls certainly tend to perpetuate the powerful bureaucratic setup which some might argue has been a necessity during war time. The longer this set-up remains, the further away will be any reasonable reduction in the strangling rates of taxation. I read in the press recently, and I concur in the view expressed, that Ottawa bureaucracy has no monopoly of intelligence, judgment and foresight in this country. It should and must be the duty of each and every member of parliament to demand and fight for the restoration to parliament of that legislative authority which they alone should possess. It astonished me when, some few years ago, the decision was handed down, I believe by the Supreme Court of Canada, that these boards possessed legislative authority. I said to myself at that time: good-bye, parliament. I urge, Mr. Speaker, combining with my urging a recognition that there are certain conditions which could develop and which we must guard against, that we remove at the earliest possible opportunity these controls which have borne us down during the period of war.

I wish to say one word to my hon. friends on my immediate right. During the past more than five years that I have had the privilege of being in this house, I have heard constant and repeated references by them to socialism as being something new. I have always held the view that socialism is in reality as old as the hills. In my opinion, democracy still remains the greatest and most radical venture

of mankind. Self-government and the right to conduct enterprise freely and privately are still the revolutionary idea. The regimentation of socialism is in truth the call of dark reactionism back to the days when there was a planned economy, a strange mixture of the aristocracy and the guilds. They are endeavouring to impress upon us that they are advocating something new, but in fact it is something which, if one looks upon it from the point of view of its age, should have been pensioned a long time ago.

In my references earlier to the disposal of surplus crown assets I hope I made it abundantly clear that I am just as much concerned about this matter as are my constituents and others across western Canada. I have tried to be completely fair in my presentation. I merely suggest to hon. gentlemen that they examine what I have put on *Hansard* and ask themselves if they would be satisfied to permit this matter to stand where it now rests.

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply and Minister of Reconstruction): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate I wish to add my congratulations to those that have been given to the mover and the seconder of the address. Both are new members in the house and both distinguished themselves by the manner in which their presentations were delivered.

I am very glad indeed that the mover of the address comes from northern Ontario. In fact, his constituency adjoins my own, and I am perfectly satisfied that the representation from northern Ontario, which in my opinion has always been able to make itself felt in this house, is further strengthened by his presence in this parliament.

I had not intended to take part in this debate. In the ten years I have been in the House of Commons I have never participated in this particular debate. Like most of my colleagues I am always glad to see the debate finished in order that we may get on with the more serious business of the session. However, two or three hon. members have asked that some members of the government tell them the score, and therefore I am very glad to do what I can to tell them the score about the work over which I am particularly responsible.

I wholly concur, Mr. Speaker, in your advice to the house that speeches should not be read and I have no intention of reading my speech; but since I desire to cover a good many subjects to-night, I trust you will not object too seriously if I occasionally refer to my notes.

The government's reconstruction plans for the immediate post-war period were outlined in a white paper presented to parliament last April and later were set out in more detail in the proposals of the government submitted to the recent dominion-provincial conference on reconstruction. The plans outlined in the white paper are now being put into execution and I consider that the results to date are reasonably satisfactory.

At this moment we must recognize that only one month has elapsed since hostilities stopped and only two weeks since the Japanese surrender was signed. During the past month war orders representing production having a value of approximately $150 million a month have been cancelled. It is not unnatural that the inevitable dislocation resulting from these abrupt cancellations is causing some uneasiness among the workers. At this time, when we are reabsorbing workers laid off from industry, we are also called upon to absorb men who are being mustered out of the armed services at a rate approximating 5,000 a month. This is certainly the testing time for reconversion plans.

I see nothing disturbing in the present situation as far as employment is concerned. The official labour report of September 7 shows a net labour demand of 132,520 men and women, and unreferred applications for employment numbering 73,150.

An hon. MEMBER: The same locality?

Mr. HOWE: Not exactly. All Canada is the locality. During the first week of September the net labour demand actually increased by 6,000. The number of unreferred applicants is, of course, too high and is an indication of the time lag required to fit workers into new and suitable occupations. I would further point out that even in the periods of the tightest man-power situation the unreferred applications in the Department of Labour have never fallen below 25,000 and the figure usually stands around 35,000, so that the present number of 73,000 is not particularly serious.

One thing that is abundantly clear is that there are at this moment two jobs open for each and every applicant for a job. Surely this is not an unhealthy situation under the circumstances. The work of reconstruction has been in progress since early in 1944 and has been accelerated since the establishment of the Department of Reconstruction in the summer of 1944. The work divides itself into the following branches: First, over all planning including studies of economics and sta-

tistics; second, industrial reconversion; third, research and development; and, fourth, control and distribution of materials.

Our planning for the initial stage of reconversion was set out in the white paper of April, 1944. The plan provides that private enterprise shall have the right of way until such time as an over-all shortage of employment appears. At the moment it is apparent that private initiative is meeting the situation adequately, and there is every indication that it will continue to do so for many months to come.

As Minister of Reconstruction I am at present in the strange position of being compelled to refuse building permits for a vast programme of private construction that is pressing to get under way, and this because of lack of man-power in the construction industry. Permits for small houses and for all industrial expansion promising substantial continuing employment are being granted freely, but we are still compelled to refuse permits for churches, schools, hotels, community halls, theatres and industrial projects such as breweries.

The construction industry normally is our largest employer of labour, but at the moment it is employing a small fraction of its usual complement. A great effort is being directed toward the expansion of this important industry and toward balancing builders' supplies with which it functions. The back-log of maintenance work as well as new construction facing this industry is enormous. Almost every building in Canada requires repairs more or less extensive as soon as man-power can be had. Our forest industries are still very short of labour, while our goldmining industry, starved for labour during war years, is steadily increasing its man-power requirements and will continue to do so.

Industrial reconversion has been under way for several months. More than a year ago the Department of Reconstruction called on all war contractors to advise the department of the manner in which assistance toward reconversion could be given. Since then a gradual change-over from war to peace has been under way. At the peak of war production some 900,000 men and women were employed in direct war work. By V-E day this number had been reduced to 650,000 men and women, and by V-J day the number was down to 450,000. By V-J day many plants had been reconverted to the point where the cancellation of war contracts meant only a limited and temporary lay-off or in some cases no lay-off at all.

[Mr. Howe.]

An example is the motorcar industry, which has been one of our most important war contractors as well as one of our largest employers of labour. In this industry tooling for civilian type trucks had been completed to the point where complete cancellation of war contracts involved a temporary lay-off of only about fifteen per cent of personnel, and that for a period of about two months. After so much effort had been put into reconversion from war to peace, it is regrettable that the workers in one of the principal motorcar plants should choose this time to go on strike for closed shop and check-off. I am not familiar with the merits of the dispute, but I simply suggest that the timing is unfortunate. As far as reconversion is concerned, had this strike not taken place I would have held the reconversion of the motorcar industry one of our better efforts.

It is important to note that practically all war plants are planning reconversion for a far greater production and far greater employment than in pre-war days. The Canadian General Electric company has recently issued a statement pointing out that present employment after complete reconversion is about double pre-war employment. This may not be typical of all war industries, but I can say that in general most war industries are planning reconversion along lines that will provide employment near and in some cases higher than the war-time scale. I have found no pessimists among the management of privately owned war plants about the post-war prospects of those plants. My contacts indicate that private initiative is operating at a high tempo throughout Canadian industry.

It is interesting to note the operation of the provisions of the 1944 budget, permitting double depreciation for industrial expansion during the reconversion period. All applications for double depreciation are filed for approval with the Department of Reconstruction and contain certain information needed to justify their approval. The double depreciation feature was made operative on November 10, 1944. As at September 1, 1945, 960 applications involving expenditures of upwards of $176 million had been approved. Of this amount the estimated expenditures for machinery and equipment amount to $120 million and for buildings $55 million. Of the latter figure $21 million was for on-site labour costs. The foregoing includes a large programme for modernization as indicated by the large proportion of cost of equipment.

Information available on plants covered by 729 applications involving $142 million of capital expenditure shows that the gross sales values of their products rose from $787 million in 1939 to $1,979 million in 1944, and is expected to increase by an additional $189 million after completion of the projects. Exports of products from these plants rose from $214 million in 1939 to $257 million in 1944, and a further increase of $115 million is anticipated after completion of the expansion. The average employment in the plants covered by 729 applications rose from 155,000 in 1939 to 303,000 in 1944. A further increase of 18,000 employees is expected one year after completion of the expansion.

The foregoing increase applies only to direct employment in the plants and does not reflect the corresponding increases that would take place in the allied industries supplying the materials, nor does it include the labour actually required to make the improvements.

I have spoken of reconversion in privately owned war plants. Reconversion is also under way in war plants owned by the dominion government. This is more difficult in that a sale of the plant to private industry usually is involved. For some months we have had a fairly definite idea of the nature of the peace-time industry which would use each government-owned plant; but when each plant is ready for sale other claims are put forward which must receive consideration. We find that the only practical methods is to call for tenders for each plant and then choose the buyer offering the best price consistent with the highest and most stable employment. All this takes time. The work is moving forward as well as can be expected. Several war plants have already been sold and are now fully converted as peace-time plants. Others are at present in process of being sold. As nearly as possible we endeavour to keep each plant in a line of work comparable with its former employment in order that the workers living in the vicinity may find employment in the same plant without too great a change of skills.

The sale and reconversion of government-owned war plants is a delicate operation which requires, and is receiving, the constant attention of myself and senior officers of the Department of Reconstruction. I am happy to say that there is no lack of applicants for purchase of government-owned war plants, except for a few plants unsuitable for any peace-time use or in locations unfavourable for peace-time production; the demands of private industry are greater than the supply. There is also an active demand for government-owned machinery. The sale of this machinery is helping many war plants to arrange quick conversion to peace-time production, and every effort is being made to dispose of this machinery in a way that will be most helpful to that end. A limited number of war plants are being retained by the crown and rented for multiple occupancy as an incubator for small industries. Here again the demand for space exceeds any reasonable supply. The most promising small industries are being given preference, and it is expected that from these multiple occupancy plants will develop industries which will in time build and occupy their own premises.

I suggest that few Canadians have any appreciation of the work involved in terminating war contracts and in clearing plants of unused and semi-fabricated raw materials, in removing government war machinery and in bringing about final settlement with each contractor.

The Department of Munitions and Supply has laid down carefully studied procedures in order that these various steps may be carried out with a minimum of delay. Especially chosen officers have been schooled for months in the procedure. I am satisfied that no other country in the world has any better procedure for accelerating conversion from war to peace.

I am particularly interested to note the new types of production which are being established here. Canada's record in producing munitions of war obviously has attracted the attention of manufacturers in other countries with the result that many have located or are locating plants in this country. The record of the relations between labour and management has been a contributing factor in attracting manufacturers to Canada, as has our favourable position in the export field.

It is quite obvious that during 1946 we may expect an expansion of peace-time industry comparable with the expansion of industry generally during the war years. Many of the largest expansions of industry yet to be reported are now being processed in the Department of Reconstruction.

In our earlier studies of requirements to provide continued full employment we estimated that one million jobs in excess of those obtainable in 1939 would be required. I can report that the one million additional peace-time jobs are definitely in sight, and that there is little likelihood of any over-all lack of employment in the near future.

At the end of this year seasonal unemployment will be added to the influx of discharges from the armed services, and there may be

localities where workers cannot readily be placed. There will, however, be other localities still requiring workers, and it is hoped that the winter months will witness a readjustment of our population to conform to peace-time patterns of employment. Just as it took many months to move people from one locality to another into war jobs, it will take a shorter period to redistribute our people into peace-time jobs. The employment offices of the Department of Labour have ample machinery to facilitate the movement of workers, and I am confident that, given time, the desired readjustment will be effected.

I have not referred to large public works projects as a means of providing post-war employment. Great numbers of public projects have been deferred throughout the war years and are now ready to go ahead. As Minister of Reconstruction I should like to see as many as possible of such projects deferred for some time yet. It is greatly in the interests of Canada to give the right of way to private building. Considerable time must elapse before we have all the labour and materials that will be required for public projects after the needs of private construction have been met.

The dominion government itself has a large shelf of public projects available for undertaking at the proper time. Every province and every municipality are in the same position. Hon. members will have noted that at the recent dominion-provincial conference the dominion government offered to subsidize all public projects that would be listed for timing with the Department of Reconstruction. Our plan of reconstruction involves the timing of public projects as a means of stabilizing employment and avoiding periods of unemployment. The dominion government plans to act with courage and vigour to maintain a high level of employment and income, and can be depended upon to undertake public projects on any scale necessary to that end.

There is no lack of desirable public projects to be undertaken in this Canada of ours. The failure of the government to bring forward public projects at this time is leading to charges of lack of planning. Such charges are wholly unfounded. It is because of careful planning that public projects are undesirable at this time except in a few localities. Canada desires a stable economy rather than an economy of booms and depressions, and all our planning is directed to the desired objective.

A service of the Department of Reconstruction that is growing in importance is offered in collaboration with the national research council, in furnishing scientific information and technical advice to industry. Close contact with industry is being established in this field, and is having an excellent reception. Now that Europe is no longer a source of information on scientific research, it is all the more important that Canada expand its activities in the field of research and development. An effort is being made to integrate private and public research, and to stimulate both. The budget of 1944 gave encouragement for private research. The government, through larger appropriations, will continue to expand public research, which during the war years has played so great a part in the development of new weapons of war. The adaptation of war-time scientific discoveries is even now playing an important part in our general industrial expansion.

Perhaps I should say a word about housing. It is not generally understood that even in the war years house building in Canada was proceeding on a constantly accelerating basis, even though the diversion of materials from war uses was difficult. The years 1943 and 1944 saw more houses built in Canada than in any previous year with the exception of 1928. In 1943 some 28,000 housing licences were issued to private builders, and in 1944 the number increased to 32,000. Licences were granted only for low-cost housing, and great numbers of low-cost houses were built. It will be recalled that the objective set by the government in its white paper was 50,000 new housing units during the first full construction year following V-E day. Subsequently it was stated that the government hoped to accomplish its objective during the first twelve months immediately following V-E day. It now appears that we shall come close to this figure during 1945, and may even surpass it, and this in spite of the fact that the war in Europe did not end until well into the construction year. Already during 1945 licences to private builders have been issued for 38,000 new housing units. In addition, the government programme under the Veterans' Land Act calls for the construction of 3,000 veterans' houses during 1945. Wartime Housing Limited, which during the war years built some 18,000 houses for munition workers, was called upon to undertake a programme of 7,000 low rental houses for veterans, and this programme is well under way. Thus on September 1, some 48,000 houses either had been commenced and completed during 1945 or were under construction.

As I have said, throughout the war the government has recognized the vital need for housing; and while it was necessary to exercise some control on the production and distribution of building supplies, the revocation

and removal of those controls was effected at the first possible moment. The last of such controls was revoked early this year, even though we were still at war and even though war requirements continued to place a heavy demand upon our resources. Plants producing materials required in house construction have in many cases been unable to maintain full labour staffs, with the result that production has been less than capacity. Some months ago the government decided that the need for new housing accommodation was of such importance that the building products industries must be recognized as of equal if not of greater importance than many of the war industries. Therefore government assistance was given to the building supplies industries long before the war ended. As part of this assistance labour was directed into brick yards, foundries, sawmills and logging plants in greater numbers, thereby enabling these industries to meet to an increasing extent the tremendous demands of new house building. In many cases, factories producing building material were in need of rehabilitation and modernization. This was the result of reduced demands for their output during the depression years. The government has given direct assistance here also, making it possible for such industries to expand and improve their production. This has taken the form of priorities which enabled manufacturers to purchase new machinery and other equipment, as well as the granting of financial aid in the form of double depreciation, which assistance the building industry has taken advantage of in no small measure. The full effect of such assistance is being realized now that the man-power situation has improved, with the result that the building products industries are getting back to capacity production. The supply of all kinds of building materials had greatly increased even before V-J day, and since then the increase has been even more marked. I am confident that the position will continue to improve rapidly and that within the next few months the difficulties which builders are meeting at the present time will be largely overcome.

In the time at my disposal I have endeavoured to outline the working of the government's reconversion plans, now that the war is ended. I have seen frequent statements to the effect that the war with Japan had ended earlier than was expected, and that the government was caught unprepared. It is true that the shock of reconversion would have been less had the war continued longer, but in the past I said frequently that temporary dislocations incidental to cancellation of war contracts would be unavoidable whenever the war should end. Personally I am the last man entitled to claim surprise at the end of the war, having known months in advance the approximate date of the use of the atomic bomb. While I felt reasonably sure that the atomic bomb would end the war, it is obvious that I could not set my judgment against that of military experts, nor could I fail to arrange for the production of munitions of war at the rate demanded by our own military authorities and those of our allies. I could, however, gear our reconversion machinery to be ready whenever the war ended, and that was done.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): If I may ask the minister a question on that point, how closely was he in touch with the research department in connection with the atomic bomb? I quite appreciate that, as he says, he could not be sure the war would end so soon, but I should like to know just how closely he was in contact with those conducting the research into the atomic bomb.

Mr. HOWE: I was a member of the joint policy committee of Great Britain, the United States and Canada which directed the whole investigation leading up to the atomic bomb, so that I think I can say I was at least as close to it as any other man in this country.

Some hon. members have questioned the fulfilment of my promise to seek the cooperation of labour in the work of the Department of Reconstruction. Apparently they are not as well informed as they might be on the degree of cooperation that has been established. Therefore I shall take this opportunity to clarify the situation in this regard. On April 29, 1945, I issued a statement on labour and the Department of Reconstruction which was widely circulated throughout the ranks of organized labour. Following the issuing of this statement and in accordance with the policy outlined therein, I communicated with the principal trade union congresses and other associations, requesting that each one nominate a representative on a reconstruction labour committee to cooperate with the labour adviser of the Department of Reconstruction. As soon as these names were submitted, the committee was appointed as follows:

John W. Bruce, chairman of the committee on reconstruction and rehabilitation, Trades and Labour Congress of Canada;

Pat Conroy, secretary-treasurer, Canadian Congress of Labour;

Alfred Charpentier, president of the Canadian and Catholic confederation of labour;

A. J. Kelly, chairman, dominion joint legislative committee of the railroad transportation brotherhoods.

For the information of the house, this committee which, as everyone will agree, consists of senior trade union officers selected by the organizations themselves, meets frequently with our labour adviser, who reports to me, and as often as necessary with myself. It is a standing advisory committee to the department, under the chairmanship of my labour adviser, with which I have full and frequent discussions on reconstruction problems in which labour is interested. I have at different times referred matters to the consideration of the committee for advice, and have as far as possible tried to implement its recommendations.

It is also one of the functions of this committee to arrange meetings between different trade unions and myself. Some meetings have already been held, and others are now being planned. These arrangements are left to the committee, working with the labour adviser.

I consider the reconstruction labour committee a valuable adjunct to my department. I have received from it the utmost cooperation, and am satisfied that the members themselves feel that, through our discussions, many points affecting reconstruction have been, and are being, clarified. I feel that the setting up of this committee and its successful functioning, are an answer to the criticism that my department does not seek the advice and cooperation of organized labour.

For the most part, organized labour is recognizing the problem, and is cooperating in the work of reconversion. I think that, in general, workers formerly employed in strictly war plants are finding employment at comparable wages in peacetime industries, or at least could do so if they wish to move to localities where comparable jobs are available. The task of reconversion requires the full cooperation of government, management and the workers, and, to the extent that that cooperation is lacking, the work of reconversion will be delayed, and the dislocations which accompany it will be intensified. Full cooperation will mean a minimum of hardship, but lack of cooperation, such as is in evidence at Windsor, Ontario, to-day, can very well lead to considerable hardship. Fortunately, the men and women of Canada are sensible and well balanced. Therefore, I am confident that Canada will set an example to the world in bringing about an orderly return to peace-time living.

While I am on my feet, perhaps I might say something about the destruction of war materials. Hon. members will know that we have tremendous stocks of war materials to dispose of. Some perhaps will suggest that these should be put away in storage and kept for possible use in the next war. I can tell the house that no longer than a year ago there were reported to the War Assets Corporation surpluses which had arisen out of the South African war. Very fine saddles and harnesses were put in storage at the end of the South African war and had never been used since, but they had been guarded and polished and taken care of for all the years that had elapsed between that war and the present one.

I suggest that a responsibility devolves upon those who have to do with surplus war assets to see that that type of expense is not saddled upon the dominion for years to come. While the dominion is in the disposal business, it should clean up those surpluses that are obviously useless for the future. That is the duty which devolves upon us. In ordinary times there is very little machinery for the disposal of assets of that kind.

As far as the equipment referred to to-night is concerned, this is classed by the air force as class E, that is, as material damaged to the point where it is not worth repairing. This happened to be radio equipment, but it is not radio equipment that any citizen could find any use for, because it is only good at high altitudes. We have many times the amount of usable and valuable radio equipment of exactly the same type than could possibly be disposed of in this country.

An hon. MEMBER: You could give it away.

Mr. HOWE: It is of no value as radio equipment, but it has some value as scrap material and is salable as such. It is not salable in any other form. Therefore, by agreement betwen the air force and War Assets Corporation, after the material had been examined approval was given to remove every valuable part from the radio equipment, such as tubes and other parts worth saving, and render the balance into scrap, thus making it salable. That was done, and we did salvage something out of material that would otherwise have been quite useless.

The question was asked as to whether we had an agreement with manufacturers of radio equipment. We had no agreement of the kind. We have quite an amount of exactly the same material in usable form that we are offering for sale. If inquiries are referred to us I am sure we can satisfy them.

The question was asked as to whether the material should not have been given to schools. We have an arrangement with every school in Canada that material of that kind will be sent to the school on indefinite loan. We do not give material away, but we are

willing to lend it without charge to any educational institution that has a use for it. This applies to all types of equipment from aeroplane engines down to the smallest item.

Mr. SHAW: Did that apply to Penhold? Did Mr. J. H. Ross, the liaison officer between the department of education and the War Assets Corporation examine the material at Penhold to see whether it had educational value?

Mr. HOWE: As I have told my hon. friend, I am not sure what Mr. Ross examined. I believe that he covers the whole dominion and keeps in touch with every educational institution in the dominion.

Mr. SHAW: He is only in Alberta.

Mr. HOWE: This is a dominion problem; it is not confined to Alberta. I will say that if there was any material there that was of educational value, we can supply a duplicate in much better condition and will be glad to do so. We will supply this to any educational institution that will apply. The disposal of war materials is a very difficult and complicated problem.

Mr. LOW: Not with a bulldozer.

Mr. HOWE: My hon. friend who has just come from the provincial legislature is having a good deal of entertainment. I wish he would just refrain until I have finished speaking.

An hon. MEMBER: He is being entertained now.

Mr. HOWE: My hon. friend is a veteran and he is quite at liberty to say that. The question was asked whether inventories were kept of materials destroyed. Such inventories are kept and will be available to any committee that wishes to explore the transactions of War Assets Corporation.

Mr. COLDWELL: Is hospital equipment available on the same basis?

Mr. HOWE: No; hospital equipment is in great demand; it is a saleable product. The loans to educational institutions referred to materials not readily salable but having an educational value.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): What about the wrist watches which were said to have been destroyed by torches?

Mr. HOWE: Have you seen a wrist watch that has been destroyed by a torch?

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): No; but I am asking about those that were reported to have been destroyed.

Mr. HOWE: You saw the report and you are taking the responsibility for spreading that report by rising in your place and asking a question in the house. Unless you know something about it you should not do that. You are taking responsibility for spreading the report by asking that question. Unless you know something about it you should keep quiet.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): You and I are absolutely ignorant; we know nothing about it.

Mr. HANSELL: We know plenty about it.

Mr. HOWE: I wish to say one final word about controls. We are getting rid of controls as rapidly as we can. Controls based on scarcity are pretty well gone. But controls that have to do with the cost of living are being and must be retained if we wish to protect the economy that we have built up during the war years, and I think it is an economy to be proud of. For example, if we took the control off lumber, which seems to be an irksome control, there would either be no lumber in Canada, or users in Canada would pay anywhere up to $20 a thousand more for their lumber. Without the control, the lumber would move across the line, where prices are vastly higher. That is why we keep the control on lumber. There are reasons, and sound reasons, I believe, for every control that is being maintained at this time.

Let me say this. The controllers who are being criticized in this house from time to time have, during an acute period of shortage, seen that Canadian citizens were supplied with their requirements. We have had, for instance, to restrict the use of gasoline. Nevertheless, the controllers have seen that when a coupon was issued for gasoline, the gasoline was there in the pump to honour the coupon, and Canada is the only country I know of in the world that has been able to keep that position.

Therefore, I say, let us not be too critical of the work of these controllers. Theirs has been a difficult task. It has been difficult to keep them at their task for the time sufficient to remove the controls in an orderly way. Scarcity controls are going rapidly or have already gone. As time goes on, history, I think, will treat kindly the work of the controllers in Canada's war period.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): May I ask a question which is on everybody's mind?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. CLARENCE GILLIS (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, at the outset may I, on behalf of the members of this group, express

our very deep regret at the news we received this afternoon of the passing of the late Norman McLarty. Some of us in this group had the privilege of sitting in this house with him for five years, and we got to know him and to like him. He was always a very courteous gentleman, regardless of our differences in politics, and through you we should like to express to his family our deepest sympathy.

In rising to take part in this debate, I am reminded very much of the parliament of 1940. In that parliament, meeting for the first time when we were engaged in one of the greatest conflicts the world has ever seen, the problem that faced the government and the members of the house was the changing over of our economy from peace to war. It was a difficult task; it took a long time, and many mistakes were made. Nevertheless, perhaps despite the government, this country made a substantial contribution to the winning of that conflict.

This also is a new parliament. We have here approximately ninety new members. The war is over. It is the responsibility now of this new parliament, and of the same government, to transform our economy from war to peace. That also will be a difficult task, one that will require the patience and understanding of everyone in this house. But we cannot afford to make mistakes at this stage of the game, because we cannot afford to quibble over the future of those who fought the war on the field of battle and are now returning to us. Nor dare we quibble over those employed in industry who provided the sinews of war which were vital to our fighting troops.

During the process of fighting the war this country had a national objective around which we could rally our people. That objective was the winning of the war, the defeating of totalitarianism abroad, and preserving on this continent that framework of democracy within which we have sufficient freedom to go forward into a better future. But at the present time, as far as I can see, we have no national objective. That national objective must be established. The people of this country must be given leadership and rallied around certain objectives for which they think they fought this war.

Our leader, the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), set out briefly, in seven or eight points, the things which we think the government should be doing at this time in order to give the necessary leadership to the country. His points were plain and very simple.

First, we believe that the people of this country waged this war in order to improve their standard of living—the standard of living of all Canadians—and it can stand considerable improvement, even the standard established during this war.

Second, we believe that everyone in this country is entitled to a decent home to live in, at a reasonable cost.

Third, we believe that the federal government must accept greater financial responsibility in the field of education and that the educational standards across Canada must be raised in some parts and made uniform throughout the dominion. We believe that the teaching profession must be given greater recognition in the job they have to do in building the future citizens of Canada.

Fourth, we believe that all the people of this country are entitled to something in the way of social security. We believe that this government should as soon as possible bring down a national social security act, to be administered under one department, which will remove the fear of insecurity from the minds of our people, a fear that they have had over a long period of time. We believe that our aged people should be cared for and that the youth of the country are entitled to better standard than they have had in the past.

These, Mr. Speaker, are the objectives for which we think we have fought this war. But in listening to the discussions in this house and in travelling across this country it seems to me that there are two opposing groups in Canada who fought this war for two entirely different reasons.

The working people of Canada, and that includes the farmers, the fishermen, the industrial workers and the small business people, fought this war to preserve this framework of democracy within which they could establish within this country, when the war was over, the things that we visualized we were fighting this war for; that is, to eliminate the conditions that breed war. On the other hand, watching the struggle to-day, we find that the owning classes in this country, those who control the means of life, claim our resources and are administering all of our economic processes. I am led to believe, by some discussions I have heard in the house, that the reason they fought this war is to preserve the status quo and to get back to 1939 as soon as possible. That is the impression I got from the discussion. You hear men say, "We still believe in the system of private enterprise." The government accepts that slogan; the Conservative party to my right accept it; the fact of the matter is that every

part of this house other than the members of the group for whom I am speaking to-night accepts it.

What is this so-called free enterprise or private enterprise? I want someone at some time in this chamber to rise in his place and define it. What are the plans of free enterprise for the future? We must not forget that under that system of free enterprise we have had three wars in one lifetime—the Boer war, the great war, and now this last conflict. If the system of free enterprise can bring about for us the social objectives for which we fought this war, we should not have had the last two wars. They have had three opportunities in the past over a lifetime to prove that they can do these things, and they have not succeeded. Personally I think conditions in the world to-day with the prospect of wars in the future are such that we cannot afford to take the chance of any more wars, because if we do, it will perhaps mean the end of civilization.

I was interested in listening last Thursday evening to the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario (Mr. Macdonnell). He made an excellent speech. However, I was struck by a few of the phrases he used. For example, he built up a nice story in favour of the maintenance of what he calls private enterprise, and I sat here thinking I would like to get his definition of it. I hope that some time before the house rises he will tell us exactly where there exists in this country to-day private enterprise as we have had it in the past. There is no such thing. For example, he stated that the system of private enterprise should be maintained, that those who are risking their capital are entitled to a profit on it. Well, there is no one risking any capital in this country to-day, and they have not been risking any capital all during the process of fighting this war.

I happened to sit on the reconstruction committee for some three years, and during that period we had the privilege of examining practically every business organization in this country which would be giving employment in the post-war period. They came in and gave us their plans; they told us what they were prepared to do, but they all wound up with the same statement: they were prepared to do that, contingent upon the federal government making available the capital necessary and guaranteeing the profits. So, you see, none of these people were prepared to risk any capital.

The situation, as I see it to-day, thinking the thing over quickly, is this. The government has established the industrial development bank. Any risk entering into the establishment of new industry after the war will be underwritten by the government through that bank. It is going to underwrite the profits. In the field of housing the federal government has handed over to the major insurance companies the building of houses, and is underwriting the risk. In fact there is no risk. In mining the same thing applies. The federal government is expected to carry on the geological surveys and to send out the prospectors. If a prospector makes a discovery he reports it to some mining company. The mining company then carries on the development and makes the money. In lumbering the same thing is true: the government will build the base roads into the timber; they will improve the waterways for driving purposes; the workmen will go in and cut down the lumber for very inadequate wages; but all the initial outlay in developing the timber resources, fire prevention, and so on—for all those things the government pays the shot; someone else steps in and makes the money.

The whole picture across Canada to-day is as I have described it. If the government is expected to carry on and develop the resources, take the risk, and make this investment, why should the government not take the profits, and turn them back ultimately to the working people of this country on the basis of social security, to give them some reward, when they are through with their labours, other than the scrap heap which they have had from generation to generation?

Mr. MacINNIS: "Depreciation."

Mr. GILLIS: Oh, no, they have no depreciation; they just "get the axe," and stagger away to an old man's home, if they can find one. In most of the provinces there is not any place that will accept them.

So, thinking in terms of seventy-five years ago, I can understand the philosophy of the Liberal party, the Conservative party and the Social Credit party in the maintenance of free enterprise. But it no longer exists. What we have to-day straight across this country is four or five large monopolies in every field, which have set up holding companies, driven out the small shareholders, and concentrated power completely in the hands of a very few individuals who to-day wield economic dictatorship over the whole country and largely dictate the policy of any government which is in power which tries to play ball with them and maintain things as they were in 1939.

Getting back to 1939, I heard an hon. member across the way say that they did not want a new social order, that things were all right as they were, remove the controls and get back to where we were. What did we fight

this war for? To go back there? Those who fought this war with certain objectives in mind had no such intentions, and anyone who takes that attitude today is completely out of touch with the world picture. You cannot get back there if you want to. We can struggle and continue to use on that basis this House of Commons or the legislatures we still have across this country, and we can do what they did in Europe—bring our house of cards down around our ears. To-day we have to recognize the fact that certain economic reforms must be made in this country; otherwise it is not possible for us to enjoy freedom, democracy, and the things for which our service personnel fought this war.

The hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario—I am not trying to pick on him particularly, but certain phrases he used jarred on me—also had this to say: you have a right to exploit your fellow-man and take a profit for it, because of the risk. He said that every worker who demands a wage increase is demanding a profit. That is not my conception of profits. Then, of course, he said that the worker was not taking any risk. I should like to ask him if he ever checked the industrial casualty lists of Canada. Those who go to the sea in boats, those who are employed in the mining industry, the steel plants, and so forth, across this country; check the figures year by year and you will find that their casualties greatly outnumber those of war. See them creeping around suffering from silicosis, going prematurely to their graves, without reward of any kind. I should like to have the hon. member on the east coast and put him in a boat with the shore fishers at four o'clock in the morning, to go out and set his traps and pull his trawls. He puts perhaps $1,500 worth of gear into the water this morning; to-morrow a storm comes up and the whole thing is gone. He is wiped out and it will take ten years for him to get that gear together again. There is plenty of risk there. Or go into the coal mines of Nova Scotia with a coal miner, at five o'clock in the morning. That man goes some six miles under the Atlantic ocean, working eight hours with nothing on but a pair of shoes and overalls. There are many casualties in that industry, and after a man has drawn his meagre pittance and budgeted on a deficit every week for years for himself and his family, if he lives to be seventy he will be given a cane and asked to make his way to the nearest poorhouse. There is no depreciation, no reward, no consideration. The risk which the industrial worker takes is physical. My hon. friend was thinking in terms of money, but we have to get away from that philosophy. In the future this country has to think in terms of human life and the needs and rights of human beings; otherwise we have fought another war for nothing.

Take the business man who is managing his own business. He draws a certain amount per week and what he takes out for managing his business is a wage for services rendered. What I would consider a profit for the average worker across the country would be this: provided that he had a job which would pay sufficient wages for him to meet all obligations, rent, fuel, family requirements, and with a sufficient income to send his children to university, if he could bank a thousand a year, that would be profit, but there is no industrial worker and there are few farmers with that kind of set-up.

I am not trying to lecture my hon. friends, but I make this statement because I am convinced that, after private enterprise has been given a chance to fight three wars, throwing men into war, giving them a uniform and then taking it off them and putting them on the street, and then telling them to get ready for the next war, that day is gone, and we shall not have that chance again. We must therefore change our philosophy in this house. It is the job of every member in this house representing a constituency in Canada to study the subject himself, not on the basis of slogans or on the basis of things as they were in the past. The job that has to be done now in Canada is to live up to the promises made our service personnel and our industrial workers during the process of fighting the war.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) spoke of a new world, a new philosophy, something new that was to come out of this war. But it seems to me that we have the same old order, the same old philosophy, because the basic thing that some people apparently are thinking about is money and getting back to where we were in 1939.

I wish to say a few words now to the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie), who I regret is not in his place at the moment. He has a large department and there will have to be a good deal of discussion in the house before this session closes. There is one matter I consider of urgent importance that comes within his jurisdiction. The speech from the throne intimates that there is to be established a veterans' charter. That is all right, but I am getting a little tired of slogans, and unless that charter means something I am not very much concerned about it. Centering veterans' problems in one department with sympathetic administration is a good thing and if that is what the charter means I am all for it. But I wish to call attention to this particularly. Coming back to this country

to-day from overseas is a large number of service personnel, boys who committed some misdemeanour, some slight infraction of military law and who were sentenced to detention on the other side, many of them to two or three years. I have seen copies of some courts martial; I have seen where a boy was sentenced to three years on the other side after having two and a half years of combat service, and some of these boys have been sentenced after the close of the war in Germany. A large number of these boys are being brought back to the country. They are taken first to Kingston and then sent back to their respective district depots and are discharged and sent to some civilian prison in Canada to complete sentence.

I have written to the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) and have been in touch for some time with the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Abbott). I claim that for an infraction of military law they cannot send a boy after discharge to a civilian prison in order to complete his sentence. I have not had any definite word from either of the ministers as to whether I am right or wrong on that point, from the legal point of view, and I do not care particularly whether I am, because what I am thinking about is this. I know of one case where a boy had two and a half years of combat service. He went through Italy, and into Germany till the war was over. He picked up a couple of army blankets one night and went and sold them to get some wine—many hon. members will understand that. That boy was sentenced to three years. He has a wife and two children. A civilian picked up on that charge in Canada would get a fine or a month or two in one of the county gaols. What has that boy got? He was sentenced to three years, fined all his gratuity, and in addition to that he is placed in a civilian prison so that he will come out with the stigma of a convict. His wife and children lose their allowance. He is dishonourably discharged and that will militate against him for the rest of his natural life. No recognition whatsoever is given for services during the period of fighting the war.

What this house should press for is the setting up immediately of a parliamentary committee on veterans affairs where all these matters can be analysed by members. I believe there are seventy members in this house who are veterans either of the last war or of this one, and they should be given an opportunity as soon as possible to get together and look over the veterans' charter, examining all legislation, because it requires examination. No legislation is effective or worth the paper it is written on unless it is administered properly. I am not going to take more time on this subject, because I know that later on it will receive a good deal of discussion. The whole matter of rehabilitation calls for considerable checking up.

I would say a word or two to the minister of munitions, who has just spoken. I would judge from the talk he gave that he is Canada's greatest optimist, to say the least. The picture he painted in the field of employment across Canada is certainly not true in the province from which I come.

Mr. MITCHELL: He has to be an optimist to tackle the problem.

Mr. GILLIS: But optimism, speeches and statistics will not solve that problem. Jobs have to be found and wages must be paid.

Mr. MITCHELL: You cannot solve the problem by a negative approach.

Mr. GILLIS: It is not a matter of being negative or positive; it is a matter of finding out what you can do and getting busy and going after it. The unemployment problem is pretty bad in Nova Scotia. In January, 1944, the reconstruction committee tabled in this house a report that meant something from the point of view of employment as far as Nova Scotia is concerned. They decided then to build a causeway across the strait of Canso and to double-track the mainland from Sydney to Moncton, tearing up the old one and taking out the grades and curves. That would give considerable employment to the people of Nova Scotia at the present time. It would perhaps take up the slack while you are getting ready to find out what you intend to do in the next year or so. When the minister gets an opportunity I should like him to tell the house exactly what progress has been made with respect to bridging the strait of Canso and so forth, because that is one of the province's major post-war projects. I see it as a cushion in the reconversion period which could take care of a lot of the people coming out of the services and out of the war industries. There is no reconversion in Nova Scotia; it is a matter of closing out the industries and putting the workers back on the street. The project to which I have referred means something down there, and I should like to know what progress is being made.

Then I should like to get a statement from the Department of Reconstruction with respect to the coal commission. The coal mining industry of Canada is a very sick one. It requires considerable reorganization. The government recognized that, because it appointed a royal commission that is inquiring into the coal industry all across Canada

with the view of reorganizing the industry and establishing a fuel policy. That commission has been on the road for some considerable time. I would urge the minister to render it every assistance and to do everything possible within his department to have the report of that commission brought down as early as possible. I believe they are completing their hearings in Sydney at the present time. It should not take very long to analyse those hearings and bring in a report. That industry certainly requires reorganization. Coupled with that is the whole steel set-up in the province. I am not going to go into that now. I noted that the minister tabled an order in council in the house on September 7 dealing with subsidies for the Dominion Steel and Coal industry. The number of that order is 1952. That order is very generous. Perhaps that generosity is required, but it certainly indicates that there is something wrong with that industry. The subsidy paid during 1943 was some $9,678,829.49. Well, an industry that has to get money poured into it like that should have some public supervision; it certainly is not private enterprise. Under private enterprise that assistance is necessary, and I am glad to see that according to this order in council the assistance is to be continued. The agreement has been extended into 1945.

Mr. HOWE: If it stops, the industry ceases.

Mr. GILLIS: That is exactly what I say. If that assistance from the government is stopped, then that industry is through. That is why we in the province are concerned. Steel and coal is the basic industry. The whole economy revolves around it. We believe that the commission is doing a thorough job in examining the industry and we should like to see that report brought down as soon as possible because it holds everything else up. If you start to talk about housing in that province the first thing you hear is; "We cannot do very much about housing until the commission reports; we do not know what the future of this industry is or what the prosperity of the country will be like in the future." I leave that with the minister to see if the report cannot be expedited as much as possible.

I now wish to say a word to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell). We are likely to say a lot of words to him before the session is over; but there is one matter that comes within the jurisdiction of his department that I am interested in, namely, the apprenticeship system established in the mining industry under the fuel emergency order. I wish to say at the outset that I think that is perhaps one of the best things the government has done for the coalmining industry of Nova Scotia. It worked well and it raised the status of coal mining to a trade. Young boys who previously went down into a coal mine and took the chance of getting their necks broken while learning the business were taken down under this scheme and put under the supervision of competent instructors. The bill was handled jointly by the federal government and the coal company. On two occasions I complimented the minister on that set-up and I asked him if it was the intention of the government to continue that apprenticeship system into the post-war period. He assured the house that so long as he was Minister of Labour or had any say in the labour department that apprenticeship system would be continued. I now tell him that for the past five months nothing has been done on that particular scheme; it has been allowed to peter out. Certain people do not want it. They are not doing anything about it.

In discussing the problem of vocational training with some of the department's vocational training officials in Sydney within the last couple of months, I found they were very much interested in it, because there are hundreds of returning personnel who did not have a job previously and who would want to go into the mines if they had an opportunity. If that scheme was functioning there would be some place for the vocational training officers to send the boys under a rehabilitation plan to give them the necessary training to become coal miners. I wish to leave that with the minister because I think he is interested. I ask him to check up on that matter and resurrect the system because it was worth while.

There are many matters that could be discussed during this debate, but I am not going to try to go into all of them. There are two more committees that I think should be set up in addition to the parliamentary committee on veterans' affairs generally. I believe that the Canada Shipping Act requires considerable revision. It is old; it has never been changed. During the past week we had the privilege of meeting with the Canadian Seamen's Union. In discussing their problems with some of them we found that a lot of their difficulties are based on the Canada Shipping Act. It is a long story and I am not going to try to go into it at this time.

I believe it is the intention of the government to have a merchant marine in the post-war period—it certainly should be. If we are to have merchant marine in Canada in the post-war period the first thing we have to do

is to train officers immediately. Most of the officers sailing our Canadian merchant ships during this war were brought from the old country, particularly the captains and the higher ranks. That happened during the last war. The British shipping companies saw to that. When the war was over, the boats were beached; the skippers went home and Canada had no qualified officers to carry on the work of her merchant marine. The same thing is true this time. There has been a lot of protest about it. Great numbers of naval personnel will soon be demobilized. A lot of them may be qualified. As part of our rehabilitation project we should definitely decide on maintaining in this country a merchant service of at least three hundred ships. Certain naval personnel may want to follow the water in the post-war period. They may be interested in taking the higher positions; but the seamen advise us that at the present time we have practically no qualified skippers and under-officials to take charge of a merchant marine in the post-war years.

The Minister of Munitions and Supply dealt extensively with reconversion. A lot can be said about war assets and so forth. I do not think that fighting over it on that basis will serve very much purpose except confusion. I do not agree very much with what he said with respect to reconverting plants and so forth, but I think it is a terrific problem and there are many headaches in it. There is no one man or two men or ten men in Ottawa who can be expected to handle that problem successfully and protect the equity which the Canadian people have in war plants and so forth; it cannot be done. Hon. members could be utilized. I believe a committee on reconversion should be set up in this house, to which could be passed many of the problems of the department. Surely we can unite in making use of materials in which the Canadian people have an equity of a billion dollars or so, regardless of our political philosophies. It is our own business, the business of government. That is the business of the Canadian people, and it is a billion dollar business. Regardless of what we may think from the point of view of political philosophy, surely we can get together to protect that equity and utilize it in the best interests of this country. I believe a committee of this house should be set up for that purpose.

We see a great many wild stories in the press, and I do not believe the press very much at the present time. If I see something in the *Globe and Mail* I say, "That is just a Tory story to embarrass the government." If I read something in the Toronto *Star* I say, "That is just a story to bolster the government," while if something appears in the C.C.F. *News* our hon. friends over here say it is only propaganda endeavouring to establish socialism. But if we all get together in a room and get the facts from the Department of Reconstruction, we can sit down and analyse those facts from the point of view of dollars and cents and what they mean to the Canadian people, and perhaps we can help the minister. At least he would be in this position, that when he came to the house there would be forty or fifty members here knowing something about the ramifications of the department and the job he is doing, and our minds would not be beclouded by the propaganda we are getting in the press.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my time is up. I wish to say that I am sincere in regard to the matters I have discussed. To every member of this house representing a section of Canada I say we have won the war on the battlefields, but if we continue to have the opposing factions we see in this country to-day all we shall do is change the uniform of the soldiers coming back. We shall throw them into the ranks of the unemployed, or into industries which do not provide adequate standards, and they will become soldiers on the home front in Canada for the next few years, perhaps carrying on the sort of struggle we shall not like. And it is not necessary. The members of this group are prepared to do anything they can now and in the future to establish for the people of this country the things for which we think we fought this war.

Mr. L. O. BREITHAUPT (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, at the outset of the few remarks I desire to make I wish to add my congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne. It is noteworthy that each hon. gentleman represents a distinguished branch of the service, the air force and the navy; and I might add with some pride that the mover of the address, the youthful member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Benidickson) happens to be my house office mate. Even if he is from the bush country, to which the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) referred, he is a good scout, and I think he will get along. In order that there may be no confusion as to the riding I represent, I should like to make it clear, particularly to new members, that there are two Waterloo ridings, Waterloo North and Waterloo South. Some misunderstanding seems to exist in the house and in some press reports with regard to the members representing these two constituencies. It has been said that "east is east and west is west and never the twain shall meet." The same might be said of the

two Waterloos; north is north and south is south, and never the twain shall meet. This applies only, however, to the political philosophy of the two representatives, and has nothing to do with their personal relationships. As far as the two ridings are concerned, our interests are mutual to a large extent. They are both highly agricultural and highly industrial, and many Canadian insurance companies have their headquarters there. The town of Waterloo, which is in my riding, is often said to be the Hartford of Canada.

So much for my little sales talk on behalf of my riding, which I think every hon. member is quite justified in making. I join with other hon. members of this house in giving thanks to Almighty God for the success of allied arms and the complete and unconditional surrender of our axis enemies. I am particularly pleased at the presence in this house of one who so recently languished in a German prison camp where he had been confined, together with a very near relative of mine, Lieutenant Arthur Breithaupt of the Calgary Tanks, ever since the memorable storming of the beaches of Dieppe by Canadian armed forces. I refer, of course, to the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. Merritt). In my maiden speech in this house after Dieppe, I recommended to the government that Cecil Merritt be made a senator upon his return to Canada, in recognition of his outstanding services. Hon. members who were here at that time will recall that suggestion. Apparently this was not to be, and he decided to enter parliament the hard way. In spite of the fact that he sits on the opposition benches, I wish to pay him a well earned tribute, quite apart from his political affiliations. His maiden speech delivered the other day has been the subject of much favourable comment even by many Liberal members, some of whom have said that the Liberal thought expressed therein would almost entitle the hon. gentleman to cross the floor of the house to the government benches. His criticisms were both fair and constructive, so we might still make him a senator.

At this time I wish to pay a very respectful and heartfelt tribute on behalf of my constituents as well as myself to those members of Canada's armed forces from Waterloo North and the entire Dominion of Canada who laid down their lives for a just and great cause, to free the world from tyranny and oppression. May we prove ourselves worthy of their great sacrifice.

During the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne I have heard from opposition parties a good deal of critical and sometimes unfair comment in regard to the government. I agree with the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis) that we all make mistakes. I make plenty of them; so do the opposition parties, and even the government sometimes makes a few. My conception of the duty of a supporter of the government is that he should not only commend the government for good work done but also suggest where improvements can be effected. The trust placed by the Canadian people in such generous measure in our great leader, the Right Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and his historic party in 1940, when he received a record majority, was certainly not misplaced. The clear mandate at that time was to win the war. The Prime Minister and his party have kept Canada united in spite of some talk we hear from opposition parties; they have delivered the goods, and the war has been won. To my mind actions speak louder than words. If in the post-war period every Canadian citizen assumes his share of the burden and pulls a strong oar, surely even the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario (Mr. Macdonnell), who made such a strong plea for leadership and guidance, will have to admit that this country really has had it. It has had that leadership for many years past, and again the people of Canada saw fit to entrust the fortunes of this great country to the Liberal party. I would point out that recently another record has been set up to the credit of the Prime Minister; that is, that after having led the country to victory his government was returned to office. So far as I know never before in Canadian history has a government been returned after a period of war administration.

A good deal has been said on the subjects of reconstruction, reconversion and housing. I am a realist, and my training is to face facts and deal with them accordingly. I am firmly of the opinion that we cannot change over from a war-time economy to a peace-time economy as speedily as some people think we can. There is bound to be more or less dislocation. At the ending of a war we cannot be expected to continue to manufacture munitions and war equipment merely to employ labour. Even at that I firmly beileve that at the present time there is no actual shortage of jobs in Canada. The figures given by the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply (Mr. Howe) this evening further verifies that fact. In fact I know there are many communities, including the industrial centres in Waterloo North, which are actually experiencing a far greater shortage of help and far more absenteeism at the present time than they did at any time during the war. While it is true that there is

not an over-all shortage of jobs in Canada, nevertheless it is true that there is a shortage of jobs in some localities where war plants previously existed. Many of those who migrated to some cities to work in temporary munitions and manufacturing centres should, in my humble opinion, bring themselves to the point where they see the wisdom of returning to their former abodes throughout the length and breadth of this country.

Much concern has been shown over the fact that there is a shortage of housing accommodation in many communities where war-time production reached an all-time high. Right here I wish to sound a note of caution. It seems to me that necessary as additional housing may be in some communities, such as those communities which are expanding their peacetime production or such communities as the cities and towns in my riding where diversified industry is characteristic of the locality, there is grave danger that in other districts an over-extended housing programme may backfire when adjustment and filtering back home of much of the urban populace take place.

While I am on the subject of housing, I should like to refer to the fact that the government plans to have insurance companies and limited dividend corporations build houses on a large scale. These plans are commendable. However, the fact should not be lost sight of that throughout the country there are many small builders who have started from scratch, who could, if given a greater chance, contribute greatly to the alleviation of the present housing situation. The figures given by the Minister of Reconstruction in this connection are impressive, that 38,000 homes have been built by smaller builders. This is only a start and many small builders would be pleased to amplify this programme, as well as other individuals who are capable and willing to build their own homes, if the granting of permits and the loosening up of building materials were simplified.

Personally I think the Department of Reconstruction is doing a good job under an able minister, but I respectfully submit that a good deal of the red tape and delay in the issuing of permits by the construction controller's department should be removed. We are sympathetic with the department in the enormous amount of work that they have to do, but I think a little word from the minister in this connection would be quite in order.

May I suggest also to the minister that the green light might now be given to a much greater extent in the issuing of permits for plant extensions and additions where such will assist in the government's plans for the creation of jobs. Surely it is a good policy to further encourage the expansion of industry for the manufacture of the much needed civilian products now in such short supply and thus provide jobs for returning personnel of the armed forces and for others who have faithfully discharged their duties at home through the very difficult war years. Building materials such as cement and steel used in plant construction are not in any case in a critical position and are not generally used in volume for home construction.

I come now to the subject of meat rationing. As I said before, we all make mistakes. In my humble opinion it would appear that we as a government have definitely made one by putting into force a clumsy and complicated form of meat rationing at the end of a great world war. This comes at a time when reliable sources indicate that the United States is discontinuing meat rationing. Only a few months ago their supply position was more critical than ours. Merely because plans were made in Canada for meat rationing prior to the end of the Pacific war is in itself no reason why we should now proceed with it. No doubt some money has been spent on the preparation of this plan, but there is no reason to send good money after bad or to attempt to cover up an old mistake with a new one.

More meat products are apparently needed throughout the world than ever before, particularly in the United Kingdom. God knows Great Britain has stood by us through thick and thin during the most fateful hours of the war. We in turn owe her a great debt and should continue to stand by her in peace as we have done in war. In order that we may do this I have a suggestion to make. The cattle population of Canada is apparently in excess of all requirements, domestic and export. Let me therefore suggest that the government immediately put forward a plan to have meat production substantially increased so that these cattle may be processed. To do this, meat producers throughout the country, large and small, could, I am told, increase their production if further additional help is directed into the industry. If this does not entirely remedy the situation and floor space is the problem, I would suggest that the government lease some of its now idle munitions plants which the Minister of Reconstruction has told us to-night are not suitable for other purposes, to meat processors until such time as the situation has, by intelligent planning, been corrected. Let us get on with the job, but let us not saddle the country at this time with meat rationing.

I wish to say a word about the proposal to have a national flag for Canada. I am all for the idea as long as the union jack forms an integral part of that flag.

The ministers of national defence for the various forces are to be complimented upon the efficient manner in which the return of the forces from overseas has been effected, and I wish to express the hope that a further speed-up will result. I trust that the recent announcement which came through from London that there might be a shortage of ships because of certain movements in the Atlantic will not materialize and that everything will work out all right.

I understand that some of the army personnel are being kept in the armies of occupation against their wishes. Surely at this stage of the war service men and officers who have fought through bloody battles in Europe should be able to choose their own location and return home if they so desire. Since much confusion still exists in connection with releases and discharges from the armed services, I would suggest to the ministers that the latest regulations be sent forward to all members of parliament so that they can at least inform their constituencies intelligently as to up-to-date procedures.

Along with most Canadians I heartily approve the government's plan, as mentioned in the speech from the throne, to revise and clarify the definition of Canadian citizenship. This should have been accomplished many years ago.

I now come to what I consider to be the most important item in my speech. While pre-budget comments on the subject of tax reduction made by our able Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley), and all the rest of the Liberal candidates, both on the hustings and in the house, lend some cause for hope, nevertheless I observe that in our present Canadian economy our people feel that a substantial tax reduction for all sections of the community is a positive commitment of the government.

During the stress and strain experienced during the war years people have been willing to take it on the chin and to bear the brunt of taxation so long as the patriotic urge of a final and complete victory over our enemies was in the process of being achieved. But now that the war is over they feel that they have a right to expect relief from many of these imposts, and a more careful scrutiny of the national budget seems to be in order. When one considers that after this war we shall have a national debt about five times the size of that of 1939 and a national budget not less than three times the highest pre-war figure, it is time we took the situation in hand. If the results desired seem difficult to achieve at this time owing to fixed charges, commitments, uncontrollable expenditures and the costs of social legislation, all of which are quite in order, then I say it is high time that steps be taken to cut down controllable expenditures, and cut them down to the bone where it is possible to do so.

I respectfully suggest that the country's business is very much like any other business, only on a much larger scale. Where the necessity exists in private business to reduce costs or else suffer extinction, remedies are not long in being found. Usually a situation such as this is carefully analysed and studied; expert advice is sought as to just where the necessary remedies should and could be applied, and then they are applied.

As to government expenditures, I suggest that a special committee of the house be appointed to cooperate with the Minister of Finance in making an exhaustive study of governmental spending. Comparisons should be made between the ordinary expenses of carrying on the government in 1939 and in the present year. Recommendations could then be made as to what steps should be taken to straighten out the whole picture, so that taxes might be reduced and Canadian credit remain at a high level. I respectfully submit that unless early and energetic steps such as these are taken, the next victory loan may receive only lukewarm support in many sections of the country.

There is also little doubt that unless income taxpayers receive some measure of relief this year from their tax burdens, hardships will ensue and incentives to work and produce will be lost. Heavy war-time excess profits taxes on industry should also be removed if the government's own plans for jobs in the post-war period are to be successfully carried out. Psychologically, and from every other angle, the time is here for us to give serious consideration to these problems.

Mr. J. W. MURPHY (Lambton West): Mr. Speaker, may I at this first opportunity compliment you on the high honour that has been conferred upon you? I am sure that you will continue to exercise that necessary degree of tolerance and fairness expected from you, especially to the new members who are not so familiar with the rules, and who rise for the first time, I can assure you, with some trepidation.

May I also extend my congratulations to the mover (Mr. Benidickson) and the seconder (Mr. Langlois) of the address in reply to the speech from the throne? My most sincere congratulations go to these two hon. members,

because they chose to serve their king and country in time of war. I am sure that no member of the government or of the other parties to our left will forget that sitting in the ranks of the Progressive Conservative party are also distinguished soldiers, including two holders of the Victoria Cross. To these hon. gentlemen I cannot find words to express my gratitude. It is indeed an honour to be associated with them. It is a healthy sign to see so many young members in this House of Commons, men who are entering the political arena for the first time.

I am very proud to represent the riding of Lambton West, which includes Sarnia, not only because it has the largest oil refinery in the British empire, not because it has also the Polymer Corporation, commonly known as the rubber plant, but because I hope to be of some service to my riding and my country. That is the reason why I am here. I maintain that one must accept his responsibility or take the consequences.

I was sorry, Mr. Speaker, as a new member to hear some of the members to your right and to your left charging the Progressive Conservative party with being responsible for stirring up disunity in the Dominion of Canada. I think that sort of debate is beneath the dignity of this house. Of one thing I am proud, namely, that members of our party cannot be charged, as can the members of some other parties in this house, with spreading the gospel of class hatred, distrust and discontent. Of all hatreds within a country, class hatred is by far the most dangerous, and to those who for political purposes are playing around with such high explosives, may I suggest that before it is too late they desist from such contemptible tactics, and that instead of preaching blue ruin and hoping for a depression so that they can stir up more class hatred, they act as real Canadians and stop selling Canada short. I maintain that our party preached national unity from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and that all would have equal rights, with no favourtism to anyone. Apparently some parts of this great dominion did not choose to take the chance of being treated on an equal basis.

We were elected as members of our respective ridings, but if we are to discharge our responsibilities as members of this house we must have a national outlook and consider that each and everyone of us represents a united Canada. I can best picture my thought by a simple illustration of nine men—I use the figure nine purposely—with their arms so tied and bound that they could not feed themselves and yet had plenty on the table in front of them. They solved their own problems by each feeding the one to his left.

I should like at this time to emphasize that it is a distinct honour for me to represent Lambton West in this house. In 1943 I contested the riding of West Lambton in the provincial arena. The ridings of Lambton West and West Lambton differ somewhat in their boundaries, and in the 1943 provincial election the riding of West Lambton was won by the C.C.F. party by a small majority. That was, as hon. members all remember, the time when the Polymer Corporation was being rushed to completion, and some 4,000 temporary workers from other parts of Canada were engaged in that construction. I may say they did not repeat it on June 4 in the Ontario government election, but ran a low third, the Progressive Conservative of course winning.

Most hon. members know that the dominion riding of Lambton West has been traditionally Liberal. It had a Liberal representative ever since confederation except for one term, when it was ably represented by the highly respected and recently deceased Mr. Le Sueur. It is with great satisfaction I say that the C.C.F. candidate lost his deposit, and thereby helped our Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) to the tune of $200; and if they ever find another C.C.F. candidate we shall assure them of the same generosity. So, Mr. Speaker, I have reason to be proud of being the second representative of our party for Lambton West since confederation.

I should like to quote from one of Canada's most popular and highly respected newspapers, the Windsor *Star* of last Friday:

> As the Liberals and Progressive Conservatives are the only two parties with any claim to national status, they are the parties who have to look to seats in all parts of the dominion. The other parties do well in this province or that, but they are not national parties. They are sectional groups, speaking for one area only.

To all those who are on the right of you, Mr. Speaker, and to my left, I wish to say, listen to this, and this will be my eulogy of my leader:

> John Bracken is doing all right as leader of the Progressive Conservatives. He is the type of man who wears well and gathers strength as he rolls along. He is never spectacular, but he is impressive.

I wish for a few moments to dwell on the more material angle of my riding. We have heard some reference to sugar beets and the scarcity of sugar. Sugar stocks at Wallaceburg, normally a high production area, are reported as nil and have resulted in the

actual importation of 2,000,000 pounds of cane sugar. This action was necessary to provide consumers and processors with even their very much limited ration. We did grow great quantities of sugar beets in Lambton county; and knowing the reasons for the lessened production I did not relish the billboard advertising of some months ago by the wartime prices and trade board, to the effect that there was plenty of sugar in the sugar bowl.

There are two reasons why Lambton county produces less sugar beets than formerly. The first one is common to sugar beet producers in all parts of Canada; that is, the government's much-muddled man-power system or, should I say, lack of system. The second is a serious menace to the sugar beet industry in our locality. It is a fact not known to many hon. members, but I am assured it is known to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner). This disease is a nematode, affecting the sugar beet. The entomologists of the Department of Agriculture are well aware of this menace and have made some surveys concerning it. The disease is considered so injurious to the industry that farmers in certain areas are not permitted to ship their beets by truck to the factories but are compelled to ship by railroad. It is feared that in shipping by truck beets may fall off and spread the disease. This same nematode is what created such havoc among the sugar beet growers in Utah. The disease has already spread elsewhere in Ontario. It is a serious situation, and every effort must be made to control and eliminate it entirely; otherwise I fear for the sugar beet industry in Ontario.

Some months ago representation was made to the Minister of Agriculture to take further action, and at the same time representation was made to the minister of agriculture of Ontario. Two creeks, or rather small rivers, which drain thousands of acres of land in this area empty into lake Huron. I have known there to be as much as four and a half feet of sand washed into the mouths of these creeks or rivers, thus preventing proper drainage. As a result of this, vast areas are sometimes under water, which simply means that it accentuates the spread of the disease to other lands. Engineers have suggested that the only way to keep the mouths of these creeks open is by constructing breakwaters at the mouths. The mouths of these creeks are subject to dominion government regulation, and the dominion government is the only agent that can legally rectify the situation. The minister of agriculture of Ontario, realizing the seriousness of the situation, agreed to pay one third of the cost of these breakwaters if the dominion government and the drainage areas paid the balance. It is my earnest desire that the minister will again look into the matter and cooperate to preserve the industry, since not only are all sugar beets subject to infection, but also table beets, carrots and other vegetables. The market gardeners are very much alarmed, and in my riding, owing to boat shipping facilities, market gardening is an industry of no mean proportions. We have many hundreds of acres in Lambton West used for no other purpose than raising vegetables.

At a later date I may have something further to contribute regarding the sugar beet industry, and I may not confine my remarks to the production of sugar beets.

The other subject which I wish to discuss for a few moments is the greatest potential industry in Canada—and I do not purpose to qualify that statement—that is, the tourist industry. Sarnia is within one day's automobile drive in the United States of America of as many people as are in the whole Dominion of Canada. It is little wonder, therefore, that I am and will continue to be interested in the tourist industry.

I have heard with interest of the scheme to beautify the nation's capital. I am in hearty accord with the idea of beautification, and suggest that at Sarnia, where, as I said before, we are the front gate to so many millions of Americans, much could be done as a dominion government undertaking as part of the programme to promote and increase our tourist industry. Every port of entry into Canada gives the tourist his first picture and impression of our country, and I think the federal government could and should lend its aid to the provincial and municipal authorities in the beautification of all these ports, through which flow these great streams of wealth, so essential to our national interests. We are fortunate in having courteous customs and immigration officials who faithfully accept their responsibilities and are a credit to the service. They are the first officials to greet these tourists. Might I at this juncture emphasize and endorse a plea for these competent men, that they receive a wage or remuneration commensurate with their duties and responsibilities. I am advised that they have not received the consideration to which they were and are entitled to monetarily. I believe I am right in saying that their scale of wages has not been raised except on a much too modest scale since 1925. Surely since the depression these men should receive decent wages. I maintain here and now that a man qualified to enter

the customs or immigration service should start at not less than $1,800 a year and not $1,200 or thereabouts, and that his increases should be on an equitable merit system.

For those hon. members who do not know, we have in Lambton West some ninety miles of shore line—partly along the St. Clair river and about sixty miles along the shores of lake Huron; a paradise for the American, and it is the American who is developing the shore line. Sarnia is less than sixty miles from Detroit. In 1939, 312,564 cars crossed the Blue Water bridge between Sarnia and Port Huron. Since that time, owing to the war and restrictions, the traffic has been less. But that will give the house an idea of what we may expect by considered planning.

It is not necessary that hon. members be told by me that we live in the best country in the world and that its changing beauty from east to west or north to south is unending and unequalled in its entirety. Nature has largely endowed our land with everything for the contentment and the happiness of our people and for those from other lands and climates who come to visit Canada. Canada must compete with the tourist attractions of other countries which are at all times being expanded and improved. One pre-war year alone, it is estimated, 16,000,000 United States tourists came to Canada, leaving in the country about $300 million. Ninety-five per cent of United States tourists came to Canada on "rubber tires".

We must be prepared not only for a return of this traffic in increased volume but also for those using the even more modern method of transportation, the aeroplane, which will open up our country to those even further removed from our boundaries than those to whom I have already referred.

The tourist traffic is valuable to our national life to a large extent and it might not be amiss to consider 1938 as a normal pre-war year. In 1938 Canada's credit balance of international payments amounted to $184,800,000. A favourable balance in the tourist trade amounted to $145,000,000, or 78·5 per cent of the total credit balance of international payments. If it had not been for the tourist trade, Canada's credit balance of international payments would have been negligible.

Much care and consideration is given by the government to the gold mining industry. Canada's credit balance in gold shipments amount to $156,500,000, or about nine per cent more than the tourist industry.

The Canadian government has established trade commissioners in many foreign countries to sell Canadian products. The credit balance in the tourist trade as mentioned above amounted to $145 million as compared with $180,500,000 credit balance in the external trade, of all merchandise shipped from Canada, including agricultural products.

In 1938, Canada's tourist trade was of greater importance to Canada's national economy than any other single industry, with the exception of gold mining.

As a result of the Atlantic charter a great deal of consideration is being given to foreign trade. To offset this there will be a natural desire on the part of countries to be self-contained, particularly with regard to strategic materials.

Canada will continue to need foreign currency. As in the past one of the greatest sources of this currency will be tourist travel into Canada.

Canada has more at stake per capita in foreign trade than any other country in the world. Foreign travel in Canada, because of its advertising and educational value, could be used to create more foreign trade.

Advertising, better understanding, and a proper interpretation of Canada and Canadians, to foreign countries will be invaluable.

Canada is a large country populated by a relatively small number of people. There are several distinct population centres. Such conditions tend to create misunderstanding, resulting in local discontent and sectional prejudices. There is nothing which will counteract these unhappy conditions more effectively than travel.

The tourist traffic will compare more than favourably with any other industry in the amount of employment produced per dollar expended. Not only is there a direct benefit to farmers, retailers, purveyors of lodging and food, to travel systems, to gasoline and to other entrepreneurs, but this money creates much indirect employment because it passes through all channels of human enterprise. Even as the tourist traffic has become of primary importance to Switzerland, so the tourist traffic could be made of utmost value to Canada's national economy.

Canada abounds in natural attractions. From the Cabot trail in Cape Breton to lovely Victoria, every section has its own national appeal. Much can be done to exploit this.

Canada's facilities for recreation must be regarded as a natural resource to be developed under wise guidance for the benefit of the greatest possible number of people. They are a natural resource, just as our mines, forests, and farm lands are natural resources. They possess only one outstanding difference; they are not exhausted by use. Scenery,

climate, and environment can be "sold" over and over again; can be drawn upon in perpetuity without any impairment of the original capital.

Development of Canada's recreational activities as a post-war enterprise has another important advantage over the production of material goods; there is practically no possibility, under reasonably prosperous conditions, of oversupplying the market. Aside from catering to the recreational needs of her own population, Canada has the advantage of lying alongside a great and populous country, perhaps the most travel-minded in the world, well disposed toward Canada and eager to make closer acquaintances. Development of Canada's recreational possibilities on a scale comparable with those of, say, Switzerland, would easily attain a monetary value in excess of a billion dollars a year.

For the past six years Canada has had a great corps of ambassadors all across the world, in the persons of those serving in His Majesty's uniform bearing Canada's name. These men and women have done much to advertise Canada abroad, although that was not their primary objective, but it should be the primary objective of the government of Canada to capitalize on their good work and foster the tourist trade to help make Canada a better country for these returned heroes to live in and as a lasting memorial to those who did not return.

Development of a recreational industry on a large scale will help to solve that problem by bringing a foreign market for our goods to Canada, instead of taking the goods to a foreign market over such obstacles as tariffs, exchange differentials and highly organized and well financed competition. Tourists are good spenders. They will consume substantial quantities of our agricultural products and will buy goods which have a Canadian flavour—maybe a Scotch flavour too—whether of handicraft or factory production, to take back home. They will furnish employment to large numbers of Canadians, who, in turn, because of their increased prosperity, will become greater consumers of Canadian products. They furnish increased revenues to transportation companies, hotels and all enterprises catering to the travelling public, to the wisespread advantage of Canadian economy.

Preservation and promotion of the health of the people must also occupy a prominent place in post-war planning. It would be a natural conclusion that residents of a great country like Canada, blessed with a healthful climate, descending from vigorous antecedents, with pioneer blood still in their veins, would rank high among all nations in the matter of general health. Any such pleasant conclusion has had a severe shock from the facts revealed by medical examination of recruits for war services. It appears, indeed, that Canada needs to take serious counsel with herself as to what she is going to do about the national health.

In a country like Canada, a land of great area and small population, and with even that small population clustered in distinct geographic groups, it is in the national interest that people should travel back and forth to become acquainted with each other, to see each other's problems and circumstances, to form friendships, to acquire the national rather than the parochial point of view.

What is true of the development of a real Canadianism in Canada is equally true in the promotion of friendly foreign relationships. The good will toward Canada felt in the United States has undoubtedly been fostered by the great exchange of travel which in normal times occurs between these two countries. The extent to which that good will has prospered the cause of the united nations in the war would be hard to estimate. At present the interests of the two nations seem to be identical, but it may not always be so, and good will will be needed to assure cooperation and generous attitude on both sides toward issues which may arise in the future. What is true of relationships with the United States is also true, if in lesser degree, of relationships with the other American countries, and with the world as a whole. Making Canada the travel centre of the world after the war will pay dividends in international relationships, including opportunities for international trade, which probably could not be acquired by any other form of investment.

But people will travel. The money poured into the manufacture of munitions and supplies has transformed a large working-class population into a class of people with money to spend.

The tourist industry needs to be retooled and remodelled, to be put on as practical a hard rock basis as any manufacturing industry or service organization, for there is no real difference between them; in tourism we shall get customers only to the extent that our goods are better than those of our competitors.

Tourism to-day is no longer a parochial question. It extends beyond the confines of any one province, for each and every part of our vast dominion is beautiful and attractive. Each of the nine provinces that form our land has its own special attraction and charm for the visitor, and we should all work together, for the common good of the country, to bring about unity out of this very diversity.

Speaking more specifically on the tourist industry and what it means to my riding, I said before that we had ninety miles of shore line. There are at least sixty miles of shore line between Sarnia and Grand Bend on lake Huron which to-day could be developed, as well as some thirty-five miles between Sarnia and Port Lambton along the St. Clair river. Some of it is now owned by Americans who have homes costing upwards of twenty-five thousand dollars. Right here let me emphasize that we welcome the United States tourist who comes even for a few hours; the one who comes for two weeks is worth more as is also the family who come for the season and it is they with whom my riding is chiefly concerned. We appreciate the travelling tourist and every effort should be made to have him return, and ultimately buy a piece of property and build a summer or semi-permanent home. In some parts of Canada, he is of greater value to us nationally. Let me now specify how important this type of tourist is to my riding in particular in that ninety miles of shore line, and the same can no doubt be said of other parts of Canada, but very few places in Canada are so fortunate in having so many so near. There is room for, say, in fifty miles, at least ten thousand homes, assuming it was highly developed and with fair-sized lots, and none of them more than four hundred feet from the shores of lake Huron or the banks of the river St. Clair. The property purchased would be in the neighbourhood of ten million dollars; the total building costs in the neighbourhood of fifty million dollars, and I have reason to believe that every American with a summer home spends on an average one thousand dollars annually. This in round figures is ten million dollars a year in our riding alone. The Americans will also buy many items of British manufacture in addition to Canadian-made goods. This extends our trade with Britain, and by these purchases we readily obtain foreign exchange including sterling so necessary in international trade. No other industry can compare with this. This is Canadian material used and made by Canadians and a means to-day to employ thousands of returning veterans, and in addition I say that the quicker we have the materials, the sooner we develop our greatest industry. We all agree that about eighty per cent of the cost of a frame house is labour, lumber and cement. At the moment we have a shortage of many building materials, including lumber.

May I submit that we need not have discovered ourselves in this position if the manpower of the nation had been properly used, and if our bifocal army—the term I borrowed from the hon. minister from Vancouver-Burrard—

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): Minister?

Mr. MURPHY: I was just elevating him about four years ahead of time.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): From Vancouver-Burrard?

Mr. MURPHY: I am a little deaf. I sometimes hear more intelligent sounds from the cradle.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Hear, hear.

Mr. MURPHY: The baby was not crying for milk either. Now let me finish my sentence: If our bifocal army had been otherwise engaged, or at least some part of it.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Go on with Sarnia.

Mr. MURPHY: You heard from Sarnia on June 11, and you will hear from Sarnia at the next election.

Mr. MACKENZIE: You heard from Canada.

Mr. MURPHY: The country now finds itself not only without proper homes for our returning veterans who were promised so much, but also with a serious shortage of building materials to construct these homes which are so sorely needed.

Between Sarnia and Grand Bend, a shore line of some sixty miles, there is not a harbour for the protection of commercial fishermen. In the event of a storm, some may head for Sarnia; others have to beach their boats. Harbours are their only protection, and may I say in this connection that the two creeks or rivers I referred to previously as not having proper outlets, could be made into ideal natural harbours if proper and not necessarily expensive breakwaters were constructed. These harbours would also bring in many United States boats and sailing craft and be a tremendous factor in promoting our tourist industry.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Boats?

Mr. MURPHY: I may tell my hon. friend I can take care of myself.

Mr. MacNICOL: You would not expect much from a cradle.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Family allowances.

Mr. MURPHY: I have heard about the dodo bird before. Many of these people, if they could harbour their boats, would erect summer homes of no mean proportion, and of this I have been assured. We should have a dominion tourist commission or the tourist

industry under a senior minister of the crown to give the necessary support and cooperation the industry warrants.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say first, that I should like to learn the French language. I like your pleasant accent and, if I could, I would go down among your compatriots and teach them to sing, "I am beginning to see the light."

I earnestly hope that when the dominion-provincial conference again convenes the tourist industry will be a subject of major consideration, that the dominion and the provinces will correlate their activities so that we may take advantage of all that we have so much of an abundance to offer, and I can assure my hon. friends to the right of you, Mr. Speaker, that if the present government does the best it can possibly do, the Progressive Conservative government will finish the job after the next general election.

On motion of Mr. Gibson (Comox-Alberni) the debate was adjourned.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Tuesday, September 18, 1945.

The house met at three o'clock.

STANDING COMMITTEES

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS—EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That standing order 63 be amended by striking out the words "and international" in subsection (j) and adding after subsection (k): (l) On external affairs, to consist of 20 members, 8 of whom shall constitute a quorum.

He said: Hon. members will recall that it was suggested by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) a few days ago that the committee on industrial and international relations should be divided into two separate committees, one having to do with labour and industrial relations and the other with commonwealth and foreign relations—I think those are the words my hon. friend used. I mentioned that at a previous session of parliament the same suggestion had been made. It was, I think, by my hon. friend the leader of the C.C.F. group (Mr. Coldwell). At the time I intimated that that course might be advisable.

As I said the other day, I think it is desirable to have two separate committees, one on industrial relations and the other on external relations. I chose the words "industrial relations" and "external affairs" as being sufficiently comprehensive to include all that has been suggested. The leader of the opposition suggested, if I remember rightly, a committee on "labour and industrial relations". Of course, labour is one party to industry, and by using the expression "industrial relations", other parties, which would include management, capital and the community, would be included. I should think the more comprehensive designation would be the preferable.

In regard to international relations my hon. friend suggested "commonwealth and foreign relations". Here again I feel that the term "international relations" or "external affairs" would be broader and would include everything which is suggested by "commonwealth and foreign relations". The term "external affairs" has been used by different governments of the commonwealth in dealing with matters pertaining not only to relations between the different nations of the commonwealth, but also with regard to matters that relate to foreign countries. It is important that the distinction should be kept between foreign affairs and those affairs that might be regarded as interimperial or commonwealth. But all are included in the term "external affairs". The term was used when the Department of External Affairs was created to cover both relations within the commonwealth and relations with foreign countries. I therefore feel it would be preferable to use the term "external affairs" rather than "commonwealth and foreign relations".

The conference which was held in London in 1926 drew up a statement of the relations as they now exist within the commonwealth, and defined the position which had been attained by the dominions as well as by the United Kingdom. In what is known as the Balfour declaration the term used is "domestic and external affairs," there being no subordination one way or the other between the dominions in regard to the control of their own affairs, whether domestic or external, and the United Kingdom and its control of its affairs, domestic or external.

In these circumstances I would suggest that to use the term "industrial relations" in the one case and "external affairs" in the other for the names of the two committees would be the more appropriate; and may I say that the government is only too happy to have these two committees established in place of the one which at present exists.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): I am very glad to see this motion moved, and I think the Prime Minister's suggestion as to the naming of the committees is a good one. It seems to me accurately to portray what those committees should be concerned with.

But there is one phase of the motion which I want to draw to his attention—that it provides for only twenty members, eight of whom shall constitute a quorum. I think that this is a very important committee; more members of the house are interested in external affairs than in some of the other committees where the membership runs up to well over fifty. Indeed there is only one standing committee with a smaller number of members, and that is on debates, where we have twelve members.

The proposal for the industrial committee is, as I take it, that it remain at thirty-five members; and it seems to me that this very important committee on external affairs should have a membership at least equal to that of the industrial committee, because many members of the house will want to be on that committee.

Then, too, there are in the house at the present time several parties, all of whom will want some membership on that committee, and twenty, it seems to me, does not give the necessary representation.

I do not want to move that "20" be struck out and "35" substituted therefor. I believe that one has only to draw the matter to the attention of the Prime Minister and a satisfactory solution will be arrived at.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say to my hon. friend that after the notice was placed on the order paper the Clerk drew to my attention the fact that the numbers he had inserted were "20" and "8", and I really intended to mention that if the house wished to have a larger number, a larger number could be immediately substituted. With the consent of the house I would have "35" substituted for "20" and "10" for "8" in the resolution, which would make the membership of the external affairs committee the same as that of the committee on industrial relations.

Motion as amended agreed to.

CANADIAN NAVY

INQUIRY AS TO CONDITIONS OF POST-WAR RECRUITMENT

On the orders of the day:

Hon. GROTE STIRLING (Yale): I wish to ask the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services a question in regard to a statement which appeared in the Vancouver *Daily Province* to the effect that recruiting for the navy was to be opened for 4,000 out of a post-war total of 12,000. It pointed out also that those who were applying were largely civilians, but that increasing numbers of those now being demobilized were anxious to get into the permanent naval service. Would the minister be good enough to make a statement with regard to this, as to whether it applies all over Canada and whether these recruits will enter direct into the Royal Canadian Navy or, as hitherto in recent years, into the volunteer reserve?

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of National Defence for Naval Services): I did not see the press item to which my hon. friend refers, but the position, as I think the house is aware, is this. A week or ten days ago—it may be two weeks—recruiting in all three services was authorized in what was referred to as an interim force, the term of enlistment to be for a period to expire on September 30, 1947. No definite number for these recruitments has been fixed, and so far no definite decision has been taken as to the size of the permanent force in any of the three services. The enlistments for these interim forces are being taken from those who are now serving. One of the main purposes in arranging for such enlistments now was to give men who might be interested in serving in the permanent forces after the war the assurance that over the next two years they would have a definite engagement and they would be able to decide, after the conditions and the size of the permanent forces were known, whether or not they would wish to serve in them. The statement which was issued at the time this type of enlistment was authorized indicated that men who enlisted for this special term would be given special consideration for enlistment in the permanent forces.

Mr. FRASER: Further in regard to the question asked the Minister of National Defence by the member for Yale, will the minister say whether the boys who wish to sign up in the Royal Navy have to sign for seven years, or has that been reduced to five?

Mr. STIRLING: The Royal Navy?

Mr. FRASER: The Royal Canadian Navy.

Mr. ABBOTT: I think it is still seven years, but I will make inquiries and give an answer to-morrow. I believe it is still seven years.

MEAT RATIONING

CONFERENCE BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND MEAT DEALERS ASSOCIATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. C. SENN (Haldimand): I should like to address a question to the Prime Minister or the responsible minister in charge of the department under which this matter comes. Owing to differences of opinion and

some misunderstanding which I think exist throughout Canada to-day with respect to the rationing of meat, will the government undertake that the conference which is to be held to-morrow between government representatives and the Retail Meat Dealers association be held in public, so that the widest possible information regarding meat rationing may be available to the people of Canada? I know a number of members who would like to attend that gathering.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I should wish to consult with the Minister of Finance before giving an answer to that question. There are advantages in having the conference in public, and there are distinct advantages also in having some conferences held in private where matters of a technical character are being discussed and where suggestions are being put forward by different sides. In most of these matters, I think, the government usually leaves it to the parties themselves. In this matter I should think that it might be advisable to ascertain in advance the opinion of the members of the wartime prices and trade board, since they will have a good deal to do and say in the matters that are being discussed. However, I am not giving any final word at the moment.

Mr. SENN: Would it be possible for us to be informed in time to attend if it is decided to hold the conference in public?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I should not like to say that the government would make an announcement on the radio, but we might have it understood that if hon. members will inquire of the officials at the front door the information will be given to them at least an hour before the committee meets.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): In view of the interest in this subject and the lack of knowledge on the part of members of parliament of the real situation regarding both meat in storage and shipping facilities needed and stock available for slaughter, might we have a detailed statistical statement placed before the house by one of the ministers? We cannot all attend this meeting, but we are all getting resolutions and telegrams. While I think we have to do all we can to feed the hungry people of Europe, and I am thoroughly in favour of any rationing that may be necessary, I find it difficult to answer inquiries that are coming in, because we have never had quite the statement we require to appraise the situation accurately.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I will direct the attention of the Minister of Finance to my hon. friend's inquiry.

[Mr. Senn.]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

BRICKLAYERS' STRIKE IN EDMONTON

On the orders of the day:

Mr. PATRICK H. ASHBY (Edmonton East): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. Has the minister been informed of the bricklayers' strike now being held in Edmonton? If so, would the minister consider immediately the setting up of an arbitration board to settle the bricklayers' strike, which is holding up the wartime housing programme in Edmonton?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): I have knowledge of the bricklayers' strike in Edmonton. I understand that employers and employees have come to an agreement on all points with the exception of one, which is to pay bricklayers, when they work within ten miles of the city of Edmonton, board and transportation in addition to the regular hourly rate. Unfortunately the province of Alberta in its judgment did not adopt the labour relations regulations with respect to provincial activities, and under the circumstances the federal government, the Minister of Labour, has no authority to set up a board of arbitration or even of conciliation. Might I suggest to my hon. friend that he address his question to the minister of trade and industry in Edmonton, under whose jurisdiction is administration of labour relations in the province of Alberta.

POSTAL SERVICE

DAILY MAIL DELIVERIES IN URBAN RESIDENTIAL AREAS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. STANLEY KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): I should like to direct a question to the Postmaster General. Is consideration being given to the restoration of two mail deliveries a day in urban residential areas? In other words, will the war-time practice of sending urban mail carriers on two different walks a day soon come to an end?

Hon. ERNEST BERTRAND (Postmaster General): We still have a large number of employees in the armed forces. As soon as they return in sufficient numbers we intend to resume that service.

HOUSING

NEED OF PLUMBING MATERIALS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF SOLDIERS' HOUSES

On the orders of the day.

Mr. NORMAN J. A. M. LOCKHART (Lincoln): I have just received a long distance telephone communication, and I have had no opportunity of consulting with the

ministers concerned. Perhaps the responsible minister would allow this to stand as notice of a question. It appears that in the finishing of soldiers' homes, which in a good many urban centres are being rushed to completion by reason of the cold weather, there is a tie-up through the freezing of plumbing fixtures, bath-tubs and so on. I was informed over long distance an hour ago that there are in the airports in St. Catharines, where I come from, hundreds of units of this equipment. Will the appropriate minister inquire whether it would be possible to release them directly in order to get these houses completed rather than have them sent through the channels of the War Assets Corporation, which is a tedious and tiresome procedure? It is urgent that these houses be completed before the cold weather sets in. Dozens of houses in my locality are in need of this equipment, and I suggest that something be done to expedite matters. The equipment is lying there. The Nobel plant has been mentioned. I would ask the appropriate minister to deal with this matter.

MERCHANT SEAMEN

SPECIAL BONUS FOR SERVICE IN DANGEROUS WATERS—S.S. "PRINCE EDWARD"

On the orders of the day:

Hon. LIONEL CHEVRIER (Minister of Transport): On Friday of last week the junior member for Queens (Mr. McLure) asked if the seamen on the steamship *Prince Edward* are entitled to the special bonus. Since then, and before, the senior member for Queens (Mr. Douglas) has also made representations on behalf of the same seamen. I have had inquiries made and am now able to reply to my hon. friends as follows.

The merchant seamen special bonus order, P.C. 3227 of the 3rd May, 1945, provides for the payment of a bonus of ten per cent of earnings of seamen serving on Canadian ships, who have performed at least six months' service in dangerous waters between September 10, 1939, and April 1, 1944.

The definition of "dangerous waters" means waters in respect of which war risk bonus is paid.

The seamen serving on the S.S. *Prince Edward* have been receiving war risk bonus by a ruling from the national war labour board which came into effect on February 26, 1943. The said seamen would therefore be entitled to the merchant seamen special bonus of ten per cent of their earnings from February 26, 1943 until April 1, 1944, upon making an application in the approved form to the director of merchant seamen, Department of Transport, Ottawa.

WAR MATERIALS

LOANS TO SCHOOLS OF CERTAIN TYPES OF EQUIPMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. G. CASE (Grey North): The Minister of Reconstruction last evening referred in his address to certain war materials that would be lent to schools, the title remaining with the crown. Will it be lent for an indefinite period, and on what condition?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction): I believe I stated that it was lent for an indefinite period. There is a special officer of the War Assets Corporation whose duty it is to be in touch with educational institutions. If my hon. friend will write to the corporation he will be referred to the proper officer.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Monday, September 17, consideration of the motion of Mr. W. M. Benidickson for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Bracken, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Mr. J. L. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of trepidation that I rise to address the house for the first time, but having seen how well the other tyro members have done I am glad to jump in and join in the debate. In this my first address to the house I should like to emphasize the fact that I am an independent. I believe that there has been some discussion on that point. I believe that my ballot paper overseas was marked "Independent Liberal", but I should like to clear up that point and say that I am following along in the tradition of Comox-Alberni as a straight independent, and in my vote in the house I shall try to reflect the opinions and the wishes of the people of Comox-Alberni who sent me here.

The constituency of Comox-Alberni consists of the northern and western three-quarters of Vancouver island. It is the constituency of which Mr. Rudyard Kipling once said, in a masterpiece of understatement, that it was the fairest jewel in the British crown.

At this time I should like to pay a tribute to the gentleman whom I have the honour to succeed. I am quite certain that all the old-timers in this house will recall with great affection and high regard Mr. A. W. Neill, the former member for the constituency. I have been particularly pleased since I came to Ottawa to find in all groups and sections of

this house, and also among the civil service, that he was very affectionately regarded. As a matter of fact that is just the way we have always felt about Mr. Neill in Comox-Alberni, and I am particularly proud to be here to succeed him. I should like to tell the house at the same time that the only reason I am here succeeding him is that he did not choose to run again.

I should like to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your election to the high office of first commoner. I should also like to congratulate the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Benidickson) and the hon. member for Gaspe (Mr. Langlois) on the able way in which they opened the debate. On behalf of the Liberals in the constituency of Comox-Alberni, I express my thanks to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and to the members of his cabinet for the able way in which they administered the affairs of Canada during the past five years. I wish also to convey to the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken), who has taken over the reins of office, the very high regard in which he is held by the Conservatives of Comox-Alberni. To the hon. members of the Conservative party who were in opposition during the last five years I extend the thanks of my constituency for the able job they did at that time.

Now, coming to the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) I should like to say that a number of people in my constituency are adherents of his, and now that I have met the hon. gentleman I must say that I can well realize why he is held in affection by that large number of people—there were more than I expected on election day. He is very highly regarded there.

I come now to the Social Credit party. They have a new leader in the house, and I congratulate him on his election. I should also like to mention the former leader who was in the last parliament. I thank him on behalf of my constituency for the contribution that he made. I am sorry that the philosophy of social credit has not penetrated to the dark fastness of Comox-Alberni. I sincerely trust that my position here, adjacent to the hon. members, will allow me to acquire some of their philosophy.

I was particularly interested in the speech of the hon. member for Edmonton East (Mr. Ashby). He made a suggestion that was very interesting to me. He said it was possible that we might pay an old age pension of $100 a month at age forty. In one more year I shall qualify for that. I was particularly interested as an independent, because the past tradition of independence in this house does not lead me to believe that I shall be put out into the lush pastures when I have lost my usefulness; therefore I really believe that he has something there that will interest me greatly.

I was disappointed when I read the speech from the throne, because of its obvious omission. I feel that I would not be maintaining the standards of Comox-Alberni if I did not point out that we were not told anything about our Japanese problem and the solution of it. Hon. members, of course, are accustomed to the hon. member for Comox-Alberni bringing up this vital point. Now that the government's dispersal policy has brought the problem into almost every constituency in Canada, I am hopeful that the British Columbia members—there are eleven of us to whom this is a most vital problem; the other five, of course, are "agin us"—will receive the support of other hon. members in the house.

I should like to make it very clear—and I am not going to take up a lot of time on the Japanese question now, because we shall have time to discuss the problem later—that our opposition to the Japanese in British Columbia is not based on the matter of race. If hon. members knew them as well as we do they would find that our opposition is based upon the fact—and I have lived among them for thirty years—that they are not loyal and never have been, and I do not expect they ever will be, to Canada. The Prime Minister felt that it was a wise course to appoint a quasi-judicial committee to look into the matter, but I believe the proper time to judge the loyalty of the Japanese citizens in this country was after Pearl Harbor—about a week after that—and at the time of Singapore, and at the time we lost the *Prince of Wales* and *Repulse*. We could have decided then, and I believe we would have had many more of them who would have applied to return to Japan than will do so now after they have had Mr. Howe's atomic bomb.

I would be remiss in my duty to my constituents of Comox-Alberni and to the members of the government if I did not present a true picture of how we feel in our constituency—and I may say I have the temerity to speak for the other ten constituencies I mentioned—if I did not say that I believe the people of Comox-Alberni are definitely determined that the Japanese shall never return to British Columbia again.

I was glad to note yesterday that the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Cruickshank) injected into this debate the subject of the monopoly of the American Can company in British Columbia. As a canner in British Columbia I should like to bring before this

house some of the facts in that regard. I charge definitely that the American Can company could have prevented the loss of fish and vegetables at the time of the strike had they so desired. Make no mistake about it; they were definitely aware that this strike was coming. They could have provided every cannery in British Columbia with all the cans they required to put up all the food we had there at the time. Instead of taking that course they supplied the large canners in British Columbia. It is significant that at the time not one large cannery in the province ran out of cans. Because of the fact that the small canners did not find it possible to put up the necessarily large amounts of money required, they were unable to get a large stock of cans ahead to carry them through that strike. Speaking for our own cannery, we are 5,000 cases of salmon short in our pack this year because we did not have enough cans in storage prior to the strike. Definitely that was because the American Can company put their cash dividends and money matters ahead of the necessity of providing food for the people overseas; that is why we are now short a large part of our normal pack of salmon and vegetables in British Columbia. When I mention the figure of 5,000 cases I am referring to one cannery only. Numerous other small canneries were involved to the same extent. Five thousand cases represents 200,000 cans, which means salmon for 200,000 British families for one week. When you multiply that by possibly ten canneries of the size of ours, you can see that it will make a tremendous difference in the food supplies available to people overseas. I am particularly anxious that the small farmers and fishermen of British Columbia should never again find themselves in the position that this large United States monopoly will have a stranglehold on them, as has been the case in the past.

I am glad to see that our new Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Bridges) has come into the house, and I particularly want to congratulate him on his appointment to this high office. I hope very soon he may be able to take time off to come out and visit us on the Pacific coast, where I can assure him he will receive a royal welcome. His predecessor as minister, the present Postmaster General (Mr. Bertrand) has left an enduring monument to his administration in the Hell's Gate fisheries project. I understand about a million dollars was spent there, but I can assure the house that this amount will be returned in new wealth every year as a result of the work done at that point. As yet I have not run into this mysterious treasury board which was mentioned yesterday by the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Cruickshank), but I sincerely trust that in future it will look with more favour upon the estimates of the Minister of Fisheries. Every time during the war years we asked the fisheries department to make any expenditures we were given the same answer, that there were more important things to do in connection with the war; and with that attitude I was largely in agreement. Now, however, the time has come when the fisheries department can make a valuable contribution to the economy not only of British Columbia but of Canada as a whole, and I should like to think that the regime of the new minister will come to be known as the golden age for the fisheries of my province.

Soon the budget speech will be brought down. I share with most Canadians a high regard for the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) for the splendid job he has done. I should like to point out, however, that our present system is really one of incentive, and, that being so, as long as the excess profits tax remains in operation the incentive is taken away. I may be telling tales out of school, because I know the Department of National Revenue is highly efficient, but so often I have heard of someone who was said to be "taking a trip on Ilsley" or "buying a bottle of Scotch on Ilsley" and so on. Perhaps the Excess Profits Tax Act actually has worked against the best interests of Canada. I should also hope that in the new budget some reduction will be made in the taxes now imposed upon the small wage-earners; surely we can manage that. We should go ahead and finance this year for our ordinary expenditures, but I suggest that extraordinary expenditures in connection with demobilization, reconstruction and so on should be budgeted over a period of five years. You will note that I am expecting the government to remain in office for five years. If a proper job is done during this reconstruction period I should think it even possible that the government might last for ten years.

If I might make another suggestion to the Minister of Finance, I would point out that this year the income of the pilchard fishermen on the west coast of Vancouver island has been almost nil. It seems to me only fair that those engaged in industries where there may be such wide fluctuations should have the privilege of spreading their income over a three-year period and paying their taxes on that basis, just as we have done for those in the fishing industry and in agriculture.

There has been a good deal of discussion here in regard to housing, and in that connection mention has been made of the lumber

shortage. I was glad to notice that finally, in response to requests from several hon. members on this side of the house, statements were made from the ministerial benches giving us some idea of what may be the policy of the government with regard to housing, which of course ties in with reconstruction. Two days ago I had a telephone call from a British Columbia lumberman advising me that he was short 150 employees. I should like to point out that his plant is only three hours' drive from Vancouver, where at the same time we had thousands of men demonstrating, asking for severance pay and a continuation of uneconomic industries so that they might not have to move out of town. This lumberman's plant is in a large town, which is just as modern as this city of Ottawa, so that there is no reason in the world why men should not move out to those jobs. When I refer to loggers and saw mill workers in British Columbia I should like hon. members to note that the average wage is around 80 cents an hour in our saw-mills and at least $1 an hour in the logging camps, so that taking these jobs would not involve any great economic hardship.

An hon. MEMBER: What about the homes for them to live in?

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): They are close to the source of supply of lumber, in Port Alberni, and we can build them homes. I think the real solution of this problem must be for the people in the large cities, who have been drawn there to do war work, to get back to where our real primary wealth lies; that is, away from the great centres of population. Those are the places from which these people have come, and those are the places to which they will have to return.

When I speak of the lumber camps in British Columbia I should not like the house to get the impression which was conveyed the other day by the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Archibald), who told the house that the loggers on the Queen Charlotte islands were living under the most primitive conditions. I have lived in logging camps for the last thirty years—

Mr. ARCHIBALD: So have I.

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): I think you spent most of your time in the post office.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: I worked in the camps.

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): I do not think you worked in the camps very much. I would have my hon. friend know that the accommodation and food in the logging camps of British Columbia are infinitely better than in the city of Ottawa. Any time hon. members have an opportunity to come to British Columbia I shall be glad to give them a real logging camp meal. Only once since coming to Ottawa have I had anything to compare with it—and I must mention that occasion now because I see my host sitting here in the house. I can assure him, however, that I say this with great sincerity.

I should like to congratulate the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) upon his most able address delivered last night. But, if he does not mind my giving him a slight suggestion, I would say that he has a difficult job on his hands, in the vast department he administers, if he is going to try to run interference for every one of the, let us say, brass hats—I believe I have heard them called that—working under him in his department. I refer to brass hats both in and out of uniform.

The minister is a busy man, and I know, too, that he is very much overworked. Perhaps some time he would be able to come to Comox, and if he does I should like to take him fishing. I know that if he did that it would do him a tremendous amount of good, and provide him with the rest he so badly needs. While we are trolling along I will see that he gets some salmon, and I shall also take him and show him some charred hulks of valuable landing barges we have out there. I do not take the minister to task for this, because I know he has been extremely busy, but I would convey to him the thought that if occasionally some hon. members in the house question the disposal of war assets he ought not to run interference too readily. I believe him to be a man who is extremely loyal to the officials associated with him, and for that I honour him greatly. I suggest to him, however, that the real intention of hon. members sitting over here is that of being helpful, and that they have no desire only to be critical.

Many people have been bothering the Minister of Finance about meat rationing. Just how meat and money go together has always been somewhat of a mystery to me. I say to the minister, however, that the present meat ration when applied to logging camps in British Columbia is entirely inadequate. We hear talk about a man living on a pound and a third of meat per week, but those of us who buy meat to keep our commissaries supplied in the logging camps have found that it takes a pound of meat per man per day to supply their requirements. I do not think we should cut down the ration of those who are doing very heavy work. As a matter of fact, in a masterpiece of overstatement, one man said that it was a day's work to walk around one of our trees. I suggest that some special

consideration should be given to the men in the logging camps who eat in the camp cook houses, and also to the people who, while occupied in that industry, live in their homes, and go from those homes to their work. They require substantial lunches, and need three heavy meals a day.

An hon. MEMBER: What about coal miners?

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): I agree with the hon. member, but I have always understood that after working in the mines, and under mining atmospheric conditions, their appetites are not as hearty. But if they require more meat, in view of the heavy work they are doing, they should have it.

Since coming to Ottawa I have been deeply impressed by the many courtesies and kindnesses I have received from members of the civil service in this city. I pay tribute to the members of that service, realizing that all too often people in other parts of Canada do not realize what a fine job is being done here.

I interpret the approaching vote as one of confidence in the government. As I have seen no sign that hon. members on the opposition side of the house could get together and replace the government now in office, I feel that in the present instance I shall vote with the government.

Mr. E. B. McKAY (Weyburn): Mr. Speaker, may I first congratulate the mover (Mr. Benidickson) and the seconder (Mr. Langlois) of the address in reply to the speech from the throne. Veterans generally will appreciate the recognition accorded the armed services by the selection of these two very fine young men to lead off the debate. I trust that veterans in the house on every side will cooperate in seeing that our returning service personnel are not only properly housed, but receive decent jobs; and also that those who are disabled as a result of war service receive not only compensation but satisfactory treatment for any injury so received.

I represent the constituency of Weyburn, and in being so selected I feel that I have been highly honoured. It is no easy task to follow in the footsteps of the former member for Weyburn, who is now premier of Saskatchewan, the Hon. T. C. Douglas. It is Weyburn, too, that was the home of the South Saskatchewan regiment, which so ably distinguished itself at the battle of Dieppe.

Most people are aware of the fact that Weyburn is a typical agricultural community. Because it is such, it is my purpose at this time to deal with certain facts pertaining to agriculture, and to outline as briefly as I can some of the policies of the C.C.F. in regard to that major industry.

In spite of our vast war-time development, agriculture is still Canada's No. 1 industry. According to the 1941 census, twenty-five per cent of our workers are still following agricultural pursuits, while twenty-three per cent of the workers are engaged in other industries. Moreover, many of the workers in those other industries are employed in factories which, in order to operate successfully, must depend upon raw materials from the farms.

In a recent bulletin the Canadian association on adult education stated that 126,000 young people left the prairie provinces in recent years to seek outside those provinces employment in industries which are more remunerative than the industry they have been accustomed to serve, namely agriculture.

It is a tragic story that many of these people come from rural homes. The 1931 census, which dates back another ten years, reveals for the first time in our history that there were more people living in urban centres in Canada than there were in rural areas, and during the last decade the trend to the city has been definitely accelerated. Obviously that is a most serious situation. The basic reason, notwithstanding war conditions, is that farming is unattractive to a large part of our population. It holds out few inducements to our young people; and while it has been more profitable within the last few years, owing to a false condition of war prosperity, most farmers realize that it is far from a permanent period of prosperity.

Most young people and their farm parents are all too familiar with the vicissitudes of farm life. They recall all too vividly those distressing days when they received the pittance known as relief. I am sure all hon. members are aware that during the depression agriculture suffered a tremendous loss of income. I wonder just how many know that that loss of income amounted to two-thirds of what it was in normal times. Between 1928 and 1933 it went even lower than that. Many do not realize that since the last war the farmer has never received a fair share of the national income. His share is still too low, even now, in relation to other sections of our population. In normal times one-third of our people live on the farms, but never since the last war have the farmers received one-third of the national income. During the decade 1930 to 1940, not so long ago, that income fell to one-tenth of the national income. It is obvious, then, that so long as farm folk receive this inadequate share of the national income there will be difficult days for agriculture.

The advisory committee on reconstruction has expressed itself thus regarding agricultural policy:

> Agriculture cannot be made attractive to those seeking a means of living unless it can be restored to its historic position of self-dependence and self-respect. The price received by the farmer for his products must be such as will maintain a standard of living comparable to that enjoyed by urban communities and adequate to supply farmers and their families with the ordinary conveniences and comforts of life.

Prosperity for agriculture definitely depends on world markets. The United nations conference on food and agriculture, which met in the United States in 1943, stated:

> The world's agriculture must be organized and expanded to provide enough of the right kind of food for everyone.

Statements emanating from the San Francisco conference were to the effect that two-thirds of the world's present population is still underfed. Contrary to the belief of some upholders of free enterprise, overproduction was not thought possible for years to come. This is, of course, provided that the world is to be properly fed. The C.C.F. wholeheartedly supports the efforts of the food conference to lower trade barriers and to establish a permanent international organization on food and agriculture. Such an organization will have sufficient data, we hope, to plan scientifically to meet the world's needs in an orderly way. Any other system permitting of disorganization such as we have seen in the past, when our grain elevators in western Canada were bursting with grain, while hundreds of thousands of people in our Canadian cities were going hungry and millions more were going hungry across the seas will only develop into a condition of trade rivalry and economic chaos.

I doubt that security for agriculture is attainable in Canada without the stability provided by external commitments, these arranged through international agreement. We welcome the government's efforts to obtain such agreements. But important as export markets are, the chief demand for farm products is here at home. The consumption of food stuffs has materially increased during the war years, and the reason is obvious to anyone. It is because people now receive more money with which to buy these goods. Yet in spite of that, many of our people are still living without sufficient of these necessities of life.

Surveys show us that urban dwellers consume less than one pint of milk a day, that in forty per cent of our homes cheese is virtually unknown, and that if everyone had sufficient meat to eat we would consume in Canada more than three hundred million pounds of meat more than we do now. It is also interesting to note that three-quarters of our population eat less than one egg a day, the cheapest and most nutritive food we have. Let us then keep in mind this vast home market.

Everyone in this house will appreciate the need for social security measures so that the living standards of our people may be raised, and help provide healthful living for the children of these families. Besides, such measures will definitely increase the demand for farm products.

This group will continue to advocate research in the field of chemurgy. Dyson Carter, in his book "So Man May Prosper" states that one hundred American factories are utilizing the products of the farm to-day to produce synthetic materials. Oil, industrial alcohol, syrup, plastics, are produced in this manner. All of us know that during the great European war just concluded a large number of vehicles ran on rubber made from low-grade grains in urban factories. We are also advised that cotton is a synthetic product that can be made from low-grade grains. This should interest Canadians, who import each year large quantities of cotton for domestic consumption. The western members of the C.C.F. regret in this connection that no branch of the industrial development bank has been established on the prairies. Small industries dependent on raw materials from the farm must of necessity be established in western Canada if we are to stabilize western Canadian agriculture. Such industries would utilize any surplus which may accumulate and do much to balance western Canadian economy. They would also provide thousands of jobs for our young people, who now travel to distant parts of the land in search of work.

Reference is made in the speech from the throne to the government's policy of floors under farm products. Commendable as that may be, we in this corner of the house believe it would be much more satisfactory to establish basic parity prices for all farm products, these prices to bear a direct relationship to the cost of production—not a floor price but a price that varies with the changing cost of production and is related to the cost of goods which the farmer buys and uses.

Buying and equipping a farm costs a considerable sum of money, and operating costs vary little whether the crop be large or small. Canada has been protecting her manufacturing for quite some time. But no protection has been afforded agriculture except during war time. The agriculturists of this country have to compete in a world open market in

order to sell their goods. Protective tariffs have cost this country enormous sums of money. According to the late Hon. Norman Rogers, testifying before a royal commission dealing with the relationships of Nova Scotia with the rest of Canada, these are the actual figures: in 1931 Canadians paid $425 millions more than the world level of competitive prices to sustain their manufacturing plants. That amount was $40 per capita, or $200 per family of five persons, and whether or not a Liberal or a Conservative government has been at Ottawa has made little change in these schedules. Protection for manufacturing has increased our living costs, and if we can afford to do that for a secondary industry I insist that we should do the same thing for Canada's first industry, agriculture. The establishment of parity prices for farm produce commensurate with changing costs of production would do for the farmer what has been done in this country for the manufacturing interests for generations.

In addition to suggestions which I have offered, we of this group insist that better credit facilities be provided for the farming industry. In 1941 the "Canada Year Book" stated that forty-eight per cent of our owner-operated farms were mortgaged, and the average throughout Canada was $2,372 per farm. In the west the situation was even more serious. Credit unions have done us considerable service in western Canada and, I believe, in the province of Quebec, but this excellent cooperative enterprise, while it has rendered outstanding service, has its hands more or less tied. The C.C.F. has long advocated, and still continues to do, that an agricultural bank for western Canada and for eastern Canada be established in order that mortgages may be refinanced at 2½ per cent interest. The government did establish an institution known as the industrial bank. It was apparently to assume the most risky and unprofitable post-war credit operations, namely the financing of small industry. Instead of bringing our credit system under social control, the government hopes that that institution will facilitate the construction of small industries which in pre-war days could not get credit. The efforts of this group at the time the industrial bank was set up to establish an agricultural institution of a similar kind fell on deaf ears.

Another part of our policy would be the appropriation of funds for water conservation and for irrigation of areas, particularly in western Canada, that are subject to drought. Such a programme would preserve our farms and at the same time would provide post-war employment. Projects of this kind in the United States have been particularly successful, and we are informed by practical and experienced engineers that they are feasible on both the Saskatchewan and the Red Deer rivers. Definitely that programme will be a necessary part of our post-war industrial development, on which the Saskatchewan government has already embarked on a small scale.

In reference to crop insurance I should say this, that those crops, no matter whether they be in western or eastern Canada, which because of the nature of their production carry great risks, should definitely be protected. It is essential to the stability of agriculture. The present government's policy, implemented by the Prairie Farm Assistance Act, of providing a maximum of $2.50 an acre when the area is declared to be an emergency area owing to drought, is excellent as far as it goes, but I would suggest that that amount be increased from $2.50 an acre to $6 an acre and that payments be on an individual farm basis rather than on a township basis as is at present the case. The cost of such a programme could be calculated when computing the basic parity prices set for agricultural products.

Reference has been made in this house by several speakers to the income tax. I suggest that some consideration be given to the position of the farmer's wife who normally performs all the duties of an urban wife together with many heavy burdens of outdoor tasks. Frequently her labour saves the hiring of extra help which normally would be chargeable against the expense of operating the farm unit. I suggest that a further exemption be granted the farmer to take care of this situation.

Last, but not least, it would appear to a good many of us that farming conditions must be made more attractive if young people who are being discharged from our armed services are to return to the farms. While serving in the Royal Canadian Air Force as a personnel counsellor, in a period of three months I had 106 boys come to me who were formerly from farms. Of those 106 only twenty-three indicated any inclination to return to farm life. That seems a serious situation, but on inquiry the reason seemed obvious. Briefly, I will put it in this way. They have seen urban life, and they too vividly recall the days of distress they went through at the time of adolescence. Roughly speaking, only twenty per cent of our farm homes have electric current with which to do labour. Only one per cent of our farm homes have flush toilets. Only one farm in three has a telephone, and despite the need for transportation there is only one car to every two farmers.

I trust that in some small way I have shown the needs of agriculture and the urgency of

enriching prairie farm life. We can ill afford to neglect the people who till our soil. If that neglect persists the effect upon our national life may well be tragic. Goldsmith, in his "Deserted Village", depicts the consequences of a declining agriculture:

> Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
> Where wealth accumulates, and men decay.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the necessity should be recognized of Canada adopting an enlightened policy toward agriculture, a policy which not only will meet the needs of the farmer, but rehabilitate Canada's greatest industry.

Mr. J. R. MacNICOL (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, I have been in this house for fifteen years—five years of that time on the government side and ten years on the opposition side of the house. During the last ten years I have been here, the work devolving on members of the official opposition has been strenuous, because until lately there were fewer than forty of us. But this session is altogether different. A large number of capable and brilliant men have been added to the Progressive Conservative ranks, and I wish to say a word of appreciation of those who have spoken on our side. I have not time to mention the new members who have spoken from the other parties, but a number of them have done very well also. On our side, however, the hon. member for Neepawa (Mr. Bracken) had held for a longer period than any other man the premiership in a British legislature. He has surely lived up to our fondest expectations and, in my judgment, has conducted himself on an eminent plane since coming here this session. The hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Pearkes), the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. Merritt), the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton), the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario (Mr. Macdonnell), the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Fleming), the hon. member for London (Mr. Manross), the hon. member for Lambton West (Mr. Murphy), all new members, have given addresses which have not been excelled by those of any other new members in my time during the past fifteen years. They will all add greatly not only to the strength of the opposition but to the debating powers of this parliament.

So far three ministers have spoken in this debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne. I will not make any comment on the remarks of the hon. member for Essex East (Mr. Martin). I will refer briefly to the remarks of the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Claxton) and at greater length to the words of the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Howe). I simply wish to make an observation or two with reference to the remarks of the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George. I will tell him of something I heard on Sunday last while on a visit to western Ontario. I heard this from a gentleman by whom I had the honour to be driven to a meeting which I was to address. He is quite well off and has two sons. Speaking about the family allowance, he said, "I am putting in the bank money sent me in the form of family allowance for my two sons for their future education in the event of its being required at some time. But I am wondering how it will help the education of the sons of the humble man, the son of the blacksmith, the machinist, the carpenter or any other artisan, and the humble farmer. I hope that if you have an opportunity you will mention this to the minister and suggest that he consider some means whereby something can be laid aside for the sons of those who are not as well privileged as my sons."

I thought that was a happy suggestion, because in my experience the sons and daughters of humbler people, wherever they have had a chance, have given a great account of themselves in this life.

This gentleman mentioned another matter with which I agree. It has to do with the soldier. In fact, I myself had a similar experience on Saturday last with a young soldier who is the counterpart of the one mentioned by my friend. This young man came to me on Saturday and seemed to be in distress. He said, "I have been six years overseas and hardly know what to do with myself. Everyone I speak to talks about something with which I am not familiar. They talk about baseball, golf, bridge, and one thing and another, whereas my last six years have been spent with guns, shells, cannon and bayonets. I cannot get my head down to thinking about a job." I suggest to the minister that in considering provision for returned soldiers special consideration be given these men; that the greatest sympathy be exercised and every effort made to get them back on their feet, and until they are back on their feet they should be taken care of in the manner in which soldiers who served four or five or six years, or less for that matter, should be cared for. That is all I have to say in reference to the remarks of the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George.

With regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Port Arthur, I shall have to disagree with some of the statements he made. The hon. member for Port Arthur, the Minister of Reconstruction, has a habit of making all-embracing statements. I have had long experience in employment. Not many in this

house have had more; perhaps none has had more and perhaps not many have had as much. So that I know something about employment. I was therefore surprised to hear the hon. member for Port Arthur, the Minister of Reconstruction, make the statement yesterday that at this moment two jobs are open for every applicant for a job. In my opinion that is absolutely impossible. I do not for a moment say that the minister was making a misstatement; he was just enthusiastic. It is not possible under normal circumstances, however, and much less under the present circumstances. There is no such thing as such a number of jobs going at the present time.

A little further the minister said that in 1946 we can expect an expansion of peacetime industry comparable with the expansion of industry generally during the war years. I was in big industry during the last war; I was in big industry following that war, and again I say that statement cannot possibly be correct. I am not saying the minister intended to make an incorrect statement, but from my experience what he suggests is not possible. Everyone knows that, during this war, industry has been operating at many times the capacity it did during peace time. How, therefore, can the industrial fabric of Canada again in peace time take care of the number of positions which the minister has suggested in his statement? As I say, the minister is all-embracing in his statements about employment.

The brilliant young cartoonist of the *Globe and Mail,* of Toronto, Jack Boothe, on September 8 had a cartoon which in my opinion should attract the attention of the entire nation. The word "jobs" is perhaps the most important in the English language, and he emphasized this fact. He showed how all-important it is at the present time. The cartoon, which was a classic, depicted jobs as monumental, gigantic and all-impressive; and they are. Anyone who has not a job or has been out of a job for any length of time knows how important it is to him to obtain one.

Two days later, to be exact, on September 10, backing up the cartoon of the young cartoonist, a large delegation of workers came here. They would not have come if the statement of the Minister of Reconstruction were correct, namely, that there are at present two jobs for everyone wanting a job. No; they came here because jobs are scarce and are getting scarcer. As every one knows who was there, they filled the railway committee room on that morning. Those who heard their remarks could realize their anxiety and their grave fears that the situation will become worse and that more and more men will be laid off. I know that in my own constituency of Davenport, which has a large number of factories, some of which are large and some not so large, ever since the capitulation of Germany, and particularly since the capitulation of Japan, some factories have been laying off twenty hands, or perhaps a few dozen or a hundred or several hundred, and in one case a thousand or more. Now, that does not bear out the statement that there are two jobs for every one who wants one. My own experience, which has been gained from people coming to my door to get me to write letters for them to this place or that to get a job, is that the situation is not at all like that represented by the Minister of Reconstruction. I hope that he will not keep that frame of mind, but on the contrary that he and the government will do their utmost to organize and prepare in every possible way not two jobs for one but a job for every one, which will be amply satisfactory.

The minister also spoke about government plants. I presume he had in mind plants that the government had a lot to do with so far as their organization is concerned, wartime plants, and I intend to speak about two of them. I shall refer briefly to the Polymer plant at Sarnia. I spent quite some time in that plant, and having a knowledge of chemistry and engineering I could plainly see through all the various chemical operations that are carried out in that plant to produce the rubber.

In passing I wish to compliment all who have had anything to do with either the planning or organizing and completion of the Polymer plant. It is a credit to Canadian engineers and Canadians all round that they were able to build a plant to produce rubber in the satisfactory way in which the Polymer plant produces it. I am not going to take up the time of the house to say much about it, because there are other matters on which I wish to touch. The Polymer plant would be a subject for a forty-minute address in itself; but it was intensely interesting to watch the two different chemical reactions that produced the two different kinds of rubber, one kind for the tube and the other kind for the casing. On Sunday last I met a doctor at a memorial service I was attending. He had come over from that part of the province, and in the course of our conversation we talked about the Polymer plant. He told me that he had four tires which were made at Sarnia, that he has now driven them thirty thousand miles and that they have given him eminent satisfaction.

I suggest to the Minister of Reconstruction and to the government the imperative necessity of keeping the Polymer plant in operation in some way for the making of rubber if it is at all possible so to do. I hope the time has come when we Canadians can make at least some of the rubber we require. For the sake of trade perhaps we shall have to import some of it from outside Canada, but if the four thousand men and women now employed in the Polymer plant can be kept making rubber it will be an excellent thing for Canada. I hesitate to think what it would mean to the county of Lambton and the fine city of Sarnia if the Polymer plant ceased to make rubber. I suggest to the minister and to those associated with him, in view of the fact that the government has provided fifty million dollars to build and put that plant in operation as a war work, that if it is necessary to keep the plant in operation they allow whoever is operating it now or will be operating it in the future to use that capital investment on a long term and low interest rate. I would go so far as to suggest that the interest be not collected if that would keep the plant in operation. If it will keep four thousand men and women employed and give us our tires and rubber at the same price as that at which we can buy them elsewhere—and I am told they would be able to do that; I am not in favour of the Canadian people paying more for rubber than they can buy it for elsewhere —under those circumstances I am not opposed to the government letting the investment lie, not demanding the interest and not capitalizing the interest unless returns permit it.

I now wish to say a word or two about another great industry in a section of the country in which I spent some time this summer, namely, the lake St. John area in Quebec. The province of Quebec has a vast treasure in the lake St. John area. It is a fine agricultural section. I did not know that before I went there. I had the idea it might be a barren, cold area, but I found it wholly the reverse. I found fine farms and prosperous farmers. So far as I could see, the whole area was a good agricultural area. It is an area that is rich in forest resources. There are a number of pulp and paper mills, such as at Jonquiere and Chicoutimi, and I have forgotten the names of the other places. It is a fine area both industrially and agriculturally. In the midst of it is that great lake, not so large as lakes go, but still a substantial lake of four hundred square miles area at the highest water level—not the normal but the level maintained by the dams at Isle Maligne. It is a beautiful picture. From the air the whole area looks like a flat bowl and in the centre the lake. In fact the Indian name for lake St. John was Peguagomi, meaning "flat". We now call it by the beautiful name of lake St. John, from which runs a magnificent river. That river is not very long; I believe it ends about thirty miles south of the lake, because from there on while it is still called the Saguenay river it is really an arm of the sea, with the tide rising at the mouth of the river and going right up beyond Chicoutimi to the foot of the Shipshaw power plant discharge. In that thirty miles the water drops 320 feet.

Here is one of the most remarkable demonstrations of the ability of Canadian engineers, of whom I believe the principal one, whom I knew quite well, was the late Mr. H. G. Acres. His was the conception, I understand, of the final magnificent simplicity of that great power plant, which is almost inconceivable. I can picture how the first engineers, looking at the discharge at lake St. John (past) Isle Maligne and the other islands, watching the rushing waters go down Chute à Caron, must have been staggered by the magnitude of the task of harnessing that river; but thanks to the late Mr. Acres and those associated with him, whose names I cannot recall at the moment, this remarkable undertaking was carried out.

The first power plant is immediately south of the lake, at Isle Maligne, where there is a drop of 110 feet. From there down to the canal above Chute à Caron the water is level, because of the dams and two power plants at Shipshaw. At No. 1 plant the water drops 160 feet and at No. 2 plant it drops 210 feet. These power plants, taking water from the same canal, I believe represent the greatest concentration of power development at the present time in a single plant anywhere in the world. I am thoroughly conversant with Grand Coulee and Boulder dam, neither of which, so far as I know, is yet complete as to power installations. When Grand Coulee is completed it will be able to produce about 2,700,000 horse-power. Boulder dam when completed will produce about 1,835,000 horse-power. These three plants on the Saguenay river really are all one combined power plant, though the one at Isle Maligne is twenty miles up the river, since they all draw water from the same source. The day I was at Shipshaw the plant at Isle Maligne was producing 540,000 horse-power; No. I plant at Arvida, adjacent to Shipshaw and drawing from the same canal, was producing about 260,000 horse-power but could produce another 130,000, since they have the positions ready for the installation of two more generators, and at Shipshaw itself the production was 980,000 horse-power. I was surprised to find

that the name "Shipshaw" is just a name for the whole development. The Shipshaw river flows right in there at the very place where the tide itself stops, and the first proposal was to deliver the water out of No. 2 plant into the Shipshaw river, which is immediately below it. But the engineers felt that the Shipshaw valley would not be large enough to take the water from that vast power plant, so they just turned the plant around and delivered the water into the Saguenay at the base of Chute à Caron falls, where the tide ceases. As I said, the day I was there No. 2 plant was producing 980,000 horse-power, so at that time the three plants were producing a total of something less than 1,800,000 horse-power; and that was not their full capacity. They could produce a great deal more than that. I believe if they added another storage reservoir to the three they now have they could raise their production to 2,500,000 horse-power, which would make this larger than any other plant in the world, barring Grand Coulee alone; and it may be some time before Grand Coulee produces anything like that.

The engineers deserve unstinted praise for what they have done. To have power of this kind it is necessary to have a continuous flow of a stated amount of water. I believe that with the reservoirs they have adjacent to the Saguenay river they can maintain a constant flow of 42,500 cubic feet per second. They are able to do this because away up the Peribonka river they built a large lake. That river was made famous by a noted writer, the author of Maria Chapdelaine, whose name I forget at the moment.

Mr. FOURNIER (Hull): Louis Hemon.

Mr. MacNICOL: That river has on it a lake one hundred miles long, about what is called Passe Dangereuse; I suppose in English we would call it Dangerous Passage. The lake behind that dam contains a reservoir of 183 billion cubic feet of water in storage. Not far from that, on a stream which runs into the same river, they have created what they call lake Manouan, in which they have another 78 billion cubic feet of water in storage. In other words, on those two rivers or in those two reservoirs they have about 260 billion cubic feet of water in storage; and by raising lake St. John itself, with its own area when raised of 412 square miles, they are able to store another 170 billion cubic feet of water. So that they have behind their power plant an almost inexhaustible supply of water in storage.

Many times I have wondered what we are going to do to keep that vast power plant in operation after the war is over. If it can be so organized I believe that in this area, with the power available, we can locate enough industries to make up a large city, and still be able to send out to Quebec city and other cities in that vicinity such volumes of power as would make them all grow—because nothing in the world will make a city grow faster than cheap power. If that area is given the support it should be given, then I say that there is destined some time to be there a vast manufacturing industry.

At the present time, and I believe for some time to come, the aluminum plant at Arvida will use all the power available. The set-up of that plant is marvellous. I hold in my hand a piece of bauxite I took from one of the boats which come to Port Alfred. This is non-metallic, but because it produces metal I should imagine it would be classified as a metallic ore. The bauxite is light enough, but we know that out of every ton of bauxite brought in from Demarara-British Guiana, half a ton of aluminum is manufactured. It is most interesting to watch a ship unloading bauxite, and later being loaded with paper from the Jonquiere paper mill, and from other paper plants in that area. After being loaded, the ship sails for England. Upon reaching there it is loaded with merchandise, and sent back to British Guiana. That is real trade! That is the kind of stuff to bring to Canada. Through the labour of about 8,000 men and women at the Arvida plant about half a million tons of aluminum is turned out each year.

May I say a word on behalf of the company operating at that point. It has built fine houses for its employees. A worker is permitted to buy his house at a low rate. I talked to several men and found them very happy in their employment at Arvida. The houses are heated and plumbed. Some of them are of stone, and all are beautiful. They range in size from four to six rooms, and I believe that about 1,800 have been built in that city. Arvida is a beautiful city, a credit to Canada, and particularly to the province of Quebec. The houses are rented at rates as low as $13.50 a month, running up to $34. That, indeed, is a low rental.

And that is the way it should be. A company of that description should go the limit—and, so far as I can see, it is doing so—to care for its employees. I believe it is taking the best of care, and is looking after the welfare of its employees. I, for one am going to urge as strongly as I can upon the minister in charge that if at some future time all the power there available cannot be used in the making of aluminum, some effort should be made to use it in the manufacturing of other commodities, so as to give employment to Canadians.

Last night the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) spoke about the coming conference, and I believe other members of the government who have preceded him in the debate have made a similar reference. But we cannot be sure that the conference will be a success. I, for one, would ask that the ministers should not put all their eggs into one basket and base their hopes for employment upon something which may never materialize. The problem is too serious to neglect or to leave entirely to a conference.

I recommend that a careful survey be made of the report of the committee on reconstruction and rehabilitation which has met during the last three or four sessions of parliament, and over which at the last session the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie) presided. That committee has tabled two excellent reports, to which reference was made yesterday by the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis). He was one of the most active members on the committee. He and I saw eye to eye on almost everything, with the exception of politics. When it came to jobs we were unanimous. The hon. member made reference to the work of that committee when he addressed the house yesterday, and had I the time I should like to do so to-day. However, I would point out briefly that no less than twenty splendid opportunities are set out in that report for the providing of jobs in a big way.

Every provision should be made to provide men with jobs, men from Toronto and elsewhere who are out of work. I say that projects should be ready to provide jobs. For instance, mention has been made about irrigation, one of my pet subjects. I am sorry to say that up to the present time very little can be done for Saskatchewan from the Saskatchewan river. Two or three years ago I recommended strongly in the house that the government should set up forthwith a Saskatchewan river authority, organized along the lines of the Tennesee valley authority, because that great Saskatchewan river runs through three provinces and should be given special attention. Certainly if all the water is taken out of it before it reaches Manitoba, then Manitoba will be left holding the bag.

Such an authority could state what volume of water should be taken from the river and at what points it should be taken. If such an authority were set up Saskatchewan should most assuredly receive from the South Saskatchewan river all the water required to irrigate west of Regina. This would mean the construction of large dams. But we are not ready to do that; why? Had I been the minister of the responsible department—and perhaps I should not say this—I should have had plans ready. I was a business man, and as such did things in a business way. Business men do not monkey-doodle and fiddle around, but go straight to work and do things.

Had I been minister I should have had ready at least the plans and specifications for the dams where required. Now look at the box we are in! While it may be said that nothing can be done for Saskatchewan, the same cannot be said about Alberta. We must do something. I ask the responsible minister to tell the house why he has not plans and specifications ready for the building of the Spring Coulee reservoir, which should and must be built, if we are to retain for Canada the water rights on the St. Mary river. Those plans should be ready.

I have surveyed the site carefully; I have made careful examinations there, and I know that the engineers have stated the position correctly. A dam can be built there and water can be conserved. Let me add that water is a most priceless heritage for the prairie provinces—and yet to-day we are letting billions and billions of cubic feet of it flow off down to Hudson bay, thereby making no return whatsoever to this country, when water required should be taken our of the river in Alberta—and might as well be, because in the states south of the boundary line they are taking it out, for purposes of irrigation.

The minister should be ready to send men at once to do that work. I would ask him this: What are the boys from the prairie provinces going to do when they come home? Last night he said:

> Just as it took many months to move people from one locality to another into war jobs, it will take a shorter period to redistribute our people into peace-time jobs.

I presume a great many of the people who came from Saskatchewan to work in factories at Toronto, Stratford, Hamilton, Galt, Brantford, and other eastern cities, will want to return to the west. What will there be for them to do? The minister should have his programme ready. Many are engineers. Many of them know something about the making and pouring of concrete, and how foundations should be set. The programme should be ready, so that those brave lads who rendered such high service on the plains of Europe, in the skies over Europe and on the seas, boys who had never seen ships or aircraft before they enlisted and were compelled to operate them, may have something to do when they return to their homes.

Orders would soon be coming back to the factories in eastern Canada, and in that way

men would be employed east and west. I would not hesitate to support a programme of $100,000,000. What is $100,000,000?. It is hardly the price of a super-battleship, and nobody makes any fuss over the sinking of one battleship. But a programme of $100,000,000 would rehabilitate the whole of the three western provinces, particularly Saskatchewan and Alberta, and provide them with power and irrigation, and water for such fine cities as Regina and Moose Jaw, so that they could maintain their identity, and the power that would be developed would lead to the establishment of many industries in the western provinces. Irrigation now planned would put into productivity approximately 3,000,000 more acres of land. Look what that would mean all along the line, right down all the way from the irrigated area itself to eastern Canada. I have been out west many times, and my observation of all the towns and cities in the west has been that perhaps the city of Lethbridge is the finest example or at all events an extremely fine example of the prosperity which comes to a town or city in the centre of an irrigated area. The benefits flow all along the line from that thriving, prosperous and healthy city of Lethbridge.

In conclusion, may I say that I have deliberately refrained from saying anything of an acrimonious nature because from long association with workers and employees my heart goes out to them and I want to see them continued in employment and security. All of us together, every member of the house, should be devoting his time not to such debatable subjects—I mean in these times, perhaps I should call them educational subjects—as a new flag or a new anthem for Canada. Our minds should be concentrated on the production of jobs to take care of the thousands and thousands of our boys who are coming home and those thousands and thousands who are going to be thrown out of employment in this country.

It is all very nice for the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply to say: I can see one million jobs. Well, I cannot see them, and no other living man in this country can see them. A man came to me for a job some days ago and I told him, "I have just read that selective service state that there are 143,601 jobs vacant" —I am using just an arbitrary figure—"and there are only 31,275 applicants"—again an arbitrary figure. This unemployed man said to me, "The figures should be turned around the other way."

Last night the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply said something like this—and again I am using arbitrary figures—that there are 232,601 jobs vacant and only 73,000 applicants. But you go to selective service for a job and what sort of job do they send you to? To a pick-and-shovel job or something of that sort. They are not sending men out to take a job as an engineer or machinist or as a chemist or other professional man. Oh, no; there are lots of so-called pick-and-shovel jobs, but not the kind of job a man wants to take who has a wife and family to keep and a home to maintain that he is purchasing. While on that subject I am going to suggest to the responsible minister that it is time that some plan be put into operation so that the unemployed worker will not, as he did during the depression, lose his equity in the house he is buying merely because he has lost his job and is unable through lack of earning power to keep up the principal and interest payments. Men are buying houses to-day at inflated prices, and they are inflated prices. A man that I know well bought a house some days ago. I would not give $3,200 for it, and it cost him $7,800. He never will be able to pay for it. If he loses his job he may lose all his equity in the house. I hope that that will not be allowed to happen again. It was the most heart-breaking thing I saw during the depression. Yet I saw it happen to so many of our finest citizens, whole-souled, thorough Canadians, who had invested one or two or three thousand dollars in the purchase of a home which they would have been able to own some day had their jobs continued, but many of them lost their jobs and, in due course, lost their equity in the homes they had been buying. It was one of the saddest things I have seen, and I hope that the government will take steps to see to it that workers unfortunate enough to lose their jobs do not also lose their equity in their homes, that at least they will get back the money they have put into the property.

Mr. RALPH MAYBANK (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the last speaker (Mr. MacNicol). I think the whole house always enjoys hearing from the hon. member for Davenport. We always have an informative speech from him, and I know that so far as the members from western Canada are concerned they are glad to hear what he has to say because he shows that he is interested in problems right across Canada. Sometimes it has seemed, the problems of the prairies claim his special interest. When he presents a picture to us it is always clearly painted. I was disappointed for a little while this afternoon when he stayed away from the

prairies for so long, for I feared that we were not going to hear from him to-day on our part of the world. But I was glad to see him come at last to the Saskatchewan river. I was reminded, as he spoke, of the old story of there being no mill by the dam site. We can only hope that he is wrong in his fear that irrigation will not soon be developed in the west.

In my first words, I wish to speak of two famous regiments. Reference was made to them yesterday by my colleague from Winnipeg South (Mr. Mutch). Respecting these regiments I wish to make a suggestion, indeed a straight request of the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Abbott).

The final turn of the scroll of the tragic drama that we call Hong Kong is being unwound, and the closing scenes bring some compensation for all the horror of that terrible episode. Equally those closing scenes remind us of the heroism of that episode. Greater even than the horror is the heroism. The final scene to-day shows that we have reunions in the city of Quebec, and reunions in my prairie city of Winnipeg. The Grenadiers will again meet their loved ones in my city, and the Royal Rifles of Canada will embrace their dear families in historic Quebec.

The whole picture as I review it leads me to make this specific request of the government through the Minister of National Defence. It is this, that in determining the composition of the permanent force of Canada for the future he will make sure that the identities of these two brave regiments will be maintained. It is my submission that the names of these heroic units should be kept in the Canadian army, before all the people, as a daily reminder to us of the imperishable deeds which are associated with their names.

The hon. member for Winnipeg South yesterday paid his respects to the new leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken), and thanked him for getting out and giving him his house to live in. I wish to pay my respects to the leader of the opposition, he being for a long time a distinguished citizen of my province. I am sorry to see him in his present plight, but still, since he apparently desires it, I congratulate him upon the leadership of the Conservative party. That term "Conservative", I may say, comes most usually to my lips although I have no constitutional bias against using the expression "Progressive Conservative". I realize that nobody will be fooled by the prefix, so what does it matter?

Well, I congratulate him not merely upon leadership but upon the speech he made in this house a few days ago. It is not the first time I have heard the hon. gentleman discourse. In fact I have heard him a number of times, and it has always been my view that he spoke with clarity and sometimes with the force of conviction. I feel that he is to be congratulated to-day upon his usual clarity. I underscore at once that my congratulations are upon the form of the speech, not the subject matter.

Adding to what I have said, I should like to review some of the leader's statements; and the first one to which I will refer commands my whole support. The hon. gentleman said as reported in *Hansard* at page 28:

> I want to say, with all the emphasis at my command, that this nation will not stand for any chiseling down of the promises and commitments made to service personnel while they were fighting our wars abroad.

In these words the leader of the opposition was absolutely right, although why he should have adopted, as I thought, a minatory tone was rather hard to see. It must be admitted, I think, that Canada has enacted already the best veteran legislation there is in the world. In spite of that, we all know there are still some blanks to be filled in and some improvements to be made. This must be done, and I do not think there is any disagreement about it.

Certainly the Canadian people are against "chiseling" in this matter; and I think that is why a great number of the Conservative old guard were left at home, because the electors remembered the chiseling operations of the Conservative government between 1930 and 1935, and they were not going to be fooled by the fact that the party had chosen a new leader and put a prefix to its name. However, the main point I wish to make is that we are all agreed that there must be no chiseling, that the administration of veterans' laws must be characterized by the utmost generosity.

I want now to offer a warning to the speaker whom I have quoted; I think it will not be out of place. I believe that he should tread warily in offering any criticisms of veterans' legislation. He should be careful not to suggest or seem to suggest that somebody else might do some chiseling. When he was premier of Manitoba he was the first person to take away a tax exemption which had been granted to veterans by the government which preceded him. But he who later admitted that he was "the most continuously successful political leader the British empire has produced in this century", was the first responsible statesman in this country to do a little chiseling on the veterans of the last war; and it is not likely to be forgotten.

I should like to make a further short analysis of the hon. gentleman's remarks.

We all know that the opposition do not have to formulate policies when they are criticizing the policies of the government. Nevertheless it is not unreasonable to expect that a national figure will declare his belief or his disbelief on some points, or that there will be a positive assertion about something, to be found at some place in a speech which he makes. Now, perusal of his speech will reveal that never from start to finish did he declare himself as being favourable to an action or definitely against some action. There was only one exception; this was when he said he was in favour of a reduction in the income tax. Of course everybody is in favour of a reduction in the income tax, nobody, probably, more profoundly or firmly than the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) himself. So that it is hardly worth while to give the leader of the opposition a score for that one positive statement of belief.

When the hon. gentleman dealt with meat rationing, for example—and this is illustrative of the whole thing—his unwillingness to commit himself was very noticeable indeed. He says, the people are asking so and so; the people are wondering what about this; they think such and such a thing ought to be done; they are going to be disappointed if so and so is not done. Never once did he state that he was against meat rationing; never once did he state that he was in favour of meat rationing. He says that if rationing is necessary it is due to some former fault of the government. Well, suppose that is admitted for illustration's sake. Even so, the situation has to be dealt with. If some sin of this administration in bygone days is the reason that meat rationing is necessary, still the problem is there, and he does not seem to be willing either to condemn or to approve.

Thinking over the whole speech, I was reminded of a poem of Kipling. I do not remember the name of the poem, but it was the story of a man who had died. He went to heaven seeking admission. Upon examination up there it was found that he had never done very much harm in his life, and prima facie it would appear that he was entitled to entrance; but on the other hand he had never done any good, and St. Peter slammed the door in his face. So he went down to the other place. But when he went down there the same sort of thing developed. St. Peter having thrown him from the one place, Nick interviewed him at the other; and sure enough he found he had never done much good and therefore he appeared to be entitled to admission to hell; but on the other hand there was no great evidence of depravity or wrongdoing in his life and Nick, being more robust in sin than usual that day, chased him off the premises of hades and he was not admitted there. He was too neutral for either place. I do not remember just what did become of the soul after that; he moved back and forth, I think, between the two stations. While I cannot say for certain the subsequent facts, it has occurred to me that perhaps there is something in the doctrine of reincarnation. This neutral soul perhaps entered the body of another person, or if that be not so, he will yet do so and will be back in this life before long. If already back, I presume he has already been chosen as leader of the Conservative party, and if he is not already reincarnated I expect that before long he will be chosen as leader of that party when in a couple of years' time they are shopping around again to get another leader. In a couple of years they will have to have some person else to carry their burnt-out torch.

I do not wish to emulate the leader of the opposition by leaving any uncertainty as to my views on the subject of meat rationing. I do not believe in pussy-footing about it. I recall that Jesus spoke with approval of those who had fed other people who were hungry and who had clothed other people who were naked. I know of no better doctrine than that, and it directs me to support the plans of to-day. I know there may be a difference as between the Christian concept of charity and the aim of serving our own convenience, but in any such case I am going to be guided by the former and not the latter consideration. I wish to add, although I think it unnecessary, that if any economic justification is needed you will find it in this, that the wheat we already sent to Greece will pay dividends to us and to our children, great fat dividends, for many years to come.

If we are to feed the hungry we shall have to see that there is fair play with regard to the remaining food in this country. We cannot just leave it to be purchased by the more well to do in the community. We have to have some plan for dividing it up. That means rationing.

I think it is probable some changes will be found necessary in the plans at the present moment. It would be an odd thing if such were not the case. But the need of rationing, when you have induced scarcity, surely must be apparent to all. There may be quarrelling about some detail or another, but if we are to feed the hungry we must have a plan of division for that part which is left. I believe that after what I have said no one will be in any doubt as to my view. Whether my stand will be satisfactory to all or most, I do not know, but I do not want anyone to be in doubt as to where I stand on this matter.

One of the troubles of the Minister of Finance is that people ask for tax reductions and also ask for expenditures. I am afraid I would have to plead guilty if a charge of that kind were made against me. However, the expenditure I wish to recommend to the government is an urgent one, and on the other hand I believe it is not a large one.

What I wish to recommend is that the insurance principle with relation to pensions should be extended to those of the forces who have seen Canadian service. I have already met with a considerable number of cases of injustice where veterans who, through no fault of their own—and mark that, that is one important point I would put forward—did not have overseas experience, and are disabled, which almost certainly would not have been the case if they had not been in the forces. Worse still, there have been cases of death and widows are without pensions by reason of the law as it stands to-day. It seems to me that the extension of the insurance principle is a most important piece of legislation.

Moreover, the cost of this can now be seen. It could not be seen in 1940. It will not all come at one time. It extends over a period of time, and I believe it is absolutely necessary in the circumstances to-day.

About the reduction in taxation, as I said, everyone is in favour of it. I have been satisfied all along that every possible reduction in direct taxes would be made. I have a feeling that the Minister of Finance cannot do as much in 1945, when the budget comes down so late in the year, as can be done next year, but I feel sure that the government is well seized of the fact that we cannot have a satisfactory reconversion, a reconstruction; we cannot have a recreation of productive life and consequent employment unless there is a substantial reduction in rates.

I hope that indirect taxes will not be overlooked. They press most heavily upon those who are least able to pay. Indirect taxes pyramided on top of one another result in a great increase in the final cost of the articles people use. A friend of mine had to get two chains for his bicycle in the United States. The cost was $6, and by the time he got them it was $10. Shotgun shells and other types of ammunition are prohibited from import by reason of indirect taxes. I am not suggesting that the articles I have mentioned are weighted heavily in the cost of living chart or schedule. But they illustrate facts covering a very long list of articles that people have to buy and that figure often quite importantly in the cost of living and increase it greatly.

[Mr. Maybank.]

Another thing about indirect taxes—and this applies particularly to tariff taxes—is that the government often does not get the tax anyway. It very often goes to some local manufacturer instead of going to the government.

Since I have said a word about both expenditures and taxation, I should like to make a suggestion tending to harmonize the two apparently conflicting ideas. It is this. Search for waste and unnecessary expenditure, and be vigilant in searching. There must have been lots of waste during the war and I do not think anyone is very critical about it. When a six thousand million dollar business or machine is quickly developed and is made to function it is inevitable that there must be a great deal of waste, particularly when the purpose of the machine is to save the liberties of people. People are not going to be too finicky about the careful conservation of a dollar in these circumstances. The situation has changed now, however, and I submit that economy should be the order of the day from now on.

Here is an example of waste. John Doe is going to be discharged from the air force. He is located at Saint John and is on furlough in Winnipeg. He is going to be discharged; that is decided. Why should he not be discharged from Winnipeg? No; it cannot be done. He has to go to Saint John, the reason given being that he has to turn in his equipment. No business concern would operate in that way. There is no business man in the world who would put himself to the expense of bringing a man back from Winnipeg to discharge him in Saint John in order to give him signature for some articles he has in his possession. Of course, expenses have to be paid both ways, from Winnipeg to Saint John and back again; and other expenses besides travelling expenses are paid. In addition you have a loss to the community of that man, who is not engaged in the production of wealth when he could be. I believe such acts can be carried out more expeditiously and cheaply. Economy should be the order of the day. I know that officers who are making rules will impose all kinds of objections, but when officers are told that such and such a thing must result, it generally results. As a matter of fact, in the particular case I have mentioned, if all the equipment that John Doe had were lost it would not add up to as much as it cost to take him to Saint John and back to Winnipeg again.

Finally, I wish to say how much I welcome the policy of the government, as evidenced in the speech from the throne, of the recognition of a growing spirit of Canadianism in the country. For a great many years it has irked

me that if I said I was a Canadian my assertion could not end there. In effect it was claimed that there was no such thing as a Canadian. Like millions of others I thought and spoke and felt and acted like a Canadian, but I imagine I was not one because there was no such thing. This people within the bounds of what is called Canada—there cannot be any argument about the name of the territory—is great enough to declare that there is such a thing as a Canadian, and the world will certainly respect it. Our stature in the eyes of the world is greater than it has ever been before, and it has grown apace in the last few years. I welcome particularly the legislation that is forecast, which is thus a recognition of Canadianism, the law respecting citizenship, the law adopting a national flag of suitable design and the law adopting a national anthem.

There is another step we should take. We should devise a method for ourselves of amending our constitution, and we should do it soon. We could have done this long ago but we gave preference to other things. Not merely is it inconsistent with our own dignity as a nation to leave matters as they are, but it is putting an improper onus upon the parliament at Westminster. We have been and are treating the British parliament like a chore boy. Moreover, there may some day be an application for a constitutional amendment in the manner that we have so far been following which will be a highly contentious matter; the parliament over there or the government of the day over there will be placed in a highly embarrassing position in being required to decide between two contending factions in Canada, and we have no right to impose that burden. We should make sure that it will never occur; we should make sure by taking into our own hands the power of amending the constitution.

I am not at the moment going to suggest what formula we might adopt. Some sections of the constitution might be amended by the mere passing of resolutions in these houses of parliament; resting a certain period of time on the table, as the expression is, and no objection being taken, they would then constitute amendments. That would apply only to minor matters. On the other hand, it may be that we would have to work out some voting method—I think that is the most likely plan to be acceptable—such as they have in the United States and in all federal countries. The late Ernest Lapointe at one time spoke with approval of a plan, namely, that if two-thirds of the provinces advocated a change in constitution, that would effect the change, provided that it did not impinge upon racial and religious rights, and if such rights were touched, then unanimity of the provinces would be necessary. That plan would probably be acceptable across Canada. I am not advocating it especially, but it is one of the plans that could be considered as soon as we decide that we shall take the constitution into our own hands. All I wish to urge to-day is that we must turn our attention to becoming masters of our own constitutional law. From that much more can follow in the way of progress and improvement.

As a footnote I should like to point out to you, sir that the various interprovincial conferences we have been having these last few years have been adopted really as a cumbrous substitute for constitutional amendment. Of course that is a dangerous and unsatisfactory method of getting along in this country. As all hon. members know, as the situation now stands, practically any person out of ten people can upset any possibility of agreement. Remember what happened a few years ago. Three men did not wish to sit in a conference; result, no agreement. Over the last several years this government by dint of tremendous work has overcome to a certain extent the difficulties that have resulted from the breaking up of that interprovincial conference. It has been a heavy task, and we cannot hope to carry on our governmental business in this country by various makeshift agreements, one following upon the other. We cannot run the risk of progress being held up by one, two or three wilful men.

Mr. BLACKMORE: You had better change your system, then.

Mr. MAYBANK: Well, I do not believe that this funny money system from Alberta will do any good in that regard.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Men like you would not.

Mr. MAYBANK: The way toward greater progress is to give to the people of Canada full control over their basic legislation just as they already have complete control over their ordinary domestic laws.

Mr. W. F. KUHL (Jasper-Edson): Mr. Speaker, I have listened to just about all of the speeches which have been made thus far in this debate. I would say as a general comment that there is complete unanimity in all parts of this house in the expression of the desire for a better Canada. I would say, however, that there is not the same unanimity as to what constitutes a better Canada. Certainly I do not consider that some of the

policies which have been advocated thus far, if applied to our nation, would make Canada a better nation. Furthermore, I believe there is also a lack of complete unanimity as to the means to be employed to bring about a better Canada.

Mention has been made by a few of the hon. members who have thus far spoken of the fact that we have not yet established a national objective. It has been suggested that before we can proceed logically we must lay down some fundamental objective to attempt to attain in the future. Personally I recognize that we must pass through a period of transition, and that during the period of reconversion we cannot hope for the things we may expect later on. Nevertheless I believe we should certainly indicate what we consider to be the long range objectives we are hoping to achieve, and do all in our power to implement them gradually as we pass through this period.

What is the objective that has been enunciated more frequently than any other thus far in this debate? I would say that with the exception of the members of the Social Credit group each hon. member in turn has enunciated an objective which I consider to be both impossible and undesirable. What is that objective? It has been proclaimed on the hustings as well as here in the house. Each individual member, in monotonous repetition, has proclaimed that the thing we must have above all else in this country is full employment. Hon. members have been talking about a new order, a new way of life and a new outlook. Well, I beg to ask: what is new about full employment? Work is the oldest thing in the world; it is as old as Methuselah. Most hon. members may have been elected on a programme of full employment, but I can assert that I was not. As I listened to radio broadcasts and such public speakers as I had the opportunity to hear, invariably they said, "Elect me and I will put you to work." Personally I did no such thing; I told my electors that if they saw fit to reelect me I would do everything humanly possible to put everybody out of work, and I think I spoke to as great a cross-section of the electors of my constituency as most hon. members did. I addressed no fewer than forty-nine public meetings during the campaign; I do not know whether any hon. gentleman here did better than that. But I can say that on every occasion I made the same statement, and the electors of Jasper-Edson saw fit to reelect me as their spokesman in the House of Commons for the third consecutive time with a greater majority than ever before.

I have already asked the question: what is there new about work? If all we want out of this life is full employment and a job, why did we ever dispose of Adolf Hitler, who was the greatest provider of work the world has ever seen? He could create more jobs in one day than the Prime Minister of this country could create in his lifetime. Not only did he put all Germany to work; he put all Europe and eventually the whole world to work. I say that at least as far as my constituents are concerned, they are looking for a holiday. Some of them have worked for one hundred years and have not had a holiday yet. I should like to suggest as an antidote to the phrase "full employment," the slogan "full enjoyment."

As I have said already, I believe those elected on the platform of full employment have been returned on a programme which is impossible as well as undesirable. Why do I say it is impossible? As I listen to hon. members take part in this discussion, I am amazed. One would think we were still living in the oxcart days, when people made their living with their bare hands. Every hon. member, whether he is an industrialist, a professional man, a farmer or whatever he may be, must know we are living in the greatest age of machine power and mass production methods man has ever seen. Everywhere you go in industry to-day, whether into a manufacturing plant, a mine, or on a farm, you see one man with one machine doing the work of hundreds or perhaps thousands of people. Just consider the position during the war. We had approximately two million of our ablest producers out of work, as far as the production of the essentials of life was concerned. They were not producing those things which would have enriched our lives; they were producing things which were destroyed and wiped out of existence. Yet with those two million of our best producers out of production the rest of us carried on and provided all the essentials for ourselves and for them as well, on a grander scale than has been enjoyed by most people in the last fifteen or twenty years. Surely this indicates that there has entered into our national life a factor the like of which has never before been witnessed in the history of mankind; that is the power machine. No doubt yesterday hon. members received in their mail, as I did, copies of a publication entitled "Timber." I should like to draw to their attention—probably they noticed it, but did not get the full significance of it—the illustration on the first page of this publication. It seems to me particularly applicable at this time, inasmuch as a great deal of the discussion in the debate has centred around housing.

On this page I find two illustrations of lumber-piling machinery, and under one of those illustrations I find this statement:

Paul Bunyan, the legendary Hercules of the woods, was just a piker! Here's a man equipped to lift up to 15,000 pounds of lumber to a height of 17½ feet from bottom of load to ground. He can trundle that load around the yards at speeds up to 35 miles per hour and manoeuvre like a jack rabbit.

Then the descriptive material in respect of the second illustration, which shows a lumber-carrying machine, is as follows:

Or take the lad in photo B. He straddles 6 tons of lumber, picks it up and rolls away with no more muscular exertion than Paul Bunyan selecting a toothpick.

This publication came into the hands of hon. members only yesterday. I point out, however, that probably they do not get the significance of what is involved in these illustrations.

Turning to a later page in the magazine, I find an illustration of a chain saw, and the following advertising material:

A well deserved tribute, for its speed in felling and bucking is almost uncanny . . . enabling one crew to do the work of 20 men using cross-cut saws.

Those are only a few of the illustrations I chanced upon in looking through this publication. In addresses I have had the privilege of making in this chamber I have placed on record page after page of statistics indicating the extent to which the modern power machine has displaced human effort. I shall not worry the house on this occasion by repeating what I have said earlier. However, I think every hon. member must be aware of the fact indicated by these illustrations, because time and again they have seen the actual machinery in operation. These labour saving devices are typical of every industry, including farming. To-day one man and his son can accomplish on a farm what it required crews to accomplish only a few years ago.

The same is true throughout all industry. I ask, in all sincerity: How can hon. members suggest logically that we can have jobs for everyone who is willing and able to work, in the face of such circumstances. They must realize that there are only so many hours of work to be done. Regardless of what is to be produced, only so many hours of work are required for that production. If it takes four hours to produce a certain unit, how can anyone insist logically that it must take eight? Yet that is what hon. members are implying when they are insisting that we must have full employment.

I have heard it argued before and probably before the conclusion of this debate it will be argued again, that machines make more rather than less work. About the only come-back ever made to me in respect of machines displacing human labour was that of an hon. member who pointed out on one occasion that someone has to make the machines. Well, for goodness' sake, are the machines made with bare hands? No; machines are made with machines.

To-day employment has become largely that of button pressing and lever pulling. During the war I had the pleasure of going through a number of industrial institutions, and I can say that most of the work boils down to just that.

I have before me some statistics indicating the truth of the assertion that the necessary number of hours of work is constantly decreasing, and that machines are putting men out of work. These figures are taken from a United States publication entitled "Man-hours and Distribution," and I refer particularly to a table taken from a study entitled "Machinery, Employment and Purchasing Power" made by the national industrial conference board in the United States.

This publication gives statistics in respect of the number of hours of work and the material produced over a period of years in the United States. The figures show that at the turn of the century, 1900, the number of man hours per unit of production for all industry in the United States stood at 6·3. Then, leaving out the intervening years, we find that for 1935 the figure under the same heading is 2·31. Does this not indicate that the use of machines is having the effect of decreasing the number of hours of necessary work?

It will be noted that the last figure set out in the table is for 1935. While I have no figures for 1945, I should not be the least bit surprised if the figures stood at about one man hour per unit of production. These figures show that to-day with the use of machinery it is possible to produce in one hour about six times the quantity produced in the same time at the turn of the century. Or, to put it another way, to produce an article today only one-sixth of the time is required that was required at the turn of the century.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

MEAT RATIONING

CONFERENCE BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND MEAT DEALERS ASSOCIATION

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the house I should like to answer a question that was

asked this afternoon in my unavoidable absence. The question was whether the meeting to-morrow between the retail meat merchants and the wartime prices and trade board would be open to the public. I have given this consideration. Since the meeting is for the purpose of trying to obviate grounds of complaint or objections to the meat rationing system as it now operates I have come to the conclusion that we would be much more likely to make real progress if the meeting were held in private, and that is the decision.

Mr. FLEMING: Does that mean that the press will be excluded?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. W. M. Benidickson for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Bracken, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Mr. KUHL: Mr. Speaker, when the house rose at six o'clock I was endeavouring to establish that the future welfare of Canada must be predicated upon a sound objective, and I had indicated that the objective which was being proclaimed by most hon. members was that of full employment. I challenge that objective as being either sound or desirable. I think we have not yet decided in this house or in this country whether full employment is a means to an end or an end in itself. As I listen to hon. members discussing the subject in the house I find them constantly confusing the two. I have not heard anyone yet clearly and distinctly indicate whether he believes in full employment as an end in itself or merely as a means to an end, and I think it ought to be made definitely clear by every hon. member who speaks on this subject. So far as I am personally concerned I consider that full employment is not an end in itself, but a means to an end, and it should never be regarded as anything else.

From time to time in this house hon. gentlemen, including such members as the member for Davenport, (Mr. MacNicol) who spoke this afternoon and others, arise and indicate the tremendous number of public works projects of one kind and another that are feasible and desirable in this country. I commend them for all these suggestions, and in particular the hon. member for Davenport, who has rendered valuable service to this house for the work he has done in that regard. But the question I wish to ask him is: What is his objective in all of these suggestions? Is his objective the schemes he has in mind, or is it that of merely providing jobs for people? Do we want to build roads to put people to work or because we want roads? Do we want to build bridges to put people to work or because we need bridges? Do we want to build homes to put people to work or do we want homes in which people can live? I suggest that the only logical and sensible attitude to take is to build roads, homes, bridges, schools and hospitals for the sake of the object itself which is being built, and not merely for the sake of giving work. If all these projects can be carried out by a few individuals sitting in their offices and pulling levers and pushing buttons, then let it be done in that way. That is just about the stage we have reached at the moment in our production system.

I have asked on previous occasions—and I do so again and shall continue to do so just as long as this subject is discussed in the manner it has been—hon. members when they rise in their places and discuss full employment to define that term which they use. I think much of our discussion is fruitless largely because we do not define our terms. We debate and discuss subjects and each of us has a different definition of the terms we are using. I would ask those who assert that we must have full employment, what have they in their minds as to what constitutes full employment? The general term used is a job for everybody who is willing and able to work. What does that mean? Does it mean that there is available or can be made available an eight-hour day for everyone from sixteen to sixty years of age? Or what does it mean? I shall not dwell on this angle much longer. But I wish to indicate that for my part I consider full employment is only that work which the power machine cannot do. I consider that sound and sensible and logical, and if it is not, I want to be told why it is not. Is that the definition which hon. members have in mind when they speak of full employment?

I have pointed out in times past, and supported it with statistics, that if in this day and age we use machine power to the maximum possibility—this was true before the war and it is certainly more so since the war—the man-hours of work necessary to produce the highest possible standards of living in this nation need be very few. I indicated by statistics that an income of over four thousand dollars' worth of consumable goods for every family of four in

this nation could be produced with no more necessary hours of work than four hours a day four days a week by those between the ages of twenty-five and forty-five. I am not going to take the time to produce that evidence which I gave to the house on a previous occasion. I simply mention it now to indicate a different angle to the subject from that which has been discussed so far in the house in this debate.

Mr. BLACKMORE: And let anyone disprove it who thinks he can.

Mr. KUHL: The Liberals and Conservatives in this house have been championing the cause of private enterprise. I wish to do so too, because as a Social Crediter I believe in private enterprise. But I believe that the Liberals and Conservatives have unknowingly done private enterprise a great deal of harm by reason of the fact that they attribute a responsibility to private enterprise which is not a responsibility of private enterprise, and by so doing they leave themselves open to a first-class charge by the socialists and the communists. They assume that it is the duty and the responsibility of private enterprise to provide jobs and employment. They assume that responsibility on behalf of private enterprise, and then the socialists come along and say, Well, you had ten years before the war to prove it, and you did not do it; there was more unemployment than ever before in the history of the nation. And what come-back have the Liberals and Conservatives? Well, they have not any, but they should have, and the only way they can have a come-back is by denying responsibility for full employment. Speaking on behalf of private enterprise, I deny that it has any responsibility to provide jobs for anyone. That is not the purpose of private enterprise. I would ask hon. gentlemen of the C.C.F. who have businesses of their own, those who have farms, do they hire men on the farm when they do not need them? Do they hire them for the fun of it? No, they hire men only when they need them, and when they are through with them they dismiss them.

Mr. LOW: To make a profit.

Mr. BLACKMORE: And to produce goods.

Mr. KUHL: I assert that it is not the duty or the responsibility of private enterprise to provide jobs for anyone. It is the duty and function of private enterprise to produce goods, and it has no other function.

Mr. HANSELL: They can do it better than the government can.

Mr. KUHL: We must reconcile ourselves to two conditions. The first is that we are faced with an ever-decreasing number of man-hours of work. I granted in my preliminary remarks that in a period of readjustment we probably cannot hope to achieve what we should as a long-range objective, but I believe we are here laying down long-range objectives, as well as policies for the immediate future, and I repeat that we must reconcile ourselves, because we are in a power machine and mass production age, to an ever decreasing number of man-hours of work.

Mr. BLACKMORE: And an ever increasing amount of goods.

Mr. KUHL: Along with that, as my colleague points out, an ever-increasing amount of goods. That has been the trend all the way through. Another thing to which we must reconcile ourselves is a new source of income. The concern which I have for the people whom I am privileged to represent is not that they shall have jobs but that they shall have incomes, and that is a vastly different thing.

Mr. LESAGE: How will you do it?

Mr. BLACKMORE: That is the thing you have to learn.

Mr. LESAGE: I want to know. I did not hear it yet.

Mr. LOW: Just keep your ears open and you will hear.

Mr. KUHL: The reason we must reconcile ourselves to that fact is quite obvious. If one machine displaces 100 or 500 or 1,000 men it is obvious to anyone that it also displaces the pay cheque. But the goods go on piling up; the prices are still on them, but the people have not incomes with which to purchase those goods.

The first thing we must do is to set up a national balance sheet. As a nation we have never done that. We must discover what we have in real wealth on the one hand and what purchasing power the people have on the other, and compare the two, and I am satisfied we shall find that the people are short just about forty to fifty cents on the dollar. I have not time to attempt to prove that, but as time goes on during this session we of the Social Credit group are certainly going to elaborate on that aspect of our policy. I grant that if that premise is destroyed the basis of the whole Social Credit proposals ceases to exist, but I am satisfied that it cannot be disproved. What we are suffering from and will suffer from more and more as time goes along is an actual physical shortage

of purchasing power, and not a maldistribution. We hear a lot, particularly from the socialists, about a redistribution of profits. I challenge them to redistribute all the profits and they will still be short of money to distribute the goods. The greatest false assumption which is made in economic thinking is, that for every dollar's worth of goods there is somewhere a dollar in money, and that if you divide up the money you are automatically dividing up the goods. The conclusion would be true if the premise were correct, but the premise is not correct.

So we must reconcile ourselves to a new source of purchasing power. No adjustment of wages or prices either to the primary producer or to the secondary producer can effect a cure. There must be a source of income outside of wages and outside of prices, and that source of income must arise through the national bank of Canada. National money must be issued to the people direct in the amount of the deficiency which exists between total production and total buying power. The issuance of national money direct to consumers in this fashion is not something for nothing. When the government through its national bank issues purchasing power direct to consumers it is doing nothing more or less than monetizing the wealth which already exists, which has been produced and belongs to the people, but which they cannot acquire because there is no money anywhere in existence with which to buy it.

I shall not have sufficient time on this occasion to develop fully the thought which I have introduced. There is one other important point I should like to make before I resume my seat.

Most of the discussion which has taken place thus far has centred around providing or enabling the people to enjoy security. Each member in turn has indicated how he believes the people should be enabled to become secure, but how much have we had said about the freedom of the individual? How many hon. members have dwelt at any length on the freedom of the individual? I thought that was largely what we fought this war for. I should like to hear hon. members define freedom. What is freedom? When is a man free and when is he not free? If one may judge from the remarks of some hon. members it seems that all that is involved in freedom, as far as they are concerned, is a full belly and a warm back. I consider that there is more to freedom than that. That is the freedom of a slave. I consider that no one has freedom unless he has the freedom of choice, as was indicated by my colleague the hon. member for Edmonton East. Freedom of choice means freedom to choose or to refuse one thing at a time. Canadians will never have freedom of choice until they are first secure. They must be enabled to enjoy their heritage, which is substantial, whether they work or whether they do not. In addition to that, they must have the right to add to their purchasing power by securing the necessary work of their choice.

A few government supporters have pleaded for patience with the government on the part of opposition members. I am willing to be patient for legitimate reasons. I grant that there are physical limitations which it is impossible to overcome; but as I listened to some of the ministers, notably the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Claxton), I detected something that I suspected I would be hearing before long. He said something about creating appetites which could not be satisfied. It will not be very long before I expect to hear members of the government side, each in turn, saying that we cannot do this and cannot do that because we have not the money. To establish a new order it is not necessary to throw out the whole of the old. Let us preserve the best in the old order, remove the abuses and take care of the deficiencies and it will work to perfection.

Mr. LEWIS MENARY (Wellington North): Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate you on your elevation to the high office you hold. I am sure you will fill it with distinction to the house as well as to yourself. I am one of the many new members who have come to the house this year and I have enjoyed the wonderful addresses made by different members. It has indeed been a treat. I have also enjoyed the barbs of sarcasm that have been good-naturedly leveled by each side. Especially do I remember the remarks of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), addressed to our side of the house, that we were unfortunate enough to come in third position on the soldier's vote. This reminds me of my boy coming running to me when he thought I had done something wonderful, "Daddy, daddy, how did you do it?" But that is the way with children.

To-day in my mail I have twelve letters which I have received from butchers and meat-merchants in my riding and none of them is praying for the government to retain the controls on the rationing of meat. To some of these men the loss is largely in cooked meats. If you take this list and add it up you will see that they have lost in the past few weeks possibly 3,000 pounds of cooked meats, and some of the butchers say they will not continue in business. One of them says it is impossible

for him to do the work he has to do. He serves his customers, and it takes him so long to explain the rationing system, and the bookkeeping afterwards again takes up so much time that he cannot do the work.

I am sure that all citizens of Canada are willing to help the mother country. We have plenty of cattle to do this and after that commitment is filled we have enough for ourselves. There are great herds of cattle in my riding. I can name three farmers within a radius of four or five miles of my local town. One farmer has 100 large steers weighing around 1,300 pounds each; another farmer, his neighbour across the road, has about sixty steers and forty head of dairy cattle; and a third farmer—I will mention his name, Frank Gamble—has 325 head of cattle on the grass. There does not seem to be a scarcity of cattle but we want a market.

This is common throughout my riding, and I may say that last week there was a load of cattle returned from the stockyards to that part of the country because of the glut caused by bad marketing. There is no shortage of cattle. Take the statistics for 1944 and look at the marketings of different stockyards across Canada. For the first thirty-seven weeks of 1944 there were 933,736 head of cattle marketed, and for the first thirty-seven weeks of 1945 there were marketed 1,168,157. That does not show any scarcity of cattle.

In my opinion the government should remove these controls because, as I have said, we have an ample supply of cattle to fill our commitments to the mother country and after that is done we can open the gates to the United States. We do not want a continuance of the stockyards being glutted with stock with the result that prices fall and farmers lose money. A farmer takes in his cattle expecting to receive 11, 11½ or 12 cents and after keeping them for a week he sells them at 10½ cents. I know a farmer in our district who took ten head of cattle to the union stockyards. He sold nine head, and one bullock was left for two weeks and finally died. This man could not get any insurance and he had a loss of over $100.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) last week mentioned something about the weighing of cattle at the stockyards. He stated that the capacity for weighing was only 4,000 cattle a day. As we are conversant with stockyards and have sold many thousand of dollars worth of produce to them, I would say that this could easily vary. For instance, if they weighed these cattle by the carload I am sure they could weigh 10,000 head of cattle in one day; but if they have to weigh them by one or two to a lot, or two or three, it takes up more time.

They have four scales in operation at the stockyards and I do not think the trouble is in the matter of weighing. It is a matter of the packers going into the country and buying cattle and shipping them into their own yards and to the stockyards and the public are not aware of this fact. This condition can only be corrected by the government under their emergency powers.

The people of Canada to-day want to do everything possible to help to feed the multitude of people who are starving in Europe and who have suffered so much in this terrible struggle. I believe that all parties in this house desire to see this accomplished. To-day we are witnessing in Canada and throughout the continent one of the biggest strikes in history. I believe that the great trouble of this mass unemployment in the big cities is partly owing to living conditions. There are no gardens, no lawns, no playgrounds for the children. I have always believed and advocated that no city should grow over a hundred thousand in population and that manufacturers should spread their manufacturing plants over the rural sections where certain parts could be manufactured and shipped into a central point to be assembled. In that way the labouring man could have an acre or half an acre of ground and could keep some hens, a cow or something like that. In that way he would be a more satisfied man and the farmer would also have a market for his products nearer to his home.

I wish to speak on the income tax. I should like to say a few words here in regard to the farmer's income tax. As a farmer I know something of the difficulties of the farmer, the poor remuneration he receives for his work, and so forth. He possibly works longer hours and has less opportunity to take a vacation than individuals in any other occupation. He can do his best in cultivating the soil and planting his seed, but he has no control over the rainfall or the dry weather, or the pests that prey on his crop. He suffers more than anyone else from extreme variations in prices. When he has a large crop there is usually a lowering of the price level. If he has a poor crop he gets probably a higher price but he may have very little to sell. His only opportunity to make any money is when he happens to have a good crop and there is failure in other districts. His average earnings over a period of years are only very moderate, and therefore it is unfair to have to pay income

tax on the years when he has a fair return unless the years of poor return are taken into consideration.

I think it would appeal to everyone, and all fair-minded persons would agree that the ordinary farmer should get some redress as to his income tax, because in the good years he pays out and in the bad years he gets no rebate. Probably in no other business do values fluctuate so radically as in the case of the farmer. The ordinary farmer with a hundred acres or less should not have to file an income tax return as far as his farming operations are concerned, if he is solely engaged in farming.

I should like to say a few words about the adoption of a new flag for Canada. My riding views with alarm the matter of a new flag and a new national anthem. I represent a great constituency which has sent overseas over one thousand boys, many of whom have not returned to the families who loved them. We offer our deepest sympathy to them. These boys went to fight that we might in the future be saved the horrors of war that other nations have suffered, and more especially the continuous bombing, the restrictions on food, clothing, housing and other necessities which have been the lot of our mother country and during which they have shown such wondrous endurance. This has awakened our sympathies and admiration for these brave people. We cannot forget the great work of the British navy or the great fight put up by her soldiers, assisted by soldiers of the British commonwealth, in North Africa, Sicily, Italy, France, Holland and Germany; and I am sure my constituents will not be satisfied with any flag that does not display as a most important part of its design the old union jack which has braved a thousand years the battle and the breeze, and which throughout the past through all the world has stood for bravery, integrity and fairness of the British people.

Mr. STANLEY KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, like other hon. members from Winnipeg who have spoken in this debate, I should like in my first words to give expression to the deep sense of gratitude that is felt in our city over the release from imprisonment of those heroic Canadians who fought at Hong Kong, including the Winnipeg Grenadiers. As has been said already by others who have preceded me, the fact that people in Winnipeg are now receiving messages from their loved ones, the fact that some of these men are already arriving home, has touched the heartstrings of the people of our city in a way we can all understand.

[Mr. Menary.]

I have looked over the lists of the men who have been freed as they have appeared in our Winnipeg papers these past few days, and I have been struck once again by the large number of the men in the Winnipeg Grenadiers who came from the constituency I have the honour to represent. I cannot forget that many of these young men, enlisting as they did in the early months of the war—many of them went to Jamaica before they went to Hong Kong—are young men from homes that experienced the deepest bitterness of the depression this country went through in the 1930's. Nevertheless these young men were prepared to do their part, and I trust that this parliament will take a solemn vow that they must never again return to the conditions they and their families went through in those tragic thirties.

I wish to join with those who have urged the government to make suitable recognition of the experience through which these Hong Kong heroes have gone. I support particularly the suggestion made by the leader of this group, the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), when he urged that any special pay and allowances or other provisions that were to have been given to soldiers in the Pacific war should be given to these men, retroactive to the day they embarked in 1941, and that amounts due a deceased soldier should be given to his next of kin.

Mr. Speaker, as I understand it the purpose of this debate is to permit hon. members to discuss the government's proposals and activities in the light of what we believe to be the desires and the best interests of the people we represent. I shall endeavour to gear my remarks to that purpose. Perhaps before I launch into the main body of what I have to say I might offer the comment that it seems to me in this debate we have had more than we needed of rehashing the last election. Particularly has that been true of my hon. friends of the Progressive Conservative party. Time and again they have simply rehashed what they thought were the issues in the election.

Mr. CASSELMAN: That was the last session.

Mr. KNOWLES: My hon. friend refers to the last session. Their speeches in this debate have sounded very much like the last session to me.

Mr. CASSELMAN: We are a new parliament now.

Mr. KNOWLES: Across the way we have had a different song from our hon. friends of the Liberal party. Again we have had more than we have needed of their theme song. It

has been, I regret to say, one of complacency, expressed again and again in the statement by hon. members opposite, particularly in reply to members of the Progressive Conservative party, "But we won the election."

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. KNOWLES: With typical enthusiasm comes "hear, hear" from across the way. It is perfectly true that my hon. friends opposite won a majority of the seats in this house, and if we had done so or if the Progressive Conservatives had done so, I dare say some of us would be boasting of that fact just as they are doing. But it does seem to me that the seriousness of conditions in Canada at the present time calls for a realistic approach to our problems rather than that sort of complacency. As a matter of fact, I doubt if any government in this country ever had less reason than the present government for being complacent. They won the election; yes, they won a majority of the seats in this house, but one should take into consideration, and the government members especially should consider, the way the people of this country voted. Taking the country as a whole, thirty-nine per cent of the people of Canada voted for the Liberal party. Without giving the breakdown for the other groups the fact is—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Why not? Break them down.

Mr. KNOWLES: The fact is that sixty-one per cent of the people of all Canada voted against this government.

An hon. MEMBER: And ten per cent for the C.C.F.

Mr. KNOWLES: Since you want the figure, it was sixteen per cent; and I suggest to the members of the Liberal party opposite that the fact that a total of sixty-one per cent of the Canadian people voted against the Liberal party should sober them far more than it is apparently doing.

Mr. BROOKS: Sober is the right word.

Mr. KNOWLES: I do not blame hon. members for being particularly impressed with the way the vote went in their own constituencies or their own parts of the country. Hon. members who have come to this house from parts of Canada that went predominantly Liberal feel that everything in the country is Liberal, but they are sadly mistaken. I come from western Canada, where only thirty-four per cent of the people voted for the Liberal party and sixty-six per cent voted against this government. Included in that sixty-six per cent were thirty-two per cent who voted for the C.C.F. I shall have to make a slight correction, Mr. Speaker; I have been quoting the figures for Manitoba only.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. KNOWLES: I will have the laugh in a moment; I am now going to quote the figures for the whole of western Canada, where the percentage was even higher. In western Canada as a whole the vote was twenty-nine per cent for the Liberal party and seventy-one per cent against it. If that does not sober my hon. friends across the way sufficiently I suggest that they look at the figures for the constituency of Winnipeg North Centre, which I have the honour to represent. They will find that there we enabled all four of our opponents to contribute their $200 deposits to the federal treasury. The total vote against the government was more than eighty per cent, while the vote for the C.C.F. in my riding, with four candidates against us, was more than fifty-five per cent of all the votes cast, and our majority was the largest in the history of the riding.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Do not hold that against Manitoba.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: What about seats? That is what counts.

Mr. KNOWLES: My hon. friends across the way, who seem to be enjoying this picture of the precarious position in which they find themselves, are asking about seats in western Canada. Very well, I will give the figures. The people of western Canada sent to this house twenty-seven members of the C.C.F., nineteen members of the Liberal party, eleven members of the Progressive Conservative party, thirteen Social Crediters and two Independents.

I have made reference to these facts concerning the last election—and there are more I could give, particularly the soldier vote, which gave the C.C.F. first place overseas, but I had better watch my time—not just for the amusement I seem to have caused but to suggest to the government that this is no time for complacency on their part. Not only have they serious problems with which to deal, but they have a country in which the majority of the people lack confidence in the present administration. They have a real task on their hands. They must deliver the goods.

Another reply that I feel we have had all too often from the government side of the house is that the war is just over; that V-E day was only in May and V-J day only in August; that the surrender of Japan was

signed only two or three weeks ago, and we are asked to be patient and give them time. Well, Mr. Speaker, that was not the attitude in September, 1939, when war broke out. There was a war to be won and something had to be done about it without delay. I suggest that peace has broken out and that the time to win the peace is now, before we lose it by allowing the problems of housing, insecurity and unemployment to pile up until their solution is made that much more difficult. So I urge that we have done with this complacency, with this stalling for time, and that the government get down to business and deal with the problems confronting the country right now while we are in session.

As I indicated earlier, I believe the purpose of this debate is to provide a chance for us to discuss some of the proposals the government has made. One of the fields in which we have had such proposals is that of social security. The other night the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Claxton) spoke on this matter, dealing particularly with old age pensions. He expressed great pleasure in the proposal that had been made of $30 a month for all those over seventy, and rejected any suggestion of a larger amount or a lower age limit on the ground that it would cost too much money, at the same time making the elaborate statement that Canada would soon lead the world in social security. I earnestly hope that day will come, and it will come when a C.C.F. government is across the way.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. KNOWLES: But while the Minister of National Health and Welfare and his enthusiastic friends over there are boasting about a proposal of $30 a month, they have not told us when it is to commence. Incidentally, it is still only a proposal, and all the figures with reference to it in the proposals made at the dominion-provincial conference, and all the figures given by the minister in his address the other day, referred to the year 1948. I wonder why 1948; is that the year of the next election?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. CLAXTON: May I answer that now?

Mr. KNOWLES: I suggest that we should have something more than proposals for the distant future.

Mr. CLAXTON: May I answer the question now?

Mr. KNOWLES: I shall be glad if the minister will.

[Mr. Knowles.]

Mr. CLAXTON: Most of the figures for the proposal put before the conference were based on the year 1948. That was the first year following the war when we thought full conversion from war to peace would be in effect.

Mr. KNOWLES: Has the government or the minister or anyone speaking on behalf of the government given any indication that the proposal of $30 a month is to come into effect any sooner than 1948?

Mr. CLAXTON: It will come into effect as soon as the provinces agree to the proposals.

Mr. KNOWLES: There we are, right back to the old problem of agreement between the dominion and the provinces before we can move anywhere. I submit that the government by making these proposals, and the Minister of National Health and Welfare by boasting of them, have admitted the rightness of the request which has been made not only from this corner but from all sides of the house that changes should be brought about in the old age pension legislation; that the amount should be raised and the age lowered; that the means test should be done away with; that liens against property should be abolished, and that the residence qualifications should be eased. In other words, every suggestion contained in the government's proposals is an admission that we have been right. They have now admitted we are right. Then why the delay? The government has power to make these increases and to make these changes now, and that is what the people of Canada are expecting.

The other night the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Claxton) said that we must be careful—I am quoting from memory, but I think this is right—not to whet people's appetites and then find that we cannot satisfy their desires in connection with what they hope they are going to get. I want to tell him I am already having to answer letters from old people asking me if the new amount of $30 a month is to come into effect on January 1, 1946. They have the idea that this is something they will get while they are still alive. I have to write back to them to the effect that no such announcement has been made by the government, but that we will do our best on the floor of the house to persuade the government to make such an announcement soon. If the minister meant what he said when he argued against whetting people's appetites for something they cannot be given, I suggest that he should pull all his weight toward bringing this $30 a month proposal into effect as soon as possible, because he has already whetted their appetites.

Incidentally I want to say to the government that I am glad the administration of old age pensions has been transferred from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. My saying this has nothing whatever to do with the personalities of the two men involved. But it has seemed ridiculous to me that, prior to this time, the Minister of Finance in his capacity of administrator of old age pensions, in the event of wanting more money had to argue with himself in his capacity of Minister of Finance as to what he should do about it. The result has been a sad story for old age pensioners. However, we now have a separate minister to argue with the Minister of Finance on behalf of old age pensioners. I believe he is interested in their welfare and I hope he will put up a real fight along the lines I am suggesting to-night.

Even when we get this $30 a month, which I hope we will get before 1948, I am afraid the Minister of National Health and Welfare will find that he must go still farther, if indeed he is going to achieve his ideal of a Canada leading the world in measures of social security. I am going again to refer to the country of New Zealand—and I suppose that already someone is trying to think up some wise-crack as soon as I mention New Zealand.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): Why not Saskatchewan?

Mr. KNOWLES: Saskatchewan is doing a good job too.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): Let us hear about it, then.

Mr. KNOWLES: There are plenty of Saskatchewan members here; they will tell you about it.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: You will not give them a chance.

Mr. KNOWLES: In the New Zealand parliament at the present time the government, has proposed, and we have reason to believe that its proposal will carry—

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): Why?

Mr. KNOWLES: That is what happens here. The government's proposal in New Zealand is to increase old age benefits at the age of 60 years to two pounds sterling a week. Let us do a little simple arithmetic. I checked carefully with two banks in this city to-day to make sure that there could be no mistake as to the rate of exchange. At both banks I was told that the New Zealand pound at the present rate of exchange is worth $3.60 in Canadian dollars.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): It used to be worth $4.86 before the labour government took office.

Mr. KNOWLES: Just a minute, and my hon. friend may stop laughing. That two pounds, therefore, amounts in Canada to $7.20 a week, or $31.20 a month.

I secured from the library to-day—and, by the way, it was quite a trip, going back and forth through all those hidden areas where so many books are kept; we might well spend a little money to improve the facilities of our own parliamentary library—a copy of the International Labour Office Year Book of Labour Statistics for the years 1943 and 1944. This book is published by the International Labour office, and it is not C.C.F. or New Zealand propaganda.

In this book will be found statistics as to the cost of living index for various countries and at page 207 is found the latest data available, that of October, 1943, for comparing Canada with New Zealand. At that time the trend was rising, and from that I conclude that if we had the figure for to-day it might be worse. These statistics show that at that time one dollar would buy in New Zealand, in food, what it takes $1.79 to buy in Canada.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Nonsense!

Mr. KNOWLES: You are not arguing with me; you are arguing with the International Labour office.

Mr. REID: Quote the rest of it.

Mr. KNOWLES: I have given my hon. friend the title of the book and the page number from which I am quoting. I have stated that information fully. I am giving every opportunity to any hon. member who wishes to take this book and review it.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Are you afraid to put the rest on *Hansard*?

Mr. CASSELMAN: You do not know what is in it, anyway.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order; when an hon. member—

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: You are not on the back bench either.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order; I must remind hon. members that when an hon. member has the floor, no interruption is allowed without his permission.

Mr. KNOWLES: The hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Cruickshank) has asked me to put it all on *Hansard*. May I explain that there are pages and pages of statistics and that it would take two or three days to

put them on *Hansard*—and then I fear the hon. member would not understand them, anyway.

Mr. REID: I wonder if you would allow a question.

Mr. KNOWLES: Certainly.

Mr. REID: Have you any figures to show what farmers in New Zealand are getting for that cheap food? That would be most interesting; let us have it.

Mr. KNOWLES: I have not farm income figures here at the moment.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. KNOWLES: You need not laugh; we will give them to you gladly. There are many more speakers in this party who can give that information as this debate proceeds.

Mr. REID: And I will give plenty, too.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I will give the answer.

Mr. KNOWLES: In other words, the old age benefit of two pounds a week translated into Canadian dollars and related to the cost of living index in the two countries has an equivalent value, in terms of food, of $59.28 a month in Canada.

I suggest to the Minister of National Health and Welfare that his proposal of $30 a month at seventy years is hardly leading the world. The New Zealand benefit it at sixty and the new rate goes into effect this fall. I suggest, therefore, that Canada is hardly leading the world—although she will some day—in social security.

While I am speaking about what they are doing in New Zealand at the present time, may I point out that the parliament now in session in that country has before it a government measure to increase the benefits to be given to widows. In Canada we have no widow's benefits, except mothers' allowances for widows with children. Even those allowances are only provincial in this country. The New Zealand government is increasing to one pound and ten shillings a week the benefit to widows. That is the equivalent, on the same basis I have outlined, of $44.46 a month in Canada.

A widow with two children will receive two pounds for herself and ten shillings for each child, making a total of three pounds a week or the equivalent in Canada on the same basis, of $88.92 a month.

In addition to these benefits, another increase is being made, and this time it is with respect to the special benefits given to wage earners who are sick or unemployed. This benefit is being increased to two pounds a week for the father, plus two pounds a week for the mother, plus ten shillings for each child. In other words, a family of four would receive five pounds a week when the wage-earner is unemployed either because of sickness or for some other cause. This, on the same basis I have already given, is the equivalent of $148.20 a month in Canada.

All this is being done in a country with only about 1,500,000 population, as compared with our 11,500,000. One has only to reflect upon that to realize the economic problem they must have in a country as small as that. It will be realized that their problem is much greater than ours, in our larger economic unit.

Mr. MITCHELL: Would my hon. friend tell us something about taxes? Let us see the other side of the medal.

Mr. KNOWLES: I do not mind doing that, except that it does take up a good deal of time from other subjects that I had wished to discuss. The fact of the matter is that when the New Zealand Labour government has gone to the country with its taxation programme, and has set against its taxes its increased benefits and its wider arrangements for social security, the people have returned them to power. That is the test.

I should like to refer for a moment longer to the question of old age pensions. The other day the Minister of National Health and Welfare objected to a proposal of an old age pension of $50 a month at the age of sixty years on the ground that it would cost $850,000,000 a year. That was the final answer to the proposal so far as he was concerned. This parliament from time to time has heard many objections to improving old age pensions on the ground that we cannot afford to pay an improved pension. In 1939 the Hon. Charles Dunning, then minister of finance, objected to a slight increase then proposed by this group on the ground that it would cost an additional $18,895,000. Now, the government itself makes the proposal to spend not $18,000,000, but more than $200,000,000—

An hon. MEMBER: And a good thing.

Mr. KNOWLES: A good thing is right. It is an exceptionally good thing. Eighteen months ago I rose in my place in this house and made a proposal respecting better old age pensions which so far as I could compute from the statistics and figures available to me would bring the total cost of old age pensions to $206,000,000. I made the proposal very seriously and pressed it as hard as I

could, but unfortunately my motion was ruled out of order by the Speaker. However, the Winnipeg *Free Press*—

Mr. HOMUTH: What is that? A paper?

Mr. KNOWLES: A paper in the city from which I come, taking note of what I had to say—

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): Is that not the same paper which urged the people to vote for Mackenzie King in the last election?

Mr. KNOWLES: It never did anything else. What a question to ask a Manitoba member!

I was going on to say that a few days after I had made my proposal in this house which would have brought the total expenditure on old age pensions to $206,000,000 the Winnipeg *Free Press* ran an editorial headed "A Mere $206,000,000", in which the member for Winnipeg North Centre was taken to task for his irresponsibility in proposing to spend so large a sum of money. $206,000,000—it could not be done. Now the government itself, only eighteen months later, comes down, I am glad to say, with a proposal that is going to cost $200,000,000 for the men and women over seventy years and another thirty or forty million dollars for those between sixty-five and sixty-nine. I hope the Winnipeg *Free Press* will call me irresponsible again to-night if it means that eighteen months from now the federal government will pay an old age pension of $50 a month at the age of sixty—

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Hear, hear.

Mr. KNOWLES: I am glad to note that I have support from across the way, and I hope that the members of the Liberal party will express that support most vehemently in their own caucus.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK. I did so yesterday.

Mr. KNOWLES: Hear, hear. Let us take a look now at that sum of $850,000,000 which the Minister of National Health and Welfare quoted the other day. It sounds huge. I find in *Hansard* of February 11, 1944, that on that day the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) asked us to vote certain moneys for the war appropriation. That was the last full year of the war, and included in that war appropriation bill was the sum of $985,270,670.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: And seventy cents.

Mr. KNOWLES: No. Seventy dollars. No cents.

An hon. MEMBER: How do you spell that?

Mr. MacINNIS: Wrong again.

Mr. KNOWLES: It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that I should get an extra five minutes for all these interruptions. That sum of money was needed for pay and allowances for the members of the three armed services. Please note what we were doing. We were taking three-quarters of a million men and women out of productive activity and providing them with food, clothing, shelter, medical and dental care, personal supplies, everything they needed, and on top of that we paid them more than $985,000,000 in good hard cash. Did the country go broke as a result of that? No, we had the most prosperous year in our history, and I submit that if we can pay, when we have to, $985,000,000 a year to a large body of our citizens for purposes of war, we can pay $850,000,000 to our respected aged citizens for the purposes of peace, so that they might enjoy the kind of retirement they are entitled to and so that the country as a whole might reap the economic benefits of such a policy.

Since my time is passing, I shall refer only briefly to other subjects upon which I wished to touch. I want to say a word about housing. This is a subject in which anyone coming from Winnipeg North Centre is keenly interested. We have had a lot of talk in this house about housing. We have had arguments about whether private enterprise or a public authority is best able to provide homes for our people. That has been threshed out fully. Members of this house know quite well where I stand on that matter, and I think events are proving that private enterprise cannot be counted upon to provide the homes our people need. I think the day is fast coming when even this government will have to set up a public housing authority to deal with this pressing problem.

I want to bring this thing down to cases by suggesting that the government, through a public housing authority, should, if it means business, take a constituency such as the one which I represent and do something about the housing problem right there.

Many hon. members who in the course of this debate have spoken of their constituencies have told of the beauty of the ridings they have the honour to represent. I am proud of my constituency. I am proud of the people who live in it. They are a people who know the score. They have done their share and more than their share in the conflict through which we have just passed. And I say with real pride that they are the people

who do the world's work. They are industrial workers, and while there are parts of my constituency that have lovely homes there are other areas in my riding—well, Mr. Speaker, come to Winnipeg and I will take you in my old car and drive you around, and you will hang your head in shame that Canadian citizens who do the world's work to the extent that it is done by the citizens of Winnipeg North Centre have to live in the kind of places that some of my people live in and bring their children up in the environment and atmosphere that is to be found in parts of the city of Winnipeg, in my own riding, and some other Winnipeg ridings as well. I have no lakes and mountains in my constituency such as other hon. members have spoken of, just working people who live in homes which they try to make worthy of the name, but many hundreds of them should be torn down and new ones put in their place, and I suggest to the government that if it means business it should go into an area like Point Douglas, or an area like that along the C.P.R. tracks, or go to Brooklands, where good streets, yes, sewer and water, are sorely needed, and in place of some of the dwellings to be found there now let us set up a model housing community. The people who live there work in the C.P.R. shops, for Dominion Bridge, Manitoba Bridge and the Vulcan Iron Works. They work in factories and offices of all kinds. They do the heavy work of the world and produce tremendous wealth. For whom? Do they get back what they produce? They get only a pittance on which to live; that is all. This country should provide for them the best homes that architects and engineers can design, with all the conveniences and advantages that go with a modern model community. I have no hesitancy in making this plea for my constituency, realizing quite well that it might prompt other members to do the same for their constituencies, and if it does, hear, hear; all power to them.

Every constituency in Canada which has a housing problem such as mine deserves consideration by the government of a project such as I have suggested—clearing out the slums, building model communities, with all the best medical, recreational, and educational advantages human beings should enjoy. Let us have a little imagination. Let us go to work and really win the peace.

There is in some of these areas to which I have referred, such as Brooklands and Weston, a keen community spirit. In Weston, for example, there is a move at the present time to build a community centre as a memorial to the many lads from that part of the city who have given their lives in the conflict which at last has ended. These people are finding it difficult to raise the large amount of money they have in mind for a suitable memorial. It seems to me that they should be encouraged in that project, and that other communities across this country should similarly be encouraged so that we may beautify not only the national capital—I am all for that, too—but so that we might beautify every city in this country, with suitable memorials, and above all, proper homes.

I see, Mr. Speaker, that you are edging to the front of your chair. I shall be just a minute or two. I should like to say that I hope we shall begin to get something concrete soon in the matter of employment. I listened with interest to the speech which the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) made last night, but I think the day will come when the government will be sorry he made that speech. It sounded well, but nothing specific was in it. It was simply added to the election promises which they must now fulfil. I hope he is right in saying that he has a million jobs; we need two million; but I suggest that what we want is, not flamboyant speeches full of enthusiasm, but the delivery of the goods, or in other words, actual jobs.

Not only must we have jobs, but the time is long overdue for some real indication that we are going to achieve industrial democracy, which surely was one of the aims of the war. No reference to it is to be found in the speech from the throne. The references to it in the government's proposals to the dominion-provincial conference are very scant, and only in terms of temporary expedients which, to my way of thinking, are not at all in keeping with the fine words of the Secretary of State (Mr. Martin) the other night when he said that the government is determined to maintain the position labour has gained. Words are not enough. If the government means these things let them deliver the goods, not with complacency here in this house, not with boasting about the fact that they won the election, but with performance equal to its promises.

With this last word I sit down. I join with others in support of the proposal for a distinctive national flag and for the other measures designed to make more real and definite our distinctive Canadian citizenship, and I trust that these very desirable steps will be achieved with a large degree of unanimity in this house. I hope, however, that, having done that, we shall put new meaning and real glory into Canadian citizenship by establishing in this country security, justice and freedom for all our people.

Mr. DANIEL McIVOR (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in this debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne because I think I have something sensible and true to say. The speech suits me for several reasons. First, I find in the opening words this expression:

> As you assemble at the opening of a new parliament, I join with you in giving humble and grateful thanks to Divine Providence for the deliverance which His mercy has vouchsafed to the peoples of our own and other lands.

That utterance, whether by the Governor General or the government, is sensible, because you cannot explain in any other way the victory and the peace which we now have. You cannot explain Dunkirk and the successful evacuation of our men from that place unless you believe in an answer to prayer. You cannot explain why Hitler did not wipe old England off the map unless you believe the same thing. You cannot explain why Hitler attacked Russia when he did unless you agree that the Great Architect of the universe did not think that Hitler was fit to rule the world. For these reasons I congratulate the government upon having this sentence in the speech from the throne. Also, they did not omit to give thanks to God for victory, because with peace came the declaration of a day of thanksgiving all over the British empire. The speech also gives credit to our Canadian forces for having a part in that victory. I find also plans to help those who are destitute, and it is a Christian programme to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, visit those who are sick and help those who are in prison. These things we are trying to do now. Those who do not agree with rationing should think the whole thing over again in the light of putting that programme into practice.

I find, too, in the speech from the throne proposals for making Ottawa a little more beautiful, perhaps, than any other city in Canada. This is as it should be, because the cream of Canada meets in this city, at least part of the time, and it is in keeping with the conception of the late Queen Victoria that our capital should be more beautiful than Toronto or Montreal. I will, however, throw out this suggestion to the government, that all the money for a community centre should not be spent in Ottawa. We are planning a community centre in Fort William, and we think we have as good right as Ottawa to some support for the beautification of our city. It is not second in natural beauty even to Ottawa. In pursuance of a plan for a community centre we have raised nearly $80,000 in cash, so that we are helping ourselves before we ask the dominion or provincial government to help us.

The dominion government took away our skating rink. We have no home for our national hockey game; they turned it into a big armoury; it was necessary then and perhaps is necessary still. So that I warn the government through the ministers who are here and I shall not be treading gently on somebody's toes if we do not get back somewhat more than the $20,000 which was paid in compensation for that rink.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) is supporting a declaration which he made before the meeting of dominion prime ministers in London, that Canada is a nation, that we have a right to our own national anthem, that, as the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Maybank) said, we have a right to make and control our own laws; and we think we can rule ourselves better than any jurist from the city of London or old England.

Again, we have a right to have our own flag. I know some of our boys were in England, and—I say it with all respect—they did not have the same respect for England that we of the first generation that came from the old land had, because they did not like it when some of the officers whom they refused to salute called them "bleeding colonials". We are not colonials. We are a nation and we have a right to our own flag—and I am going to show you what some people in Ottawa think should be the flag of Canada. I have it here. I showed this to members of the Liberal party about a year ago and I flew this very flag in Fort William on victory day. I thought it was all right. Whether it will be the future flag of Canada or not, at any rate Fort William got a foretaste of what some manufacturer in Ottawa saw fit to design. Here in this flag you have the red, white and blue, and those hon. members who believe just as strongly as I do in the flag can still sing, "Three Cheers for the Red, White and Blue." There is a stripe for each province; there is the Canadian coat of arms, and there is the green maple leaf, which is the natural colour of the maple leaf. Not only that, but green is the "go" sign of Canada as well as the "go" sign of Fort William.

I have not spent any time in congratulating anybody, but I was greatly proud to think that one of the northern members was chosen to move the address in reply to the speech from the throne. He demonstrated, what we know, that northern men are men still. We had an election in Fort William and I

would say that there was not a cleaner contest in all Canada. I did not see a man anywhere at any time who seemed to have had too much ginger ale. Those who were opposition candidates were kind enough to me, so kind that they did not advertise a single mistake that I had made, either while I was in this house or while I was out of it. I must say I am eternally grateful, because I have made a few mistakes. I am grateful to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner). I do not know whether he had anything to do with this, but when we needed workers in Fort William, a good many workers came from the province of Saskatchewan, and there were good enough Liberals and people with sufficient common sense to elect me. I pity the C.C.F. when they go back to Saskatchewan, because there is going to be a change.

Some people think that all we have in Fort William is fresh water, rocks and lake Superior trout. But I can assure you sir, we have in that part of the country one of the best farming districts in Canada. We have an experimental substation that is paying for itself hundreds of times over. We have the best potato land. We have a 500 bushel to the acre club in Fort William. Just think of it, an Irishman coming from the old sod and raising 500 bushels of potatoes to the acre! We have the champion potato grower in Canada seventeen miles west of Fort William. Cape Breton and the maritimes are not in it.

Again, we have proved that the district will grow first-class fruit. I am sorry I was not in the house when the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Cruickshank) was advertising his peaches. I congratulate him; but wait until he comes to Fort William; we will give him a peach that will make his mouth water.

We have in Fort William one of the best feeding grounds for fattening cattle because in the fall of the year it is damp and cool and we have fine, healthy grass. It is a splendid place for finishing cattle.

We have a great boom just starting in mining about 55 miles west of Fort William where there is opening up another gold mine—a find they call it—and the people are going there. I do not need to speak of Steep Rock, with its hematite iron ore, the best on the American continent. I do not need to speak of lumber, nor do I need to speak of our elevators, which constitute the breadbasket of the world. We have a new industry springing up in Fort William where the waste of the sawmills from pulp and paper is being pressed and manufactured into a very fine type of fuel. When the estimates of the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) are up I will show him a sample.

There are two or three things we need to get in Fort William. We want to get the transcanada highway along the north shore of lake Superior. We want to get it finished because it would mean a great tourist boom for Sault Ste. Marie, for Schreiber, for the head of the lakes, for Kenora and Winnipeg. We believe that is needed, and since the tourist trade is the third best trade in Canada we think we should get it.

Take again the great lakes waterways. This ought to come, and we are encouraged to know that President Truman of the United States is prepared to support it. We are prepared to support it and I do not think there will be opposition in this house.

We need hospitalization in Fort William. We expect to get cheap money and I expect that the Social Credit members will support us in that. But whether they do or not, we believe that our government has common sense enough to help us in getting our new hospital.

I now come to what I consider the best part of my remarks. There was a considerable lay-off in Canada Car. I believe 3,600 were laid off. That plant had been empty since the last war, but the Minister of Reconstruction stood by us in great shape. He got us orders for planes when neither England, France nor the United States would allow any of their better type of plane to be made by anybody else. One thing followed another until there were over 6,000 people employed in Canada Car, and I would say that the work done by that plant is second to none in any of the war plants of Canada. In fact we think it is just a little better. The day came, however, when the war was over, and thank God it is over and we can turn our thoughts to something else. The Minister of Reconstruction came along and helped us splendidly in getting orders for buses of a fine type. Not only that, but he will stand behind us, because the Minister of Reconstruction is the man that stood behind us when we were fighting for holidays with pay and when we wanted cooperation between the management and unions and workers. He is the man who stood behind us when we needed help. I find in *Hansard* that the minister has invited more leaders of labour than any other minister ever did in the history of Canada to cooperate with him. He has called upon the head men of these union organizations and has meetings with them regularly, and he will take their advice and the findings of their judgment. I wish

to pay a tribute to the labour leaders of Canada because from the very first time I met my old friend Tom Moore I had a profound respect for these leaders. They compare favourably with the leaders of any of the parties in this house. They have been through the mill; they know their own capacities, and they have sympathy with the toiler.

When war broke out hon. members will remember how often the Minister of Reconstruction heard and how often we heard it said that the attitude of the government was, "Too little and too late". And it was true, because democracy is never ready for war. It is a difficult thing to turn peace industries into war industries, but to my mind it is not so difficult to turn industry back into peace-time pursuits. Notwithstanding that, we at the head of the lakes are grateful as are others in Canada that the Minister of Reconstruction is the man who will have the opportunity of putting industry back into peace-time production.

The minister said yesterday that he was hopeful of having full-time employment. I would say that he has good reason for that, and so have we because of the number of jobs there are waiting for somebody to take. I should like to say that sometimes I am disappointed with the Minister of Reconstruction. Just before the session opened I and a number of men from Port Arthur and Fort William tried to make an appointment with him for the 4th or 5th of September. He turned us down. I then found out that he was in Toronto having just the thing that he tried to give to the workers of Canada, a holiday. I have nothing to say in favour of the labour leaders who did not treat him with the respect that he deserved, because he wanted to have a holiday before he had the meeting with them that he had arranged for in the city of Ottawa. I was surprised at the minister's patience because, as you remember, Mr. Speaker, the newspapermen said that his putting was poor that day. He came in there and he missed a glorious opportunity to make a hole in one. He did not do so, but he was more courteous than I would have been in the circumstances. I would say to any man, whether on the government side of the house or anywhere else, that if you try to meet the Minister of Reconstruction no man will meet you more courteously and efficiently and send you away with a warm spot in your heart than he, but if you try to put something over that is crooked, try to get something to your advantage that hurts somebody else, I can tell you that you will get an answer just as plain and polite as you deserve.

So far as Canada Car is concerned, we who support the labourers and workers say that wages should be kept up. President Truman said: "We can never go back to forty cents an hour." I do not think any man can have a home, a wife and family, earn a living and educate his children on forty cents an hour. We have no right to go back to that. I am one of those who will fight as far as possible to give a man a full day's wages for a full day's work.

I believe that on the other side there are some leaders of corporations that do make men sore and I was almost going to say they make them see red. I think of a big abattoir where I was once able to secure work for a bright young man. He worked for eighteen years and was then directed to go to another town. In reality it was a demotion instead of a promotion. He refused to take the position, and of course this man in the corporation who was more interested in profits than anything else said, "If you do not take the job, you know what to do." The young man said, "I do, and you can give my job to somebody else." He then came back to Fort William and within a week he had a better job than that which he had worked up to in eighteen years with Canada Packers.

I was disappointed when the warehouse operators at their convention a while ago said that their only hope was to get wages reduced, and their only hope of getting wages reduced was to get men to come back from the war. Any corporation that will use the sacred life of our boys, who went over there and fought for us and then came back, in this manner, and ask them to take a reduction in wages, is not fit to get the support of the people of Canada; it is a disgrace to civilization.

I listened to the hon. member for Cartier (Mr. Rose) and I agreed with him in some things. I was terribly disappointed when he quoted a statement that appeared in the Montreal *Standard* as coming from the president of Canada Car. I shall read it as it appears at page 169 of *Hansard* of September 13, because we need to know it. It is a newspaper report that I hope is not true. If it is true, then the sooner Canada Car gets out of Fort William, the better it will be for us. This is the quotation:

> The party is over. Not only will there not be enough jobs, but wages will have to be brought down to former peace-time levels. If the employees won't take a cut in wages, the plant will have to close down. We can't afford to have our profits cut into by paying the high war-time wage levels.

Who would not get hot under the collar after reading that, "The party is over"? The cream of Canada, the boys and girls, men and women went over there, but they did not go to a party. They fought for your freedom and mine, and with the help of God you and I will see that they get fair play. The party is not over; the party is just beginning and we are going to have a fine time.

I should like to compare these two corporations with another corporation. I suppose some hon. members have been reading about it. Perhaps they do not know any more about it than I do, but I got my information at first-hand. There is a firm called "Jack & Heinz" of Cleveland, Ohio, who treat their employees like human beings. They pay good wages. They supply recreation at the expense of production. The first thing they do with a new employee is to get him a pair of new boots. They send him to a specialist to have his feet examined and get him a pair of boots in which he can stand and work and do an honest day's toil. There is no time clock in that manufacturer's concern, but if anybody is not there on time then the workers look after him. There is no loafing and no smoking on the job, because if a worker does either he gets enough catcalls to make him sick and he goes back to his job again. During the war they paid large bonuses and were taken to task for it; but they showed that they could pay those bonuses to their workers and do more and better work than people like Henry Ford.

Hon. members may think I am speaking at random, but I went across the line last week-end and it was reported to me that the Ford people have been sending out groups of investigators to investigate the workers to find out if there is a streak of red in them, or if they lean that way. These are the people that put on the drive against the Hebrews in the United States. If they find that these people are communists then they are displaced by men from the forces at a lower rate of wages. What a difference it would be if the Ford people would send out their investigators as this other company did to find out where the distress is, to find out where there is not enough money coming into the homes to feed, clothe and educate the children! If they could find out where there is sickness and distress and practise the teaching of the Master Workman of Nazareth, then Ford would leave behind him a name worth far more than all the money he could pile up. These people are safe and secure, and we think we in Canada also can be safe and secure. I will admit that around each member of this house is a group of friends who are loyal, but I am sure hon. gentlemen will not be surprised when I say—because I think it is the truth—that the rank and file of the people of Canada do not care a snap of their fingers what party is in power. What they want is a living wage, to be secure, to be treated like human beings, and to do an honest day's work. I would say, too, that the workers of Canada are always entitled to one day's rest in seven. That should be the Sabbath day, so that after toiling all week they may go to some cosy place and listen to music that has the strains of heaven in it, and hear something that will take away their cares and leave them disgusted with their sins, ready to face what may come in the days that lie ahead. In my opinion the cure for distress in Canada or any other country is for labour and capital to adopt the principles of the sermon on the mount, to practise forgiveness even unto seventy times seven, to go out and do an honest day's work and to serve our fellow men. If we do that we need not fear what the f ture may have in store for us, because we know we are going in the right direction.

In conclusion, I should like to congratulate the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) on having come into this house. I helped elect him when he first ran for public office in Manitoba, as a Progressive. The Liberal and Conservative candidates, together with another candidate who called himself by two or three names, were too fond of ginger ale to suit me, so that I voted for the Progressive candidate. I congratulate him on having gone a long way and then having come here. I hope he will practise the principles he followed when he entered the provincial house, and if he does so there will be changes. I should like also to congratulate the Prime Minister on having done what I advised him to do; that is, for having contested the seat of Prince Albert in the last election. I told him it would be better to go there and take a licking than not go there at all. He did take the licking, but only after he had first won, then lost. I am convinced that by the end of this parliament the Liberal party will have shown Canada that it can provide work and wages, better living conditions and Christian charity, and that it can be forgiving even to the opposition.

Mr. VICTOR QUELCH (Acadia): Mr. Speaker, I believe most people in Canada were relieved to see the unwieldy majority of the Liberal party in this house reduced following the last election. Certainly that is true of all members on this side of the house, and I do not doubt for a moment that many hon. members sitting on the government benches realize that this result will be of benefit to the country. I make that state-

ment because in future it will not be quite so easy for the government carelessly to disregard public opinion in this country. In other words, it is to be hoped that in future we will have a more democratic form of government than we have enjoyed in the past, and one that will be subject, at least in some degree, to the will of the Canadian people.

During the past year there has been a rather bitter campaign waged in this country against socialism, a campaign in which members of the government have participated. Yet it is well to realize that the growth of socialism has been stimulated in this country largely as a result of the failure of the policies of the Liberal party and their predecessors, because socialism and all other isms are always stimulated in times of extreme poverty and want. People in this country to-day, remembering what occurred after the last war, remembering the conditions that existed during the hungry thirties, are fearful as to what may happen in future; and the organized attempt on the part of certain industries to reduce wages at the present time is not increasing the confidence of the people in the immediate future. If the government are really sincere in their desire to halt the growth of socialism in Canada they should realize that the way to do this is not by a campaign of abuse but by action to introduce certain essential reforms which will make the present system work, so that the resources of Canada may be developed to their full capacity in the interests of the Canadian people, and so that the Canadian people may receive the benefits therefrom together with the greatest possible degree of individual freedom. If that is not done; if instead we allow another depression to come upon this country such as we had in the thirties, then I believe we shall be paving the way for troublous times in Canada; for I believe most of us will agree that there may be a great deal of trouble in this country if such conditions reoccur. I do not believe the people of Canada ever again will be satisfied to listen to the sort of blathering they heard in the thirties, when it was said that no money was available to develop the resources of this country. I must admit that I have been disgusted in the past to find many of those people who so bitterly attacked socialism at the same time being just as bitter against those reforms which are absolutely essential to the successful operation of the capitalist system. Apparently they do not realize that by such opposition they are merely developing the growth of isms in this country; and of course when I refer to essential reforms I have in mind those which have been advocated in the past by the social credit movement.

There is very little in the speech from the throne to indicate that the government realize any need for fundamental change in their policies. Apparently they are still going to depend to a very large extent upon exports and foreign investments in order to maintain what they call full employment in this country. This was emphasized in a speech on the post-war programme delivered in New York by the deputy minister of finance, Mr. W. C. Clark. It is also referred to in the white paper on reconstruction. Apparently the government still intends to follow the same old road in regard to international policy that has in the past lead us to international friction, depressions, and wars. Before the war that kind of policy was defended in this country on the ground that we were a debtor nation, and that therefore it was necessary to maintain a large favourable balance of payments in order to meet our foreign obligations.

It will be recalled that from 1935 to 1939 we maintained, on an average, a favourable balance of payments of $219 million a year, thereby helping to bring about a reduction in our external debt. But it is also well to remember that during that time we had extreme poverty in Canada. A million people were on relief and a half million were unemployed. At the same time industry was operating only at a percentage of its capacity. Hon. members who sat in the house from 1935 to 1939 will recall how members of this group repeatedly urged upon the government the necessity of introducing large-scale social services and large-scale national projects, so that money paid out for these services would help to create a demand for the imports that could have been brought into this country in return for the credits that we had abroad.

As the demands for goods was stimulated in that way production would have been expanded, so that we could easily have produced sufficient goods to meet our foreign obligations and at the same time raise our standard of living. But hon. members will recall the reply we always received in the house from the then Minister of Finance, the Hon. Charles Dunning. We were always met by his hysterical outburst that the government did not have any money for such projects, and that the only money available to the government was that which they could obtain from the people's pockets. When we used to suggest that it might be possible to have monetary expansion

for the purpose of meeting those expenditures he used to brand the suggestion as one of crude inflation.

Yet, within a few weeks of the declaration of war millions, yes, hundreds of millions of dollars were created by the banking system for the use of the government. Yes, over three billions of dollars were created by the banking system for that purpose during the war.

I know that in the past, especially during bond sales, it has been popular to tell the people that the war is being financed by taxation and bond sales to the public. But let us remember that if we had depended upon those methods alone we would have had a war effort quite different from the one we did have. It is only because just as soon as war came the government was willing to have created almost unlimited amounts of money that we were able to develop the resources of the country to the extent that they were developed.

It is strange that the government was not prepared to create money to meet the needs of the people of this country in peace time; but the minute war came they were prepared to have money created in order to save their skins. The situation to-day, of course, is entirely different. Our external debts have largely been liquidated. In addition to that, we have a number of large credits abroad. So that there is no possible excuse for maintaining large favourable balances of payment in the future. Our aim should be to bring about an even balance of payments, apart of course from those exports that may be required to meet our moral obligations. These would be exports in the form of contributions to the war-stricken areas in Europe and Asia.

So, Mr. Speaker, we should not for one moment tolerate a policy of foreign investments until all the people of Canada are receiving an adequate standard of living. While a policy of foreign investments may help to maintain employment, it is bound at the same time to bring about a reduction in the standard of living of the people to the extent of the investments made.

This attitude of the Liberal party in respect of foreign trade is well illustrated in a full-page advertisement which appeared in the Winnipeg *Free Press*. A good deal of this type of propaganda is being circulated throughout Canada at the present time. The one I hold in my hand is number six of a series of advertisements on Canada in the post-war world, and appears under the caption "Can't we keep this up forever?" I shall quote only a few paragraphs to illustrate the absurdity of this type of policy. The advertisement begins in this fashion:

> Do you remember when we had large-scale unemployment in Canada? And now it's gone. And everywhere you hear men saying, "We can do for war what we can't do for peace. Why can't we keep this up forever?" The answer is: We can. If we really want to.

Then the article goes on to say that we have had prosperity in Canada during the war, the reason being that in that time we have had an almost unlimited market for everything we could produce. Then it goes on to say:

> That is in war time. What about peace? We can go on producing at our present rate and we can keep up a high level of employment in the future—when the war is done—provided we find customers who want to buy what we produce.
>
> We can, if we want to, go on producing in peace time and give the stuff away (as we do in war time) if we want to. We can make boots and shoes and pots and pans and crockery and textiles and automobiles and a hundred other things, and give them away, instead of giving away tanks and guns and planes.
>
> But nobody would be better off for that, for we would get no more goods for ourselves than we have now.

Then the writer comes to this conclusion:

> Then we will have to find markets for what we make, markets in which we will be paid for what we ship. If we can find markets, we can go on working as hard as we are doing now, and we will all be better off. Much better off than we are now. But it will depend on trade. If we can get the trade, our boom can go on and on. If we cannot get it, it won't.

Well, in the first place I would ask: Who wants to have to go on working just as hard as we have been working during the war? Ask the farmers in the west who have been slaving sixteen hours a day, because of the absence of their sons, if they want to keep that up in the future.

This advertisement is a good illustration of that hoary, old slogan: "Export or perish." I agree that we must have markets. But what about the Canadian market? Certainly we can give goods away; but do we have to give them away in foreign markets? Can we not, for a change, give our goods to the Canadian people? Let us recall what it says here:

> We can, if we want to, go on producing in peace time and give the stuff away. . . . But nobody would be better off for that, for we would get no more goods for ourselves than we have now.

Does that not depend upon to whom we give those goods? Instead of giving them away in exchange for foreign securities which, in future, may not be worth the paper they are

written on, why not give them to the Canadian people, in the form of social service or for services rendered?

Speaking yesterday, the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Shaw) referred to the fact that when in Alberta the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) had attacked the Social Credit organization on the ground that we were opposed to international trade. May I emphasize the fact that that charge is absolutely false. At no time has any member of this group attacked international trade. What we have done is something entirely different; we have attacked the Liberal government's policy in regard to international trade, because that policy has always been directed toward maintaining a large favourable balance of payments and foreign investments, while at the same time we have maintained that the correct function of international trade is to bring about an exchange of goods on the basis of mutual advantage to both parties concerned.

I would say that the government's policy on international trade is just about as phoney as was its policy on monetary reform in 1935, when they told the people that we were going to have currency and credit issued in terms of public need to meet the domestic social requirements of the Canadian people, and then for the next five years sabotaged the resources of this country under their deflationary policy, so that upon the declaration of war we found ourselves in the pathetic position of having thousands of men rejected from the army because they were medically unfit owing to malnutrition.

We in this group have in this house repeatedly emphasized the need for expanding the purchasing power of the people to the point where it is possible to maintain an effective demand against our production or the production of other nations for which our own production can be exchanged; and when I say effective demand, I mean an effective market. Therefore we believe that in order to stimulate consumption in this country, and thereby production, there should be as rapidly as possible a progressive reduction in taxation, first of all on the people in the lower income brackets by substantially increasing the size of the exemptions, and second, by abolishing the sales tax, which falls most heavily on the people in the lower income brackets.

We in this group have always maintained that the real purpose of taxation should not be to provide revenue for the government but to prevent inflation, and during the war the government have on repeated occasions acknowledged that fact.

Then we say that to the extent that taxation fails to meet government expenditure there should be an expansion of money through the Bank of Canada, so that the resources of the country may be developed to their full extent without any expansion in the national debt or increase in taxation.

Then, of course, as the transition from war to peace progresses, as the production of peace-time goods is expanded, we shall be in a position to extend social services in this country and carry out various national projects that are now urgently required.

It is true that the government has taken certain steps to expand social services in this country and is, I believe, proposing others, but these proposals are altogether inadequate to meet the needs of the people. For example, take the old age pension paid at the age of seventy years of $30 a month irrespective of other income. Undoubtedly that is a step in the right direction and is a great improvement over what we had in the past. But would anyone suggest for one moment that $30 a month is a sufficient amount of income for anybody to live on? When we realize that these old age pensioners must have resided in Canada for at least twenty years and therefore have been slaving and working in this country during all that period, surely nobody would suggest that a miserable pittance of $30 a month is a sufficient amount. When we recall that the national income of Canada today is around $9,000,000,000, which works out at an average of $3,000 for a family of four, no one can argue that Canada could not very well pay them a substantial amount, and we have therefore urged that a minimum pension of $50 a month be paid at the age of sixty regardless of any other income that the individual might happen to be receiving.

On the other hand I realize that the government is facing an almost impossible task when it attempts to finance a balanced programme under a debt creating system. You often hear it said by people throughout the country that we found the money for war, and therefore we would have no trouble finding the money for peace. You may say that we can finance the peace in exactly the same way in which we have been financing the war; but can we? These people apparently think the Liberal party have found some new way of financing during the war. Unfortunately there has been no real change in policy. The government is still depending upon taxation and borrowing. The only difference is that instead of depending on the borrowing of the savings of the people, it has been financing quite heavily by borrowing newly created money from the

banking system. As a result of that policy, the national debt has risen from a figure of around 3½ billion dollars as of December, 1939, to around fourteen or fifteen billion dollars as at the end of 1944. Does anybody really believe that we can continue to expand the debt in that way? Some people may be optimistic and say: Well, there is no reason why in the future we should not be able to reduce this debt. Yet what is the record of Canada in the past? In no year since confederation have we ever reduced the amount of public debt in this country. I know that the assistant to the Minister of Finance last year mentioned that from 1924 to 1930 we had a balanced budget and reduced the national debt by $250 million. But he should have added that during that period, owing to the policies of the federal government, the provincial debt increased by $500 million, so that on balance the public debt, instead of being reduced by $250 million, was expanded by $250 million. That has been the growth of public debt in Canada. Year by year ever since confederation the public debt has steadily grown. So does anybody really think, now that our debt burden has been multiplied many times, that we are going to find it easier to finance in the future than we have found it in the past under this type of financial policy?

I was interested in the statement made by the principal of McGill university, Doctor James, to the reconstruction committee a few years ago. He said that if we want to maintain full employment and an optimum standard of living for our people we would have to adopt an entirely new budget philosophy. He said that in so far as current expenditures and revenue are concerned the budget could be balanced, but so far as capital expenditures are concerned we would have to be prepared to maintain an unbalanced budget, that we might have to expand our debt every year by three or four hundred million dollars, and be prepared to see that go on for the next one hundred years. The only quarrel I had with his statement was, why say one hundred years, and not for ever so long as we maintain our present financial system? So that if, according to Doctor James, it is necessary to expand the national debt by three or four hundred million dollars every year, what hope is there that we are ever going to pay off the national debt? Yet the Minister of Finance had the audacity last year to bring down a paper in which he said that the government after the war would introduce a scientific scheme of budgeting so that the national debt could be paid off. I think all of us will be interested when the budget comes down in hearing the Minister of Finance explain how in the future they are going to pay off the national debt through some scientific scheme. I agree, of course, that they may be able to do so if they are prepared to leave the road they have been travelling in the past and adopt the policy we have been advocating, which is that to the extent that taxation fails to meet government expenditures, national money should be issued through the Bank of Canada so that we can finance without any increase in debt or taxation.

And so we find that the government, in their confusion, in trying to remove the surplus production from this country, not surplus to the needs of the people but surplus to their ability to buy, in order to maintain full employment, are going to carry out a policy of large-scale foreign investments. This merely means that the standard of living of the people of this country will be reduced to that extent. That is why this group have always quarreled with the term "full employment" unless it is at the same time coupled with the words "in order to maintain an optimum standard of living". because we can very well have full employment and at the same time a lower standard of living, by exporting goods which are required by the people and not bringing imports back in return; that is, by a policy of foreign investment.

Notwithstanding anything I have said, I want it thoroughly understood that we of this group realize that we have a moral obligation to make goods available to the devastated areas of Europe, to the war-stricken nations. For that reason we have always supported in the house the principle of mutual aid and such measures as UNRRA. But we must keep this fact in mind: some day those areas will no longer be destitute. The day will come when these countries will rebuild their factories, and when that day comes these nations will desire to pay for their exports with their exports. At that time we must be prepared to accept freely the exports of other nations in payment for the exports we ship them. I would say that the real test of the economy we are building to-day will come four or five years from now, when these nations desire to pay for their imports with their exports. The test will come, whether or not we have built up an economy in which we have an effective demand against the production of the country and the production of other nations for which our own production can be exchanged. If we have not done that we shall be visited with a situation which may very well develop into a serious depression.

The speech from the throne states that we are to be asked to approve a measure to provide for Canada's participation in the final act of the Bretton Woods agreement; that is, to join in the international monetary fund and the bank of reconstruction. Without any hesitation I can say that in so far as this group is concerned the government will get no support from us in that programme. We shall oppose the measure because, in the first instance, it means a restoration of the gold standard. I know some will say, "Yes, but it is a different gold standard." Well, the gold standard of 1925 was different from the gold standard of 1914, but still it was a gold standard. The main difference between the gold standard of Bretton Woods and that of 1925 is that the former is of an even more vicious character. Second, we shall oppose it because in its present form it is bound to create international friction. I have heard many people say, "Do you not realize that the experts of forty-four different nations signed that agreement and consented to participate in this scheme, and did so voluntarily? Is it likely that these experts would have been willing to participate in that scheme had they thought it would be detrimental to their countries?"

In the first place, let us realize that these experts did not necessarily represent public opinion in their own countries. But there is another matter of even greater importance. To show what I mean I should like to quote from an editorial which was published in the Fundy *Fisherman* of August 28, taken from the New Zealand *Mirror,* to show to what extent these agreements are being signed voluntarily:

> The lend-lease agreements which the various nations were obliged to sign before obtaining supplies contained a provision which was not in the legislation enacted by congress. This laid down that the debtor nations were to enter into agreements directed to the expansion, by appropriate international and domestic measures, of production, employment and the exchange and consumption of goods, etc. The international money plan is the first of these measures. It is one thing to consider the plan on its merits. It is another matter altogether to discover what the consequence of rejection will be.

In the London *Economist* of July 21 we find this statement regarding the situation in which Britain is being placed by having to say "yes" or "no" to this agreement:

> As a matter of plain economics, there would seem to be a clear balance of argument against the Bretton Woods scheme—that is against the monetary fund. . . . But as a matter of politics or (if the word is taken to imply something sinister) of amicable relations between governments, there is almost everything to be said in its favour. How much economic hazard is a reasonable price for continued generosity and friendship or at the least for avoidance of American disappointment and resentment? It all depends upon the size of the hazard and the intensity of the friendship.

I would say, "some friendship!" The sincerity of a friendship which demands economic chaos as the price of its maintenance may indeed be questioned. In other words, we find that nations which are acquiescing in the Bretton Woods agreement are indulging in a policy of appeasement, and surely this war has shown that appeasement never pays; a showdown has to come, and the longer you appease the other nation, the greater will be the showdown when it comes; it is far better to have it at the start.

I am not going to say any more at this time about the Bretton Woods agreement, but when th measure is before the house we shall have quite a bit more to say.

The speech from the throne refers also to a measure to establish a veterans' charter. This charter is to embrace, I understand, the various orders in council which have been passed in regard to soldier rehabilitation. We are strongly in favour of a committee being appointed to investigate that charter and to suggest any necessary amendments. Most people realize that to-day there is a good deal of confusion and dissatisfaction with regard to veterans' affairs. Let me add that much of that confusion is to be found right amongst the officials of the minister's own department.

I want to briefly refer to the Veterans' Land Act. My reference to it will be brief because no doubt the time to discuss it will be when the matter of setting up a committee is brought up; that is, if a committee is appointed, which I trust will be the case. I was on the committee in 1942 when we discussed the new Veterans' Land Act. I realized at the time that the new act was a great improvement on the old Soldier Settlement Act; nevertheless I recognized that there were certain weaknesses in it. I pointed them out at the time. Unfortunately many of them still exist. I am going to refer to this now because I hope the minister will take steps to remove these evils and not wait until a committee is set up.

I have in mind especially section 13. I am not surprised that that section was labeled "13," because it has been and is a hoodoo to many returned men who hoped to benefit under it. The director of the Veterans' Land Act, Mr. Murchison, has stated that he does not consider this is a matter of very great importance, because, of one thousand soldiers settling under the Veterans' Land Act, only six have gone under section 13. Well, naturally

no soldier would go under section 13 if he could possibly avoid doing so, but I am quite certain that if that section is amended as it should be we shall find that a very large number of soldiers will take advantage of it.

Section 13 provides that where a soldier has a farm with a mortgage on it he can obtain a loan from the soldier settlement board in order to pay that mortgage back. He will not, however, receive any of the other benefits of the act. He will not receive any grant. I pointed that out in the committee and I pointed it out in the house. The Minister of Veterans Affairs will remember that the leader of the opposition at that time asked him whether my statement was correct, that there was discrimination, and the minister himself admitted that there was. But unfortunately nothing was done about it.

This is the situation. You may have a soldier with a half-section of land valued at $5,000, with a mortgage of $3,000, in which case he has an equity of $2,000 in that land. All he can do under the Veterans Land Act is to get a loan to pay off that mortgage with interest at 3½ per cent, but he does not get benefits beyond that. He does not get a grant but merely a loan. On the other hand, if a veteran returning has, instead of an equity of $2,000 in a half-section, $2,000 of an equity in bank deposits or $3,000 in bonds, he can get the benefit to the full extent of the act and can get an outright gift of around $2,300.

I maintain that the soldier who has a farm with a mortgage on it representing an equity of $2,000 should be able to sell that land back to the board and take advantage of the Veterans Land Act and get the full benefits of that act. Why should he be treated differently from the soldier who has his money tied up, not in land but in bonds?

The minister recognized last year that discrimination existed, but so far nothing has been done. Unfortunately, however, that is not the whole story. If a soldier obtains a loan to pay off a mortgage he loses the whole amount of the reestablishment credit. I could not believe that because, according to the act, he could lose it only to the extent that the benefits he receives are greater than the rehabilitation credit. But I telephoned the deputy minister regarding this and he informs me that if a soldier comes under section 13 he loses the reestablishment credit.

No one would argue that when a soldier receives a loan he is receiving more than his rehabilitation credit. Apparently they are taking the stand that a loan of $3,000 is the same as a gift of $3,000. The soldier does not receive any gift when he receives a loan; the only benefit he receives is a reduction in the rates of interest. Therefore the soldier who comes under that section should be entitled to the full amount of the rehabilitation credit, although it states that when he comes under the Veterans Land Act he loses those benefits. So long as he is under section 13 he should receive the full amount of the rehabilitation credit, and the minister will find, I believe, that the members of his staff are fully in accord with that suggestion. However, since we shall be discussing this question later on I will go into greater detail then.

One more question that I would refer to in this connection is the question of the merchant marine. Unfortunately the merchant marine is excluded entirely from all benefits of rehabilitation unless the seaman has received a disability while serving on a ship. That is as I understand it. We discussed this question in the soldier rehabilitation committee in 1942, and the opinion of the majority of the committee was that the merchant marine should benefit under the Veterans Land Act. But the minister then pointed out that it would not be in the interests of the country to encourage the seamen to leave the sea at the end of the war. The seamen would be needed, and therefore they could not make the act applicable to the merchant marine, but at a later date that might be done.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Has my hon. friend seen the order in council passed last year in regard to merchant marine benefits? If he has not I will send him a copy to-morrow.

Mr. QUELCH: Does it apply to the Veterans Land Act? Do they benefit under the Veterans Land Act?

Mr. MACKENZIE: No, but there are lots of other benefits.

Mr. QUELCH: That is what I am referring to. I am glad to hear that sailors do now receive certain benefits.

Mr. MACKENZIE: If pensionable.

Mr. QUELCH: Yes, provided that they suffer a disability while serving on a ship. But the soldier or the airman need not have received any disability in order to get the grant or the rehabilitation credit or any other rehabilitation measure. Why, therefore, should the merchant marine have to suffer a disability? All hon. members realize the tremendous service which the merchant marine has given the country.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I should be glad if the hon. member would defer this part of his remarks until I can send him a copy of the order in council to-morrow. I am afraid he has not seen it.

Mr. QUELCH: I was informed by an official of the department that a man had to be pensionable to get the benefits. He had to receive a disability.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Not for some of the benefits, but for the land act.

Mr. QUELCH: The minister admits that so far as the Veterans' Land Act is concerned the merchant marine are not eligible. The minister remembers that when this matter was discussed in the committee it was felt that at the earliest possible date the merchant marine should be eligible. Perhaps right now it is felt that these men are needed at sea, but as soon as we can spare them from the sea, then the act should be made available to them. In all sincerity I would say to the minister that perhaps the best way to encourage merchant marine seamen to stay on the sea would be to maintain a decent wage and not to do as the Park steamship company is trying to do, to bring about a drastic reduction in wages. That is not the way to encourage seamen to remain on the sea.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I must remind the hon. gentleman that he has spoken for over forty minutes.

Mr. QUELCH: If I might have one minute longer, I should like to have said a few words regarding the necessity of putting into operation certain national projects for irrigation. I understand from what the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) said yesterday, and from the white paper, that it is not intended to make a large expenditure in that regard now. They are going to build a shelf of national projects to take care of unemployment if it should occur in the future. In other words, national projects apparently are once more to become relief projects. I feel that where it can be shown that there is absolute need for implementing a certain project, that project should be carried out to-day just so long as the men and materials required can be found.

Mr. H. O. WHITE (Middlesex East): In rising to address the house for the first time I wish to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on the high office to which you have been elected. I wish also to thank you for the kindness you have extended to new members in overlooking some of their shortcomings. I know I shall be needing some of that consideration myself. I represent the constituency of Middlesex East, the area surrounding the city of London, and while surrounding the city of London I have not yet been able to surround the member for that constituency.

I am in a rather peculiar industry, possibly. While I am a farmer, I am surprised at the lack, shall I say, of words in appreciation and support of the farmers' position in the country. Not only am I a farmer, but I am engaged, as I say, in a peculiar industry in that I am able to steal a living from my neighbours. I am in the business of producing honey and those who want to get my product must line up and produce coupons.

A good deal has been said about housing and sanitary facilities, but no one seems to think about the men and women on our Canadian farms who have done without things for years, while at the same time producing the food to feed starving Europe. According to a survey, there are 125,000 sub-standard farm homes and it is also well known that there are hundreds of vacant homes throughout the farming areas of Canada. One only needs to drive through western Ontario to realize that conditions must change. We see weeds on every hand, fences and buildings in need of repairs. There is no shortage of things to be done. There are jobs for all. The very fact that this government subsidized farm products is an acknowledgment that the farmer is not receiving adequate prices and at a time when consumers generally are more able to pay for food than ever before. Farmers fear, above all else, that agriculture may be allowed to descend to the level of European peasantry.

It is my wish to direct the attention of the house to the noticeable absence in the speech from the throne to any specific plans for agriculture. This lack of plans for agriculture is noticeable in many instances, but more particularly in the present situation with regard to cattle marketing and failure to maintain hog production in face of the professed need for meat products. It is in the best interests of this house that the representatives of the people get back to earth occasionally. Anyone who was among the farmers and the people last week could not but understand that the farmers are up in arms over the cattle marketing situation.

The statement of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) on Friday, that the weighing facilities were responsible for the congestion at Toronto yards, is not the opinion which I received from A. M. Stewart, the oat king, one of the directors of the stockyards, residing in Middlesex county—

Mr. GARDINER: Partly responsible.

Mr. WHITE (Middlesex East): —and which was to the effect that 6,000 a day could be weighed. He stated that so far they have weighed without delay every lot that has been purchased and were prepared and equipped to handle all the cattle that come into the yards.

Mr. GARDINER: May I call the attention of the hon. member to the fact that the president of the organization said that the number was 4,000.

Mr. WHITE (Middlesex East): Farmers resent the strikes planned by labour in food processing plants which are timed at the most critical marketing periods, and apparently neither labour nor management care how great a loss these strikes are to the farmer. Labour is entitled to support in obtaining its high levels of employment, for decent hours and fair pay, but the farmers expect fair treatment as well. Information is not available as to the number of cattle sold directly to the packing houses, while hundreds of cattle are left in the stockyards unsold, to be purchased later at a loss to the producer.

A farmer acquaintance of mine, living near the Montana border in Alberta, told me that in the five years of war, the difference in price of cattle between Alberta and Montana has cost him about twenty thousand dollars.

There is a need for all the meat that we can produce, but farmers must not be forced to take a loss of from ten to twelve dollars on every good beast. On the other hand, small butchers and grocers are objecting to the complications and extra work the ration entails. Small operators are being sacrificed to the large packing companies. We hear considerable about the decentralization of industry. The best interests of the country are served when as much as possible of the processing can be done nearest the area of production, and not as the farmers are compelled to do under the present regulations, which send their produce to the plants of the big packers.

The much heralded free enterprise must also include free markets for our cattle and produce. George Bernard Shaw once said that this planet was the insane asylum of the universe. I think this is the only explanation of our meat ration and housing situation as it exists to-day. Some of its more erratic patients are in charge of those plans.

Let us take one look at the soil of Canada. Soil fertility is not an ever-flowing spring that is renewed each year by the snow and the rain. Every farm product that is sold off the farm removes certain essential elements of fertility. A glimpse of things to come along this line may be found in the decreasing yields of farm crops. The numerous deficiency diseases of plants, animals and humans are but an indication of the lack of these essential elements, as is the enormous increase of weeds which in a way is nature's attempt to repair soil depletion, by the return of humus to the soil. History has shown that man cannot disregard this important matter. Many once fertile areas of the old world are now deserts. Ever westward moved the farmers of America. Let us plan to maintain our soil, the basic wealth of this country. The farmer under present conditions is unable to make provision to maintain soil fertility. The government of Canada must not again permit the farm income to fall to such a low level that the farmer will be unable to buy the needed material for rebuilding his source of income.

A word or two about free enterprise. The farmer, to my mind, knows better than most just what free enterprise means. To him it means freedom to market his crops and sell his live stock where he pleases and at the best possible prices. He does not ask for state controls that hamper all his activities. He does ask for protection from the government in his dealings on the markets so that he may hold his own. We, as the parliament of Canada, must see that he gets that protection. We do not want conditions such as would drive him in defeat to the socialist way of life; conditions where he has to sell to the big packer at a loss on his cost of production when he could sell elsewhere at a profit, for instance, in the United States. Socialism thrives on a defeatist attitude and our farmers must not be allowed to fall into it. They have their hopes pinned on us. We must fulfil their expectations.

Farmers are not looking for social security. All they have ever asked for is an opportunity to sell their products at a parity price with the things they have to buy. Given a parity price, they will be able to equip their farms and homes to modern standards; they will be able to educate their children; they will be able to have leisure time; they will be able to lay something aside to provide for their old age Just as in the case of the worker, where real social security means the right to a good job at good pay, the farmer can provide his own social security if he is given the opportunity.

I wish to say a word or two about the Veterans' Land Act housing. Veterans' Land Act houses are a menace to rural municipalities. They must be the dream of a bachelor. Municipalities are going to be saddled with these houses. Drainage, roads and many services will be demanded. Fortunate are the municipalities that are without these rural

slums. There is something the matter when good hundred acre farms with house and barns in Middlesex, Lambton, Huron, Perth and many other counties sell for less money than these veterans' land houses of questionable value. Before the veteran has paid for the house, he will certainly have lost his equity in it.

With the war over, we all want to see a reduction in taxation and in our national debt. With gratuities and the social security measures planned we shall not find this easy. It must be done, however, if we are to go forward in the post-war period. Canada needs selected immigration. If our population were double what it is now, our debt per capita could be cut in half. If prices of farm products and basic industries are allowed to fall to one-half their present level, that would be the equivalent of doubling our national debt.

I wish to say a word about the transatlantic conference lines. Prior to the war I was engaged in exporting honey to the United Kingdom. At that time an agreement existed between the principal steamship lines in regard to rates from Montreal and other seaboard ports. Owing to an oversight Toronto was not included in this agreement, and small Norwegian freighters could come to Toronto, pick up freight and deliver it in the United Kingdom for much less than the conference rates. With the advent of a Canadian merchant navy owing to the war and, at some future date, the deepening of the St. Lawrence river, let us be in a position to market our Canadian produce in Canadian boats, at rates which are not set by any cartel or outside shipping monopoly.

On motion of Mr. Belzile the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie the house adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

Wednesday, September 19, 1945.

The house met at three o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

REFERENCE BY MR. SPEAKER TO DISPLAYING OF EXHIBITS DURING SPEECHES

On the order for motions:

Mr. SPEAKER: I desire to draw the attention of the house to a new practice which, in my opinion, should not become general in the debates of this house. I refer to members' displaying of exhibits when making speeches. On Monday last, an hon. member came in with two baskets of peaches and showed them to the house in order to make a point in the discussion. Yesterday, another hon. member unfolded a large flag and spread it wide over one of the gangways. I think the house will agree that such a practice is far from adding to the dignity and decorum of the House of Commons of Canada. The proper places for the production of exhibits are the standing and special committees where they may be required as evidence in certain investigations. If perchance the display of merchandise on the floor of the house should become part of our procedure, I am very much afraid it would create an atmosphere hardly desirable for a parliamentary institution, and I trust the house will bear with me when I say that hon. members should refrain from such a practice in the future.

WHEAT

MAXIMUM PRICE FOR EXPORT—ESTABLISHMENT OF LONG TERM FLOOR PRICE

On the order for motions:

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a brief statement on wheat prices.

The second world war has concluded with Canadian wheat producers in a particularly strong marketing position. Not only has the general disruption and bad weather reduced production in the war areas, but the Australian and North African crop failures and a small crop in Argentina have left Canada and the United States as the only countries at present having substantial export surpluses of wheat. This has coincided with the release of pent-up demands in the liberated areas.

In these extraordinary circumstances, Canadian wheat might well command for a limited period very much higher prices in the world market. The importing countries, nearly all of them our allies in the war, are buying out of necessity and, to a large extent, on credits. They would be compelled to meet through larger credits or through sacrifice of other food and rehabilitation supplies whatever higher price is demanded for Canadian wheat.

It is in the interest of Canada and of Canadian wheat growers that the importing countries should continue to obtain Canadian wheat at prices not in excess of those prevailing at the end of hostilities. Accordingly the government, by order in council, has instructed the Canadian wheat board to offer wheat for sale for export overseas at prices not higher than the current export price of $1.55 per bushel, basis No. 1 northern, in store Fort William/Port Arthur or Vancouver.

In asking Canadian producers to forgo such benefits as might be realized in the short run through higher export prices, the government

recognizes the paramount need for relative stability of income to wheat producers. Toward this end, the government undertakes that in the five-year period ending July 31, 1950, producers will receive not less than $1 per bushel, basis No. 1 northern, in store Fort William/Port Arthur or Vancouver on the authorized deliveries for each crop year. For the balance of the 1945-1946 crop year, at least, the Canadian wheat board initial advance will continue at $1.25, where it was set two years ago. By providing a long-term floor price of not less than $1.00 the government will protect producers against the consequences of any sharp reversal in the world wheat position during the next five-year period.

The government, in adopting this policy of a maximum price for overseas shipments for the present and a floor price for five years, is asking the producers, in their own interests, to forgo exceptional short-run advantages in favour of a long-run stability of income. In arriving at its decision on this policy, the government had the following fundamental considerations in mind:

Any further increase in wheat prices now would aggravate the problems of economic and political readjustment of the liberated areas to Canada's detriment in future trade with those areas. There is a moral obligation not to take advantage of our recent allies in their time of compelling need.

Higher wheat prices would encourage the importing countries in a hurried return to wheat production and pre-war wheat policies very directly to the detriment of the wheat exporting countries, particularly Canada. Moreover, production in a number of exporting countries would be unduly encouraged.

I wish to lay on the table copies of order in council P.C. 6122.

Mr. WRIGHT: May I ask a question with regard to the statement the minister has read? Does it imply that the wheat board will continue to operate until 1950?

Mr. MacKINNON: It does not refer to that. The hon. member can deduce what he wishes from the statement, but there is no reference to the continuation or non-continuation of the wheat board. I anticipate and the government anticipates that the wheat board will continue indefinitely.

Mr. COLDWELL: In view of the importance of this statement, with the material it contains, to the producers of western Canada particularly, will the government set aside a day when the matter might be discussed by members who represent the wheat growing areas of the country? The statement is so important that it should not be tabled without discussion.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Do I gather that deliveries of wheat in the years between now and 1950 are to be governed by a quota, as was the case during the war?

Mr. MacKINNON: I made no reference to that. If the hon. member reads the statement he will see that the point is covered.

Mr. SENN: Does the statement apply to winter wheat from the eastern provinces as well as the western?

Mr. MacKINNON: The statement refers only to western wheat, wheat grown in the western provinces. Ontario wheat production is dealt with on another basis.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I gathered from the minister's statement that a quota was to be imposed on the amount of grain which could be delivered. Of what value would it be to the farmer to have a guaranteed price if the quota which he can sell is too small to enable him to live?

Mr. SPEAKER: I must point out to the hon. member that the matter is not debatable.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The leader of the opposition asked if it would be possible—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I meant the leader of the C.C.F. party, who is also a part of the opposition. He asked whether the government would set apart a day to discuss the matter of wheat just referred to. First of all let me say, as to giving information immediately to the house, I hope the house will accept that as a mark of respect, if I may put it in that way, rather than as something to be criticized. The desire of the government was to have the house given information on this important matter at the earliest possible moment. As to setting apart a day, I think we should conclude the debate on the address before we consider fixing any time for other matters. Once the debate on the address is concluded there will be occasions, as for example when the house is moved into committee of supply, on which this matter could be brought up for discussion in a regular way. I think that would be preferable to fixing a special day at present.

Mr. COLDWELL: We will bear that in mind. May I ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce whether the government is also imposing the wartime ceiling on exporters of textiles, lumber and all other goods based

on our primary products? I ask this question because of the information I have in regard to textiles.

Mr. MacKINNON: I would appreciate it if my hon. friend would put his question on the order paper; I do not think I can answer it offhand.

Mr. COLDWELL: Very well.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

WINDSOR AREA—BOARDS OF CONCILIATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. F. BROWN (Essext West): Will the Minister of Labour please indicate what the present situation is in the Windsor area with respect to the arrangements made for meetings of boards of conciliation established as a result of applications by the U.A.W.-C.I.O. under the wartime labour relations regulations, P.C. 1003, and when the reports of such boards may be expected?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): A number of boards have been constituted in the Windsor area on application of the United Automobile Workers of the C.I.O.

The boards of conciliation dealing with the disputes affecting Canadian Automotive Trim Limited and Bendix Eclipse of Canada Limited have filed their reports and copies were transmitted to the parties yesterday.

The board dealing with the dispute affecting the Windsor Tool and Die Limited has concluded its sittings and its report is expected at the end of this week.

Two boards under the chairmanship of Judge Ian M. Macdonell of Toronto dealing with disputes affecting Dominion Forge and Stamping Company and Walker Metal Products Limited, and one board under the chairmanship of Judge E. Lovering of Toronto, namely, Truscon Steel Corporation of Canada Limited, have been fully constituted and I am advised that hearings have been arranged for next week.

Another board of conciliation has been established in the dispute affecting Chrysler Corporation of Canada Limited, but it has not yet been fully constituted, the company having nominated its representative only on Monday of this week. The nominees of the union and the company are now conferring with respect to the selection of a chairman.

I should like to point out to the house that there are certain time limits imposed by the regulations for the nomination of board members by employers and employees, for the selection of a chairman by both, and within which the boards are required to report to the minister. This is made in view of the fact that sometimes the employers and sometimes the employees make certain observations with reference to delays in the constitution, the sittings and the findings of boards of conciliation. Once a board has been fully constituted the time set for hearings is a matter for decision by the board itself, that is, the representatives of employers and employees and the chairman of the board.

ADVERTISEMENTS SEEKING CANADIAN WORKERS AS POTATO PICKERS IN MAINE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. DONALD M. FLEMING (Eglinton): May I direct this question to the Minister of Labour? Is the minister aware that there have appeared in the press of Montreal and other eastern cities in recent days advertisements purporting to be inserted by the national employment service, unemployment insurance commission, for workers to offer their services as potato pickers in the state of Maine, at a time when there is a shortage of labour in the timber-producing areas of Ontario, where operators are not permitted to advertise for workers?

Mr. SPEAKER: I must remind the hon. member that the question shoud be short and to the point.

Mr. BLACK: Mr. Speaker, may I—

Mr. FLEMING: May I have the minister's answer? It is an important matter.

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I say this in a kindly way; after listening to some of the speeches from the opposition in the last couple of weeks—

Mr. ROWE: You are not making a speech.

Mr. MITCHELL: Just a moment. After listening to some of the speeches delivered by hon. members of the opposition in the last two weeks I am glad to know that in some parts of Canada at least there is a shortage of labour. I thought there was a terrific unemployment situation all across the country.

Now, dealing with my hon. friend's question, for many years past, perhaps longer than many of us have been alive, there has been a natural movement of labour in certain parts of this country—I speak now of the Atlantic and the Pacific—across the border during harvesting time. In western Canada there is that movement from the Dakotas and Utah to assist in harvesting there. Last year, and as a matter of fact every year since the war broke out, we have had a movement of labour from

certain localities in Quebec and New Brunswick into the states of Maine and New Hampshire, and I hope it will always be that way. Even during war years we were able to man the lumber camps in this country, and I anticipate we shall be able to do the same thing next winter.

Mr. FLEMING: Is it a fact that Ontario operators engaged in the production of timber and pulp are not permitted under existing regulations to advertise or canvass for men in the province of Quebec?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. gentleman should put his question on the order paper.

Mr. FLEMING: With great respect, I am told that this is a matter of very great urgency in the timber producing areas of Ontario.

Mr. SPEAKER: From what I have heard there is no great urgency about the matter, and the question should be placed on the order paper.

CANADIAN NAVY

CONDITIONS OF POST-WAR RECRUITMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. K. FRASER (Peterborough West): Yesterday I asked a question of the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services with regard to the Royal Canadian Navy and the minister said he would make inquiries and answer the question to-day.

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of National Defence for Naval Services): I apologize to my hon. friend; I overlooked making the inquiries. I shall make them this afternoon and give him an answer to-morrow.

KHAKI UNIVERSITY

INQUIRY AS TO ESTABLISHMENT IN UNITED KINGDOM

On the orders of the day:

Hon. H. A. BRUCE (Parkdale): May I ask a question of the Minister of National Defence? Has the defence department established a khaki university of Canada in the United Kingdom? If so, will the minister give full particulars as to the site, staff, cost and function?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of National Defence): I shall be glad to give the information, Mr. Speaker. Of course I cannot do it to-day. Whether I should do it in answer to a question on the orders of the day, or whether it should be put on the order paper or be asked on the estimates, is a matter of opinion.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to remind the hon. member that questions on the orders of the day should be short and to the point, and should deal with matters of urgency. If there is no urgency they should be placed on the order paper.

Mr. BRUCE: I ask the minister to take it as notice of my question.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

MERCHANT SEAMEN

INQUIRY AS TO ELIMINATION OF WAR RISK BONUS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON B. ISNOR (Halifax): I have received a large number of communications, telegrams and letters with respect to the war risk bonus being paid to seamen. I desire to ask the Minister of Labour the following question: Is it true that the war risk bonus paid to seamen is to be discontinued; and specifically has the Park Steamship company applied to the national war labour board for a wage reduction which would represent the elimination of the bonus?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): There are two questions involved there. I shall answer the last question first. The answer to my knowledge is "No". I should like to tell the hon. member and the house that no steps are being taken at the moment for the elimination of war risk bonus.

UNITED NATIONS

CANADA AS INTERNATIONAL PEACE CENTRE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister in his capacity as Secretary of State for External Affairs. In the press of this week there have appeared articles relating to the preparatory work being done by the interim commission for the setting up of the united nations organization. In these reports it is stated that two sites are being considered for the site of the united nations organization and the international peace centre. The two sites mentioned are Geneva and San Francisco. Would the Prime Minister be good enough to inform the house whether or not an invitation has been extended by the dominion government to the organization looking towards the choice of Canada as an international peace centre? It would seem to me, and I am quite sure to the Prime Minister

as well, that there are powerful and compelling reasons which could be advanced by way of argument to have the centre in Canada.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Secretary of State for External Affairs): May I say to my hon. friend that no formal invitation has been extended to the interim commission with respect to the matter to which he has just referred; but I think it is well understood by all the nations that are members of the united nations organization that if the interim committee should wish to have the whole or any part of the organization located in Canada, this country would regard a request of the kind as complimentary, and one which would be cordially welcomed and sympathetically reviewed. I understand that the interim commission is not considering any one locality but is considering the advantages of different countries. I have not the least doubt in the world that Canada is among the number.

MEAT RATIONING

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON PROGRESS OF CONFERENCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. P. C. BLACK (Cumberland): I should like to ask the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Agriculture if they are in a position to make a statement as to what progress is being made in the conference on meat rationing, which I understand is proceeding at the moment. I have communications from my constituency and from the maritime provinces pointing out that it is difficult, indeed almost impossible, for them to carry on supplying meat and marketing meat products and at the same time adhere to the regulations. They are greatly interested in knowing whether the regulations are to be cancelled, modified or confirmed. I have been informed that as the regulations stand at the present time they will not continue marketing after the 24th of this month.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I must remind the hon. member that questions should be short and direct, without any statement being added to them. Moreover, I should like to say that when there is no urgency they should be placed on the order paper.

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): I cannot report on the outcome of the conference because it is not yet over.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): The conference is in progress, however?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

LIVE STOCK

GOVERNMENT ACTION IN DROUGHT AREAS OF SASKATCHEWAN AND ALBERTA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. J. McCUAIG (Maple Creek): In view of the very critical drought conditions, the second worst in thirty-five years, in southwest Saskatchewan and south-east Alberta, would the Minister of Agriculture inform the house what steps the federal government is prepared to take to relieve the congestion in shipping and packing house facilities in those areas?

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): I thank the hon. member for having sent me a copy of his question. As far as I know there has not developed, up to the moment, any serious problem in connection with shipping or the utilization of packing house facilities in the drought area of western Canada, but a very serious condition does exist there which may necessitate shipping the live stock from that area because of lack of feed. I have been in communication with the provincial governments, and more particularly with the government of Saskatchewan, for the last six weeks, since I made a trip through the area and discussed the matter with the provincial minister of agriculture. Since that time arrangements have been made for the distribution of feed, in regard to which I may have something further to say to-morrow, and both governments also have urged all those in that area who have live stock ready for marketing to get it out at an early day. In other words we have been urging farmers who have cattle on the grass almost ready for marketing to get those cattle out as soon as they are ready, and that may have something to do with the fact that up to the present time killings in the plants are running through at record rates as far as cattle are concerned. That is being done in order that there may not be an undue marketing of cattle next month, particularly toward the end of the month. I may add that this does not concern something we are going to do; we have already started to do it. We have had the cooperation of the provincial authorities in the matter, as they have had ours.

HOUSING

STEPS TAKEN TO RELIEVE SHORTAGE—TABLING OF P.C. 5794

On the orders of the day:

Hon. H. A. BRUCE (Parkdale): Will the Minister of Finance make a statement at an early day as to the steps his department has taken to meet the acute shortage of housing

throughout Canada and, arising out of that question, would the minister place on the table of the house order in council P.C. 5794 of August 30, 1945, dealing with amendments to the National Housing Act?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): I table now the order in council referred to. As to the first part of the question, amendments will be proposed to the National Housing Act, at which time I will make a statement.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Tuesday, September 18, consideration of the motion of Mr. W. M. Benidickson for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Bracken, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Mr. GLEASON BELZILE (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, since your election as first commoner you have received many congratulations, all appropriately expressed and all well deserved. You have even been complimented upon your wisdom in your choice of ancestors. I shall be very brief, because I do not want to repeat any of the things which have already been said much better than I could say them.

(Translation): However, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call forth your kind rcollections. I go back some twenty-five years, when I had the pleasure of being your fellow-student in the same institutions, first at the Collége Ste-Marie, and afterwards at the Université de Montreal, and I take the liberty of telling you that, even then, your kind-heartedness and your intelligence, your industriousness and your thirst for knowledge were foreboding the high success which life held in reserve for you. In fact, you were among the few people about whom a poet said:

Aux âmes bien nées, la valeur n'attend pas le nombre des années.

Let me assure you that I am glad indeed to delve into that past and to recall those memories to you, because I am sure you will thus be prompted to deal kindly with your former comrade.

(Text): I also compliment the mover and the seconder of the address. The speeches they delivered in this house disclosed their sense of duty toward their fellow members in the armed services, and they may rest assured that in due time their representations will receive my most cordial support. All who participated in our victory are entitled to the gratitude of their country. They deserve that peace be kind and consoling to them. They are entitled to a chance to forget all the horrors and atrocities they have suffered.

I also compliment the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) upon his election to this house. In the interests of my constituency I sincerely hope that his service in that capacity may be equal to or even longer than the service of the Prime Minister, which is something over twenty-five years.

(Translation): I am proud, Mr. Speaker, to act in this house as spokesman for the people of the constituency of Rimouski. However, that implies a heavy responsibility because my constituents expect me to represent them with dignity and courage; I dare hope that I shall deserve the confidence they placed in me. Unassuming and industrious, the population of Rimouski includes farmers, workmen and settlers who follow the traditions left by the pioneers of this country. During the last twenty-five years, twelve new parishes have been established in my constituency and they are to-day among our most populous and prosperous communities. There are other constituencies which cover a larger area, but there are few which are more outstanding in the field of cooperation and education.

(Text): In the cooperative field, the county of Rimouski compares most favourably with any other county either in Quebec or in Canada, except possibly the counties of Bonaventure and Gaspe. Every parish has its own agricultural cooperative and its credit union or caisse populaire, which to a great extent have contributed to its development and progress. We also have consumers cooperatives which rendered great service during the war.

Last year two professors of the university of Wisconsin came to Rimouski to study, on the spot, the working of these organizations. They were dumbfounded by what was revealed to them. They saw a consumers' cooperative founded five years ago with an initial membership of 80 and a capital of $800—$10 per member—doing business at the rate of $200,000 a year, in 1944, and in the midst of the labouring classes.

Since coming to the house I have heard practically every hon. member who has spoken deal with the housing problem in his constituency. I have read in the newspapers that this is an acute problem throughout Canada. I have pleasure in informing the house, however, that there is no housing problem in the town of Rimouski. Our credit union or caisse populaire saw to that. Since 1939 they have made 575 loans, ranging from $500 to $8,000 for the repair and building of houses.

The professors from the university of Wisconsin, to whom I referred a moment ago, saw a whole suburb of Rimouski, comprising some 3,000 people, living in houses built with those loans. This is how the caisse populaire system works. It pays for all the material and skilled labour, the borrower building the house with his own hands and with the assistance of his friends and neighbours whom, in turn, he helps. The result is that a loan of $2,500 builds a house which would be valued at $4,000. So that now the parish of St. Robert Bellarmin, thanks to the caisse populaire, forms a distinct community in the town of Rimouski. It has its own church, its own school and, of course, its own caisse populaire. It needs now only a post office, and I am now asking the Postmaster General (Mr. Bertrand) to grant them this much needed service.

(Translation): I have just mentioned the educational field. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, Rimouski's teaching institutions and schools are among the finest and most extensive in French Canada. The inhabitants of Rimouski riding are fully aware of the advantages derived from education as shown by their steady contribution to the building and maintenance of institutions devoted to spreading knowledge. The secondary schools of the town of Rimouski can hold their own with those of wealthier and larger cities. As a matter of fact, Rimouski, as far as statistics go, comes immediately after Montreal and Quebec for the facilities its puts at the disposal of young students. There you will find every type of school required by studious young people. I refer particularly to the Rimouski Seminary which ought to obtain the title it so well deserves, that of rural university.

Indeed, the Rimouski Seminary includes a school of theology, a classical college, a school of agriculture, a school of commerce, a naval school and also an arts and crafts school. This great French-Canadian institution receives each year over twelve hundred boarding pupils. I wish to emphasize particularly the contribution of our arts and crafts school and of our naval school to the war effort of Canada. Thousands of young men have received there technical training which enabled them to become specialists in the various branches of the army and the navy.

Here, may I express the wish that those who have lived among our people and who have learned to know them will make known throughout Canada the kindliness which has been shown them in our section of the country. They will thus contribute to strengthen the ties which eventually must unite the exponents of our two cultures; part of their education will have been acquired among us, and we hope that their remembrance will be lasting and friendly.

I wish to pay a tribute to the teachers, both ecclesiastic and lay, who, for a mere pittance, have dedicated their lives to our young people, and I assure them of my utmost respect and gratitude.

Sitting for the first time in this house, I am now going through the ordeal which marks the initiation of a new member. I have conscientiously done everything prescribed. With the greatest care and attention I have followed and admired the impressive ceremonies which have taken place on the opening of this parliament, and I was quite moved when I heard His Excellency, the Governor General of Canada read the speech from the throne in the language of my forefathers. A deep feeling of piety and gratitude arose within my soul toward all those who, after the conquest, won for us the political freedom we now enjoy; I refer to Viger, Morin, Papineau, Lafontaine, Cartier, and all those great patriots who laboured without respite so that the vanquished of 1760 might become the equals of their conquerors. May God forbid that I should forget the example of their devotion to their compatriots and their self-denial in the fulfilment of their duty.

I listened with much attention to the speeches delivered on the address. Gradually, the emotion which at first gripped my heart was transformed into a feeling of surprise. Some speeches delivered from the other side of this house greatly amazed me. I cannot deal with all of them, but I shall mention a few.

An hon. member of the Progressive Conservative party has expressed his astonishment at the little support granted to his party in the province of Quebec. Yet, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the election of two members, one French speaking, the other English speaking, sets a record which should satisfy the hon. member. Nothing in the Progressive Conservative platform could appeal to the legitimate aspirations of the electorate in my riding to whom overbidding and exaggeration are distasteful. While they feel the deepest respect for His Majesty the King and the Crown, and are honestly proud to be part of the British Commonwealth of Nations, they object to obsolete imperialism and colonialism. They are content that Canada should be as free as the United Kingdom to direct its own policy so as to further its own interests; they ask but to be masters in their own

home, and they well realize that the Westminster statute was the work of a Liberal government. Others, while expressing themselves satisfied to a certain extent with Canada's war effort, have severely criticized the Liberal administration of the past five years. I have a habit of looking back, and I recall that Canada was at various times under Conservative leadership; I also find that all crises and depressions occurred under Conservative administration. In 1890, when the rural parishes of Rimouski constituency were emptying into the American melting pot, were not the Conservatives in power? What had their government done to prevent that unfortunate exodus which deprived the country of millions of citizens? How can it be explained that industries which rise and expand in New England were not launched in our country? Yet, in those days, high tariff was the recognized panacea. At the time of the 1911 crisis, was Canada not governed by Mr. Borden? And who but the Conservatives were in power through the inflation and deflation periods of the first world war? Finally, how did the Bennett regime solve the unemployment crisis which sapped our country's fundamental strength? Yet, in those days, Mr. Bennett commanded a sufficient majority to implement his programme providing for continued prosperity and employment while remaining within the limits of the Constitution. How can it be explained that Conservative principles of government, legislation and control of the country did not prevent these disasters? To my mind, it is ill-advised to demand that such principles be applied to the present day administration of the country.

It cannot be claimed, Mr. Speaker, that these unfortunate happenings were entirely coincidental and solely dependent on world-wide causes. A brief glance backwards shows that Canada's periods of greatness occurred under Liberal administration. Around 1900, we had the period which historians now call "the Laurier prosperity." It is sufficient to recall the revival which took place during the first term of the present prime minister, and it is sufficient to think of the record of the present administration, of the great strides made by this country, of its magnificent war effort and of the achievement of a truly Canadian spirit. And shortly we shall have a symbol which is necessary now that our country has attained the rank of a great international power.

It is unnecessary to dwell at greater length on this matter as everyone in this house knows the position occupied by Canada in the international sphere; the greatest powers in the world have recognized the greatness of our country and have sent ambassadors to our capital. And Canada has her own ambassadors; she has sent trade commissioners to strategic places throughout the world and the international agreements which she has concluded with various countries have opened numerous outlets for the products of our industry and our agriculture. It is true to say that it is due to the policies of the Liberal party if Canada has, to quote the words of André Siegfried, risen to the rank of an international power. Those are the results of the application of the principles of Canadian liberalism.

And, Mr. Speaker, my amazement gives way to apprehension when I consider the programme of the C.C.F. party.

Basing their theories upon mere assumptions or resentment, the exponents of socialism attack the very foundations of social order. They consider the whole of civilization as being based solely upon economic factors, and establish on this shaky foundation the relations of individuals among themselves and with society. They subordinate man, composed of flesh and mind, to matter and place him under the absolute control of an all-powerful state; there lies their grave mistake. It must not be overlooked that there is in the socialist movement some idealism which might attract the mass of workers. Indeed some of its claims are partly justified and this may account for some of its successes at election time. But the social problem has other angles which make their whole programme absolutely unacceptable. Socialism stems from a false interpretation of values and it advocates a utopian organization of labour. The experiment already carried out in other parts of the world with a state which both produces and distributes shows how dreadful the application of this system would be in our country. Indeed, those who have tried to apply it fully are now abandoning their original uncompromising attitude and agree to return to the respect of individual rights, all of which shows the mischievous nature of this doctrine. The socialistic solution can only bring about ruin and general poverty; it will of necessity hold back production because the labourer who is deprived of the stimulus of personal interest will not have the courage to work. It still remains true that personal interest and the desire to better one's condition constitute the greatest stimulus to work and that any attempt to abolish it is simply an idle fancy.

This is so true that this house heard the remark of an hon. member when he humorously congratulated his brood sow for the freedom from work she enjoyed. Such irony when carried out to the extreme, amply demonstrates the utopian character of this theory. Work remains and will remain the lot of humanity.

Lastly, the socialistic solution is unjust because it encroaches upon the natural right of property which is anterior to society and inalienably belongs to the individual and the family. The state makes use of undue authority when it endeavours to restrict the exercise of this right, when not compelled to do so in the interest of the people.

It is absolutely certain that no government in Canada could put into practical application the socialistic principles. Such an experience would necessarily reduce our people to slavery and result in the loss of their economic freedom. All the pioneers and founders of this country came over here for the sake of freedom and with the will to enjoy it completely, and their descendants, whose needs are the same, would have nothing left but freedom of thought limited by the obligation of holding their tongue. The ideal situation is not that man should be wolf to man, according to the English philosopher Hobbes, but should strive rather by the actual practice of justice and even of charity to create a more and more intimate relationship between capital and labour. They are indispensable agents in the same achievement and they are destined to cooperate rather than to oppose one another.

The time is riper than ever for the implementation of the doctrine of Canadian liberalism as advocated by Laurier. It is national in character and capable of application to all classes of society from one ocean to the other. Its ideal of freedom for all is its immediate field; social justice and security, the bettering of the living standard of the humble and the poor have been the dream of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. To-day, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) is on the point of making it come true. Money has been relegated to its proper function, that of serving the interests of the human race. At this moment, I think of the achievements of the Liberal party in this field: child welfare, national employment organization, unemployment insurance, veterans relief, family allowances, old-age pension. In another sphere, there are the arbitration of labour disputes, the establishment of minimum wages, the granting of agricultural loans and the civil re-establishment of veterans of the armed forces.

Fairness in social relations flows from such legislation and their proper enforcement. Although defective, like all other human achievements, they nevertheless place Canada first among the civilized nations in the field of social legislation. It is through these measures that the Liberal party has shown its concern about the welfare and the betterment of living standards both for the individual and the family. In them are incorporated all the progress realized in other parts of the universe. Experience has taught the Liberals how to control traditional doctrines; liberalism has remained faithful to the absolute and unchaning principles of individual freedom in society and of natural property rights; however, it has adapted their application to the new conditions that now prevail for the greater good of all our citizens. Thus, it was in a position to grant requests which, at first, seemed incompatible. It has endeavoured to reconcile authority and freedom, individualism and social sense; it has carefully avoided opposite errors and aimed at the maintenance of peace and harmony on all social levels and among all classes of Canadians. This ideal was so commendable that other parties are endeavouring to claim it as their own.

I find confirmation of these statements in the first part of the speech from the throne. It takes into account both the anxiety of the man on the street and the problems of the social worker. It raises politics on a level with human solidarity and the practice of social justice. Is it not astounding that some have found it vague and even incomprehensible? The speech from the throne is inspired by an ideal far above the economic and monetary planes and this may be why some people have not understood its implications. On hearing it, I remembered a short definition of civilization given by a contemporary philosopher, Mr. M. Daniel Rops:

> Civilization is a state of equilibrium between a moral ideal and a practical economic and administrative system.

Mr. Speaker, the implementation of the principles enumerated in the speech from the throne is a guarantee of a sound and just administration of the country. I am proud, as representative of the people of the constituency of Rimouski, to give my unfailing support to a government who advocates such an ideal and gives such a guarantee. It is the assurance of a progressive and united Canada where living will be a pleasure.

Mr. RONALD MOORE (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to this debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne. I understand

it covers most of the legislation which the government propose to bring forward at this time to meet the conditions which confront the people of this country. It is to be regretted that more has not been brought forward in the speech from the throne because there can be no question about it, the Canadian people face the most crucial period they have ever experienced in their history.

The first condition with which I think we have to deal, and to deal with very shortly, is reconversion. I notice the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) told us that already plans had been laid for rebuilding Canadian industry to peace-time conditions. But what plans have been laid? I understand some industries have already been reconverted, but just last night we heard that reconversion will not be completed until 1948. That is a most serious situation and should receive the earnest consideration of this house. I have received letters, in this morning's mail, telling me that war workers who were laid off in the city of Winnipeg and received peace-time jobs in packing plants have already had to cash in on their bonds in order to keep up their standard of living. I think it is imperative that the government do something; indeed they should already have done something, to raise the wages of war workers who are going into peace-time work. According to the Toronto welfare board it requires $35.90 a week to live up to modern standards. What is the average wage of a war-time worker in one of our war plants? It is around eighty cents an hour. It may vary in different parts of the country, but generally speaking eighty cents an hour is a good average. The worker needs approximately $35 a week after all expenses by way of taxation have been met. I submit that that amount of money is not too much to receive for a week's work. So far nothing has been done by the present government to increase the rate of pay of those working in our peace-time industries, those industries which are going to become so important in the very near future, because we have now finished the war, and are on to peace-time work, peace-time construction. So much for the necessity of a more definite policy so far as reconversion is concerned.

I want now to deal for a few minutes with rehabilitation. I am very much interested in the rehabilitation policy of the present administration, because I, too, am a returned man. I might say that from D-day on until the end of the war every Canadian service man was discussing the rehabilitation policy of the present government and wanting to know if he would have a job when the war was over. Not only that, but they wanted to know what was the chief issue in the election campaign, and whether they would be assured of full employment. During that period, the administration issued a pamphlet which was entitled "Back to Civil Life." First, I wish to congratulate the administration upon their war service gratuities. Taking them as a whole they are very fair, possibly higher than those of any other country in the world. No doubt some changes could be made. I do not think the clothing allowance is high enough. Also, as regards the department's reference to the buying of power machinery for those who are going to take up farming, $1,200 is not sufficient to outfit a farm with power machinery. As I have said, however, taking the gratuities all in all they are, I think, very fair.

What about the carrying out of the policy? In the little pamphlet to which I have referred, and which I believe was issued by the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie), it is stated that the success of the government's rehabilitation policy depended, first, upon the initiative of the veteran himself, and second, upon the ability of private enterprise to supply jobs. If the success of our rehabilitation policy is dependent upon the ability of private enterprise to keep our soldiers employed, I venture to say that when the next depression hits this country the service men will go down like tenpins in a bowling alley.

I know there are hon. members who hold stern views as to the necessity of maintaining private enterprise as the basis of our economy. I respect those views, but just as honestly as I respect them, I want to make clear my opinion that it is impossible for private enterprise to solve the problems which confront our people. When the next depression strikes this country we shall have mass unemployment, because it is not the policy of private enterprise to supply employment; their interest is only in the making of profits; when there is no profit in a certain business private enterprise will take no part in further production in that line.

In order to prove that this is the case I wish to quote from the *Bankers' Magazine* for January, 1943. Listen to what it has to say about the necessity of unemployment to maintain the private ownership system of production:

> And is there not also a tendency in much of this modern planning—not forgetting the Beveridge plan—to overlook the fact that, human nature being what it is, the workers of the future, capitalists and wage-earners alike, will require the old spur of rewards and punishments (good profits and good wages, fear of losses and bankruptcy, and, yes, fear of unemployment and poverty) to ensure the necessary drive in this work of internal and international competition?

I am sure that hon. members would have to look through a great many magazines in the parliamentary library before they could find one paragraph containing as much nonsense as there is in that one paragraph in the *Bankers' Magazine.*

But that is not the most serious implication of the *Bankers' Magazine.* We must have unemployment and poverty, so they say, to maintain the efficiency of the capitalistic system; but what about the necessity for "drive" in the field of national and international competition? That is the most serious implication of this statement in the *Bankers' Magazine.* Obviously, if that is the case the Atlantic charter means no more to the international bankers than does the Beveridge plan or the Marsh report, for if we are to have "drive" in national and international affairs, how can we ever subscribe to the fourth and fifth paragraphs of the Atlantic charter? I wish to quote those paragraphs:

4. They—

Meaning the United States and Great Britain.

—will endeavour, with due respect for all their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity.

How can any system of private individualism or private initiative subscribe to that? I do not see how they can do it.

5. They desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing for all, improved labour standards, economic adjustment and social security.

These are noble commitments, but I earnestly submit that this government cannot subscribe to them and maintain the private system of ownership.

Let us consider for just a moment the great economic concentration which has taken place, a condition which applies not only to Canada but to the capitalist system generally. It is true of the United States and of every other country operating under that system. According to the survey of financial corporations for 1934, what do we find? Our three largest banks control seventy per cent of all the banking assets of the country, and in addition to that the same three banks control 832 directorships in 375 of the largest corporations in Canada manufacturing practically every known need of the Canadian people. I ask the administration, do they think that is a fair basis on which to build up an economy to bring about "a bright new world?" It cannot be done. The only solution to the problem is to begin right now to build a cooperative system in this country and I am suggesting to the government that they should begin the building of that system at once. We already have in some of the war-time controls, in our cooperative enterprises, a large measure of cooperation and I think the government ought to continue to extend that, because in cooperation lies the future of the Canadian economy.

In order to explain fully what I mean I should like to quote an article which appeared in the Ottawa *Journal* of September 5, 1945. I am sure hon. gentlemen to my right will be very much interested in this article because it deals with one of the greatest socialist enterprises to be found anywhere in the British empire, and possibly it is as great as any socialist enterprise to be found in the Soviet Union itself. I am referring to the Ontario hydro electric commission. I quote the following:

There is little to be reviewed that is new; but it is well that the public mind should be refreshed sometimes with some of the salient facts about this great provincial asset, and the commission and its work. Established by the Ontario legislature in 1906, the commission is now nearly forty years in operation. An enterprise considered dubious in 1906, the commission has long proved a magnificent success. It now supplies cheap hydro electric power to over 900 municipalities in Ontario, to all the cities, 26, of Ontario, to 106 towns, 305 villages and 487 townships. This service to the townships means service to a great part of the farming community of Ontario.

Here is the report itself, and I ask every hon. member to listen to it because we find here the very essence of C.C.F. policy.

The basic principle governing the financial operations of the undertaking is that electrical service be given by the commission to the municipalities (and by the municipalities to the consumer) at cost. The "cost" includes provision for eventual repayment of all capital expenditure. Notwithstanding this, Ontario has meanwhile the cheapest electric service in the world.

I think the Ontario government is to be commended for maintaining that system, and in fact it is hard for me to understand how the province of Ontario, for the past forty years first Liberal, then Conservative, and back to Liberal and then Conservative again, has been able to maintain as a public enterprise one of the greatest businesses within that province. I suggest to the federal government that they continue the good work by carrying the principle of cooperation into the federal field. I wish to suggest where they could make a beginning.

I notice at the present time, because of the tempo of the war, that we now have in Canada $800 million worth of government-owned war plants, many of which could be

reconverted to peace-time production. I suggest to the present government that instead of handing over these war plants to private individuals for a song, or possibly less than that, they maintain the plants as public enterprises, run on the same basis as the Ontario hydro electric commission, to supply peace-time goods on the same basis as the people of Ontario are supplied with cheap electric power at cost.

I should like to make special reference to one of these very large industries, one which has been built up during the present struggle. I refer to Research Enterprises Limited, which I understand is located at Toronto. At its peak of employment it employed 7,000 men; at the present time, I understand, it is employing approximately 5,000 men. I believe that that plant is one of the most up-to-date scientific research plants to be found in the British empire and I wish to urge upon the government the necessity of controlling that plant. It is the only plant within the British empire which manufactures optical lenses. It is the only plant which can manufacture on a large scale radar equipment. Practically all the American radar equipment used in the west African campaign had to be made in that Toronto plant, and I think it is important that the present administration should maintain the plant for the people of Canada, retaining ownership and control of it. So much for that.

I fully realize that the present administration cannot go forward with any vast programme of socialism, but there is a great deal that they can do to relieve unemployment as it develops in the near future and as it is bound to develop because of the economic system under which we are operating. I suggest that they should begin as soon as possible the development of northern Canada. Northern Canada is the last frontier left to capitalistic expansion. Personally I do not like to see it developed under capitalism, but if that is all there is at our disposal we shall have to be satisfied with it. I suggest to hon. members that our neighbour to the north of us, over the north pole, the Soviet Union, is making marvellous developments in its northern land, and I should like to see Canada emulate that development by carrying out similar developments on our side of the north pole.

There are many things that could be done in that section of Canada to further private interests, to further private development. They could develop water power. On the Nelson river, for example—and this is only one example—there is a hydro electric power site at which there could be developed 700,000 horse-power which would supply all the mining area for 100 miles in radius. In addition to that, that electrical power could be transported to the northern part of Manitoba and Saskatchewan and used for rural electrification, something that ought to be done in the near future. Then I should like to see the government take on some form of reforestation programme. At the present time our forests are rapidly dwindling in every province, and I think the federal government, in co-operation with the provincial authorities, ought to establish as soon as convenient some kind of reforestation measure to replace our forests, which are rapidly diminishing.

I wish now to deal for a few minutes with education. Other speakers from the same group as that to which I belong have already dealt with the subject, but it is so important that another word along the same line will not hurt. I wish to deal in particular with the school at Churchill, Manitoba. The school at that point is in particularly bad circumstances owing to the fact that most of the property held at Churchill belongs to the federal government and is therefore untaxable. In connection with schools in unorganized territories such as this, I think the federal government should be willing to make a larger grant to carry on education.

There is something else in connection with education which ought to receive the consideration of this government. I refer to technical education. I take it that the present federal government is in an excellent position to provide technical education to the children of this country. For instance, take the three armed services. They were provided with technical schools well furnished with the latest equipment. I see no reason why the federal government could not take the machines from these different technical schools and redistribute them throughout Canada to schools which would be much smaller, thus giving our boys and girls a chance to get technical education in the line of work they intend to follow.

I believe that we should have a more balanced economy in western Canada. To obtain that we should have a few more factories built in that part of the country. If we construct factories in western Canada I suggest that they be based on agriculture. Now that rubber is such an important industry in Canada, I see no reason at all why we should not have a synthetic rubber plant built in western Canada to make tires for motor vehicles from synthetic rubber produced from alcohol as a base. That is, grain alcohol

would be the base of the raw materials for the production of rubber. I understand that alcohol as a base for synthetic rubber is a much better raw material than oil which is now used.

There is something else I should like to mention with respect to western Canada, namely, the absolute necessity of keeping the Winnipeg grain exchange out of the picture. The Canadian wheat board, with the able assistance of the federal government, has done an excellent job in marketing Canadian wheat. I believe that they can do just as well in the future as they have done in the past, which would completely eliminate the necessity of reestablishing the Winnipeg grain exchange.

I come now to the question of taxation. We have heard a great deal about taxation in this house in the last few days. I am quite willing to admit that in some places taxation is unfair. I do not think salaries of $660 a year should be taxed; but I am not opposed to paying high taxes as long as the government can maintain the present tempo of employment. As long as they are able to do that, I for one am quite willing to pay my fair share of taxes in order to maintain our living standards at a very high level.

Another matter was mentioned in the house which I think ought to be dealt with. I believe the hon. member for Edmonton East (Mr. Ashby) suggested that we should have retirement from industry at sixty years of age at a pension of $50 a month. Another hon. member to my right said that that would be giving old age pensions to young people. There may be some reason to believe that, but I ask the house to consider what Henry Ford told us about the automobile industry a few years ago. Mr. Ford told us that in the automotive industry a man was considered old at thirty-five. When we get reconverted to peace-time production I venture to say with our mechanical production it will be very difficult for a man to keep a job in the automotive industry when he passes thirty-five years of age. Therefore I do not think the suggestion made by the hon. member for Edmonton East was wide of the mark.

I now wish to deal for a little while with housing. This is another subject which has received a great deal of consideration from hon. members. Once again I am not blaming the government for the housing situation that exists in Canada. That situation is the result of the manner in which we have been doing business for the past thirty-five years. It is the result of private initiative. Private initiative will not build houses if there is no profit in them. The working people of Canada have not received sufficient money in the past thirty or thirty-five years to enable them to build adequate houses; therefore houses have not been built. You can go back to 1911 and you will find that a housing shortage existed in this country. At that time an editorial appeared in a Toronto paper deploring the condition which existed in the four largest cities, Toronto, Winnipeg, Vancouver and Montreal. It stated that there were developing in those cities slum conditions similar to those which existed in Europe. That was in 1911. Shortly after 1911 we had a depression. Then we had world war I. No houses were built during that time. Then we had another depression from 1919 to 1922, and very few houses were built. Then from 1922 to 1929 we had the wild spree which culminated in the great depression in 1929. Very few houses were constructed up to and including the present war and we now have the whole problem on our hands. Competent authorities tell us that we shall have to construct the same number of houses in Canada as exists now in four of our cities, namely, Calgary, Edmonton, London and Brantford. That means that we are short approximately 150,000 houses in this country, and it will take approximately five years to complete that construction. It will require an expenditure of $1,750,000,000, and will provide work for 190,000 men. That is one way in which we can help to solve our unemployment problem if the government see fit to find the money and go ahead with the construction. If we do undertake anything like that, I would suggest that we should resort to the use of brick instead of lumber for that construction, because it will be very difficult to get sufficient lumber and season it in time to go forward with the construction.

I shall mention just one other matter which has to do with my own constituency and which I think the house will hear more about later. I refer to the Hudson Bay railway and the port of Churchill. I am very much interested in seeing that development carried out. I want to see the whole north country developed because it is Canada's last frontier, and I think it ought to be developed if for no other reason than to keep abreast of our neighbour across the north pole. I submit that that route can be used for more than three months of the year because we now have newer and better equipment. We have radar, which can be installed both on the ships and at convenient points on islands in Hudson bay and along Hudson strait to warn us of the ice floes and of moves made by the ice coming down Davis strait.

In addition to that, we should build up mining throughout northern Manitoba and northern Saskatchewan. I do not think there is anything else I wish to say at the present time. I consider my remarks adequate at the moment and shall conclude them.

Mr. GEORGES H. HÉON (Argenteuil): (Translation): Mr. Speaker, intentionally, I shall direct my first remarks to you in the French language in order to emphasize, once again, that it is one of the two official languages in this country. Unfortunately, in certain quarters, there is too much inclination to forget that fact. It is proper to recall it, even if only to awaken some of our compatriots whose faint-heartedness would make them partisans of eternal compromise. Our English-speaking friends like frankness, truth and virility. We rise very much in their esteem when we expound our legitimate claims in a firm but ever courteous and dignified way, because they like, as I said truth and frankness, while loathing every form of obsequiousness.

(Text): Mr. Speaker, I should like to discharge immediately a most agreeable duty. Congratulations being apparently in order, I extend them to you personally, sir, on your unanimous election as Speaker of this house. Heartily endorsing the remarks made by all the leaders of the different parties, and by the press, I would add that your varied and not inconsiderable experience in the Quebec legislature and in this house will prove immediately beneficial to all of us. We are assured that your unfailing courtesy, your particular generosity (which I have already experienced), and your indulgence, will render your tenure of office most pleasant.

Both the mover and the seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne are also deserving of our felicitations. The fact that they wore the universally honoured and respected uniform of Canada's armed forces greatly enhanced the significance of their words.

I feel also, Mr. Speaker, that in all sincerity I should warmly congratulate the Minister of Transport (Mr. Chevrier) and the Secretary of State (Mr. Martin), both of whom I hold in particularly high esteem, on having attained cabinet rank. I am convinced that the ability and personal distinction of both these gentlemen will greatly redound to the credit of their French-Canadian compatriots. They may not be sitting in the first row, but that matters not a whit since it is only by his honesty of purpose, ability and efficiency that a public man is judged by all intelligent, unbiased and right thinking men.

Finally—and this will rudely jolt those who would carry bitter political feuds into this house—I extend felicitations to the leaders of all the political groups on their election. I am not so deeply ingrained with the red or blue pigment that I cannot readily acknowledge, the sincerity, earnestness and patriotism of our political leaders. We may not always agree with them. I for one may have respectfully to dissent more or less often. We may not agree with their ways of attaining the only true destiny for this country, that of a strong, united, prosperous and sovereign nation; nor may we always agree with their methods, which at times may seem to be highly unorthodox, and illogical to the common man, but who in this House will dare deny that they are all giving their time, their energy and indeed very often their health and whole life to better the lot of their fellow Canadians?

At this point I should like to make a suggestion which is not entirely new but is deserving of serious consideration. I believe it should be possible for the so-called boards of strategy—which appellation is very often a misnomer since sometimes they have turned out to be boards of blunders and errors—of the various political parties to reach a gentlemen's agreement whereby the election to the house of their regularly-chosen and nationally-recognized-and-accepted leaders would be assured, or at least greatly facilitated. The present situation is unsatisfactory and unfair to the leaders and to their constituents. We all know what a general election means to a party leader. It involves speaking engagements and conferences with party brain-trusters across the tremendous distances of this dominion in a very short period of time; the adjustment of innumerable clashes, differences and frictions among the faithful in various provinces, constituencies and even villages, with the inevitable result that the average leader will be lucky if he is able to spend twenty-four hours with his own constituents. This gives his opponent or opponents a tremendous and unfair advantage The evil of this situation has been abundantly shown, I think, by the predicament in which the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) found himself recently; and I am serious about this. Here was the leader of a party which had secured the largest number of votes, the man who thus was Prime Minister-designate of his country; yet when he signed at San Francisco on behalf of Canada he was a defeated candidate who had been denied a seat in the house where the nation had expressed some desire to see him direct and lead the government of the day. No one will deny

that this situation, in addition to giving him no particular cause for rejoicing, I imagine, was highly incongruous and paradoxical. The distinguished leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) was also similarly affected prior to the last general election. Although I did not attend the Winnipeg convention where he was unanimously chosen, I am informed that the convention was representative of all party factions in the nine provinces. The party he leads always has been and will remain a major factor to be reckoned with in Canadian politics. It might be argued that he was offered an opportunity to run in a by-election; but with the probability that the cleverly-conceived and smartly-executed York South strategy, which had so effectively beheaded his immediate predecessor, might again be brought into play, it was tantamount to jeopardizing his chances of election, and personally I think he was very wise in not falling into the trap. Yet on this account, the regularly-chosen and nationally-accepted leader of a dominion-wide party was prevented from leading that party in the house during the war years, when his leadership would have been most essential; and when I make that statement, I am not detracting from the highly-creditable performance of my old friend the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon), who discharged a most ungrateful obligation with a contagious and perpetual smile.

Canada has just emerged from its participation in two world wars in one generation. Our victory has been achieved through a tremendous sacrific of life which this young nation could ill-afford, and a national debt which has reached unbelievable and almost terrifying figures for a nation of twelve million people. The reward, however, lies in the satisfaction of complete victory; a job well done; a fair chance for a long era of undisturbed peace if our statesmen will rise to the occasion, and the still not-fully-implemented pledge of the four freedoms to all nations, powerful or weak, and to all individuals, rich or poor. But this war has also left its scars on Canada, as all prevoius wars have done. One of the ugliest of these scars has been caused by the very nature and progressive degree of our participation. Let us call a spade, a spade. The conscription issue has been used again, as in 1914-18, by unscrupulous politicians to foster their own petty, personal, political advantage. Through it, racial and sectional animosities, not wholly-extinguished before the war, have been rekindled, and thus national unity and inter-racial harmony, which are so essential to the welfare of Canada, have been seriously impaired. Shall we ever get rid of the conscription bogey? Frankly I do not know, although I must say that the present government, by almost imperceptible degrees, has successfully imposed a measure of conscription on the province which previously had been most violently opposed to it i.e., Quebec. If election figures mean anything, the electoral results on June 11 showed by the overwhelming number of government candidates returned that the voters, although perhaps unwittingly, had approved the principle of conscription as applied by the Liberal government. Personally, I feel that if, God forbid, this country should ever again become engaged in another total war, where our very existence was threatened, and universal service was resorted to by the government of the day, it should be done by something similar to the United States system, under which the millionaire and the pauper, the son of the president and the son of the labourer, the influential and the insignificant, the Republican and the Democrat, alike are called by number and treated on the same footing. If the number comes out, and if the holder is not entitled to an exemption—and these exemptions are clear and well defined—he is inducted into the services. But if his number is not drawn, he can still attend to his civilian duties and walk around in mufti, without taking the risk of having a white feather planted in his lapel by some patriotic but irate old maid.

Mr. Speaker, I have been elected in the old historical constituency of Argenteuil as an Independent Conservative, to preach and practise—but mostly to practise—principles which were in the forefront at confederation and inspired the real founders of the Conservative party, Cartier and Macdonald; equality among the races, discrimination against none, respect of the constitutional rights and sincere opinions of all Canadians.

If the Progressive Conservative party will adhere to this doctrine it shall have my full support; and I express the hope that it will prove as easy for the present distinguished leader of the party to render the old Conservative guard as progressively-inclined as the progressive element is conservatively-minded. Perhaps here, Mr. Speaker, the words of De Tocqueville may find their application:

> The political party I would call great, is the one which clings more to principles than to consequences; to general more than to special cases; to ideas and not to men. Such a party is usually distinguished by a nobler character, more generous passions, more genuine convictions, and a bolder and more open conduct than others.

However, I cannot conceive that this parliament, which must unflinchingly shoulder the terrible responsibility of taking the country

over the hurdles of the immediate post-war period, with its greatly-aggravated problems of a temporarily-unbalanced economy, will try to do so through strict party lines. The tasks ahead transcend party advantage and, this time at least, it is not the party leaders who have set the real issues, and they can not evade them if they try.

The issues have "come out of the depths of that deep, which is called public opinion." That all-important group of Canadians which is not bound by party lines, and votes according to its common sense and calm judgment, has a right to expect that we shall legislate only in the national interest. Further, the little man and the little woman of no fixed political party, in my constituency and in all constituencies this dominion over, who have enlisted or who have generously given their sons and daughters to the services, forged the tools for war during long hours of the night and day, bought the bonds, given their generous blood at Red Cross clinics, and gladly borne the burden of back-breaking taxes, without even the shadow of a complaint, are entitled to be represented here. That is why, I for one, propose to reserve my independence and freedom of speech and vote, every time the social security, material prosperity and immediate welfare of this same little man and woman will be at stake.

The speech from the throne has many more omissions than commissions; and although it has its good points, such as, for instance, a Canadian flag and Canadian citizenship, which will help to put an end to the plague of divided loyalties, it is not sufficiently clear-cut, and far too nebulous as to what the government proposes to do in the way of helping our war veterans reestablish themselves in civilian occupations, and in reducing the burden of taxation which weighs too heavily upon the industries, the salaried white-collar worker, and the labour and agricultural classes of my constituency. I cannot accept it in its entirety, and therefore must withhold judgment until the measures implementing it are brought before this house. There is much with which I can agree in the opposition amendment, and even the sub-amendment as it concerns housing. These amendments are in the nature of warnings to the government that the Canadian people will brook no side-tracking or fence-sitting in the execution of reconstruction policies.

Mr. Speaker, one more word. In my constituency which is a perfect cross-section of this dominion, since it is half industrial and half rural, and is inhabited, almost in equal proportions by Canadians of English, Irish, Scottish and French origin, we have made an honest and loyal effort to solve the problem of true national unity, through forbearance, respect and generous interpretation of one another's voiced opinions, and unbounded faith in Canada and Canadians. True, there still remain in Argenteuil, a few islands of resistance wherein dwell narrow-minded fanatics; but they are held up to the ridicule of, and held in contempt by their fellow men.

All the racial groups in Argenteuil have given me a majority vote, because I have pledged myself to fight sectionalism, and racial and religious prejudice, wherever I find it. I propose to fulfil my pledge and carry the fight wherever the enemy is, not excluding my own racial group, and behind whatever political party it may lurk, because, unfortunately, as Bulwer once wrote:

> It is the misfortune of all miscellaneous political combinations, that with the purest motives of their more generous members, are ever mixed the most sordid interests and the fiercest passions of mean confederates.

May I therefore appeal to all hon. members gathered in this most important post-war parliament, where the destiny of this and coming generations of Canadians is at stake, to help heal all war-wounds by forgetting and forgiving past quarrels and dissensions, and by rededicating ourselves to the cause of a true and broad Canadianism, harmony between our two great races, help, cooperation, equality between all classes, and opportunities for all. This Canada of ours is big enough, rich enough for all of us to live in it, in equality, peace and plenty.

The countless thousands of our fellow-Canadians who have given their lives in the war which has recently been brought to a successful conclusion, have traced with their generous blood the path along which lies Canada's glorious and only true destiny; a strong, united, proud and prosperous, sovereign nation, freely associated with the other peace-loving nations of the Commonwealth and, for that matter, all other peace-loving nations of the world to ensure peace to all men of goodwill, and the welfare of mankind.

To paraphrase a Churchillian expression: "Let us all then to the task".

Mr. L. W. SKEY (Trinity): Mr. Speaker, in rising to make my first contribution to the proceedings of Canada's twentieth parliament, may I commence by offering you my congratulations, and saying that I listened with interest to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) when he spoke of your illustrious family record. I have read, too, with further interest, the tribute paid you in this week's issue of *Time* magazine.

May I also extend my congratulations, sir, to the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Benidickson) and the hon. member for Gaspe (Mr. Langlois) upon the excellent manner in which they acquitted themselves in their difficult duty of moving and seconding this motion.

As a new member of this house I must admit I face this task with more anxiety than I would a flying operation. However, may I begin by saying that I hope my contribution to the efforts of this house will be a useful one and that I shall at all times be able to keep faith with its dignity and high tradition. This afternoon I should like to speak for a few moments about my constituency, the services and Canada's future.

I speak as the new member for Trinity. My riding runs through the heart of Toronto, the second largest city in Canada. It extends from the harbour to St. Clair avenue. It has within its boundaries three great hospitals, two of them military hospitals. There is Christie Street and the Red Chevron as well as one Ontario hospital. It has as well the Canadian national exhibition grounds now inhabited by No. 4 release centre of the Royal Canadian Air Force. It takes its name from the park where stand the beautiful but vacant buildings of the old college.

The people in my constituency are good Canadian citizens. They have sent thousands of their sons and daughters to our services and to fight with Canadian forces overseas. They are war workers; they are unionists; they are peaceful tradesmen. Their businesses are large and small and they have manufactured many war materials as well as peacetime products. The origin of the people of my constituency is Canadian, British, French and American. Besides this, there are large numbers of new Canadians of Polish, Ukrainian, Estonian and Scandinavian descent.

During this war they have laboured constantly, each in his own way, to accomplish the defeat of our enemy. They have for six years produced the supplies, the war materials, the men, the women, the money, the service comforts and the courage which go to make up a nation's war effort. If they could be here to-day they would ask me to express for them the hope that there might be some relief from the taxation which they have borne without murmur, so that mothers and fathers will be able to put aside something for their own security and comfort in old age as well as to assist their sons and daughters who are returning from the services. They would ask for some relief from controls.

More than this, I think they would ask for leadership; they would ask to see a beacon into our future. They want guidance and leadership from Canada's government and the lifting of the secrecy that has surrounded the proceedings of this great house for the past six years. They would like to know how to reconvert themselves individually and how to reconvert their businesses as best they can to Canada's advantage.

If I may pause here for a moment I should like to say that never in Canada's history has there been such a disposition among all our people, among our unionists and business men to accept clear and direct leadership from their government. These same people in my constituency would like to have peaceful homes with some security and assurance that they will be able to remain in them for a short time. But above all they would want me to express in this house that they desire not only unity in their local riding but in Canada as a whole.

If I may speak for a moment on the subject of political peace and unity I should like to liken the constituency from which I come to that of your constituency, Mr. Speaker, that of St. Mary in Montreal. I understand that it runs through the heart of your great city, and the two ridings are not dissimilar. In the last general election four political parties contested my riding. Three of the candidates finished within a few hundred votes of one another, while the fourth candidate received substantial support. During the campaign there was some exploitation of religious faiths, some exploitation of racial prejudice and a beginning of class consciousness among our labouring groups. While I have every sympathy with their efforts to reconvert to peacetime industry and their efforts to gain leadership and guidance from the government, I have no sympathy with any method or means they may use to exploit class consciousness in this free, democratic country of Canada. To show that other members of this honourable house are aware that this condition exists, I should like to refer to what has been said before in this house. One hon. member said that on the morrow of the conclusion of this great war there is a beginning of much that looks like efforts to itensify controversy in some of our domestic fields. Then again an hon. member said that those who lend their voices to unnecessary and unjustified agitators may help to create a situation which will be much more difficult to meet than they have reason to expect.

Last April the legislature of Ontario was dissolved and the provincial government sought a mandate from the people of Ontario. But there were certain parties and groups in that house who did not seem to agree that it

was right to ask the lieutenant governor to dissolve the legislature and call a general election. Those groups came to the locked doors of the legislature, demanded admittance and asked that the session continue. When I refer to these class conscious elements in our community and these political methods I have in mind that that is an example of what we may expect in the future if the integrity and authority of the free parliament of Canada is not maintained by all its members.

In any urban riding in Canada I think we have in miniature a picture of the forces of disunity that are at work in the world to-day. Here the problems of peace are presenting themselves to us in our own communities. These problems are well understood by the new Canadians in my constituency, these new Canadians who come from European homes, who have lived under difficult and different and absolute political regimes, who have sought freedom and sanctuary in our great country, who have fled from the mass-mind control of states such as nazi Germany.

I would be the first to say that we should be very careful to guard the rights and privileges of a free parliament in Canada. These new Canadians know what we need for the future. They know we need a friendly exchange of goods, of cultural achievements, of news, of ideas, of friendship and free and open travel and press facilities. These new Canadians know we cannot enclose any part of this world behind barriers of thought or barriers of wire and steel, because they know well that behind those barriers fear, suspicion and mistrust must grow, fear, suspicion and mistrust which can destroy us and the peace of this world. That other hon. members are aware of the same problem is evident from the record of *Hansard*. As one hon. member has said, these problems will not be solved by pitting one group against another and by creating needless suspicion and hate. And the challenge of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) extends, I feel, not only to the government but to all groups in this great House of Commons. As reported at page 26 of *Hansard*, he said:

> . . . that we be worthy of these days. We must build an economy in which our people will have faith; a democracy in which we can all have confidence and a programme for Canada in which, on its fundamentals, we can all be united.

I will now pass on to say a few words about the amendment moved by the Progressive Conservative party to the address in reply to the speech from the throne. I think in my previous remarks I have expressed well the feeling of doubt, which is prevalent in my constituency and must be prevalent in many other parts of Canada, that there is a lack of positive leadership for the future. I feel that we have well expressed in our amendment these doubts of the Canadian people as a whole, and that the desire for public leadership and the necessity of homes and jobs and quick reconversion has been fairly stated by my party.

The reinforcement issue is an old one to many hon. members, although it is a new one to many of us in the services. I do not propose to say a great deal about it to-day, but I would not be on this side of the house if I had not agreed with the stand taken by my party. I should like to add that I do not think the government of our country would be facing the great difficulties of demobilization had they followed what we consider to be a more enlightened policy with regard to the armed forces.

The problems of the services do not seem to me to be dissimilar from those of the civilians. The men must be released, and our civilian population would like to be freed from many controls. The men of the services require rehabilitation, and our civilian industries require reconversion. The men of the services will receive pensions and gratuities; our civilian groups would like to be able to enjoy lighter taxes. Both groups are concerned with homes and jobs. Previous speakers on this motion have dealt adequately with the subject, so that I shall leave it now and pass on to what I think the service men would like to be reassured about with regard to the attitude of this house and the present parliament.

I think they would ask first of us that we produce as much of a feeling of national unity as is possible in any community. I know they would ask of us a fearless approach to our national problems. In the past they have been controversial and they must be solved to help Canada's progress. I know the services would say to the government to-day, bring them down, bring them before every party and group in this house; let them see the light of day and let us face them fearlessly.

Many men and women in the services have obtained a wide knowledge of Canada during their time in the war. They have seen many provinces; overseas they have fought beside Canadians of all races and creeds from all parts of the dominion. They cannot tolerate any longer the petty divisions which seem up to this time to have been so easy of exploitation by politicians in this country. I know they would have us make an end of all these that can possibly be buried. If they have been as fortunate as I have they would have seen all the provinces with the exception of Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia. They

would have enjoyed the friendliness of Prince Edward Island, seen its red soil and its potato fields and tasted its lobsters and oysters. They would have met the friendly people of Nova Scotia and formed an idea of the great contribution of that province to the building of our mighty Canadian navy. They would have seen the woods and farms of New Brunswick, and maybe they would have had the experience, which I had some months ago, of flying over that province and witnessing from the air a forest fire which was consuming the wealth of the province and apparently ranging unchecked. They would have seen the historic capital of the province of Quebec and cosmopolitan Montreal. I happen to have lived in Ontario; I was born there and have travelled over it widely; and for three years I was resident in friendly Manitoba. The rest of the provinces of Canada it is my intention to see before the close of this parliament, and I hope that other hon. members among us will travel as the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) has done and investigate all the provinces and become acquainted with the people of all provinces and tongues and faiths in our dominion.

Before I speak about my own service, the air force, I should like to pay humble tribute as an air force officer to our Canadian army and navy. The army, fighting for the first time as an integral unit, suffered a long, hard struggle in Italy, then gallantly marched into Normandy, and from there through the Netherlands, Belgium and Germany to the Baltic sea. They displayed in siege and battle the greatest powers of invention and endurance.

In my experience in the air force I have had a lot to do with the Canadian navy and with the Royal Navy. I have witnessed their phenomenal growth, their vigilance in the home waters and on the broad Atlantic, and seen the way in which they have admirably discharged their tremendous responsibilities of convoy escort.

Turning for a moment to our branch of the service, I should like to give this house a short description of it. It is young; it is lusty; it is imaginative and it is still growing. Its members have fought alongside the army and navy of Canada and of other countries, and I know those other services will appreciate a claim that can be made for the air force, that they should have a certain amount of freedom to digest their immense expansion and the immense power they achieved during war time.

I would commend to this house the stand that has already been taken by the government in allowing the ministry for air to remain separate for some time. It may take the air force as long as from two to three years to get straightened away on its new path in peace, and I would commend leaving it to its own growth until it has achieved full manhood and adjusted the new factors which have so recently brought it into discussion again. The air force at present requires a policy for peace. Young men, good men, able men, technicians, pilots and men whose knowledge and duties cover all the services that it governs would like to stay with it. It has seized their imagination, and they would like to stay with it and play a part in the future defence of Canada, should that ever be necessary. They would like to know what the government has to offer them in the way of a career.

I should like now to pass on for a moment and speak on the subject of technical research. I am sure that when the appreciation of this war is written historians will give to the technical capacity of the scientists of the united nations, England, the United States and our own great Canada, credit for a tremendous achievement, that they will judge that our scientific potential was, apart from the will of our people to fight, the dominant factor in our victory.

I feel that our scientific potential is the greatest factor in our peace-time recovery and in our continued prosperity. Were I not such a junior member of this house I might go so far as to recommend that we have a ministry of technical research to which the heads of all services could take their problems, to which industry, agriculture, medicine and all our other professions in Canada could go with their problems for solution and help.

In summing up my remarks, I should like to leave with the house the thought that the services and civilians alike would ask of this government, and ask of us, unity in Canada. I would put forward the suggestion that perhaps our wartime information board and the national film board, controlled by a joint parliamentary committee, could be used as two great instruments to teach all parts of Canada about their neighbours, their friends, about the problems of other provinces, and to educate us to a national outlook.

I believe that science and scientific research and technique as an aid to all Canadian businesses and to our services is the great need of the future. With no desire to delay the house any longer, may I say that in a few days' time hon. members will be asked to consider grants for the armed services. I have no information and no idea as to what these grants will be, but I would leave with the house this one thought. I believe it is necessary that we should keep the weapons of war in the hands of the people who love peace.

Mr. FREDERIC DORION (Charlevoix-Saguenay): Mr. Speaker, I should like first to join with the other speakers who have taken part in this debate in offering you my most sincere congratulations on the high honour conferred upon you unanimously by the House of Commons. In the last few years we have learned to know you, and I am sure that, with the sense of justice and equity which characterizes you, you will maintain the tradition that has been established by those who in the past have so illustriously occupied the seat which you hold at the present time. There is no doubt that this honour reflects also upon your family, and especially upon your country and also upon our province.

Since we last met in this chamber there have been many changes as a result of the general election of last June. Among the newcomers, particularly those from the province of Quebec, there are many young men who will no doubt be a valuable asset to the House of Commons. I would call attention to the fact that the bar of Quebec is very highly represented among the members. Some of them have already been called to fill important positions, as, for example, attorneys for the crown, members of the council of the bar, and a president of their association. Allow me to mention the present batonnier of the bar of Montreal, the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Hackett). I have no doubt that all these members will make their contribution to the keeping up of the good reputation of our bar, which has already furnished this house with a great many prominent members.

If on one side new representatives from the province of Quebec deserve the honour that has been conferred upon them by their electors, I cannot forget that unfortunately we have lost some members who for one reason or another were very close to some of the members of the house. I wish to mention my friend Mr. J. S. Roy, the previous member for Gaspe, who for the past five years sat in this house commanding the respect of all his fellow members. Even if we did not share his political views, I am sure that every member sitting in the last parliament had the utmost consideration for my former colleague, and I have no doubt it must have taken a capital man such as the present sitting member for Gaspe to defeat him.

As many hon. members have said in the course of this debate, and as we have also read in the newspapers throughout the country, the speech from the throne contains a few good suggestions. On the other hand, it is noticeable for its lack of measures which were expected by the people of the country. I note with satisfaction that the government has finally decided to bring before the house a policy providing for a national flag. I am sure that this decision will be welcomed by all fair-thinking citizens, by those who hold Canada above everything else, and by those who want to see our country secure its share of sovereignty. I am also pleased to note that the government has decided to define Canadian citizenship. I really believe that this is a new step toward what everybody wishes, and I sincerely hope that these two measures, when they come before the house for discussion, will be discussed with broad-mindedness.

Mention was also made in the speech from the throne of the international part that our country is called upon to play, and I expect that when the appropriate measures dealing with this question are brought before the house we shall have an opportunity of expressing our point of view. I may state now that the events of the last years and particularly of the last months have changed to a certain extent the ideas one could have with regard to the important role that our country is called upon to play in international affairs.

(Translation): Mr. Speaker, if Canada is to play the part she is expected to take in the international sphere, and even if she is to weather the difficulties of the post-war period, she must, to my mind, fulfil two essential conditions. The first is that we should continue our march toward absolute independence; the second, that we should find a fair and equitable solution to our domestic problems.

In order to fulfil the first condition, I think it would be necessary to destroy some remaining vestiges of the colonial spirit of old. The first and one of the most important of those vestiges is, I believe, the view that is taken in the matter of amendments to our constitution. As is well known, under the terms of the statute of Westminster, we are still compelled to go to the London parliament in order to obtain consent to any amendment to this country's constitution which we may want to bring about. That clause of the statute of Westminster, which was supposed to guarantee the rights of minorities in Canada, has indeed become a grave danger. I could not illustrate that better than by mentioning what happened in 1943 on the occasion of the last amendment to our constitution. In July 1943, the House of Commons, following a discussion and by a majority vote, passed a resolution whereby an address was voted to His Majesty the King, requesting him to have the kindness to amend

our constitution so that the redistribution of electoral districts might be deferred, and on that occasion, when the resolution came up before the British House of Commons, it was thoroughly discussed. I have in hand the British House of Commons report of July 22, 1943—the date on which the Secretary of State for the Dominions, who then was Mr. Attlee the present Prime Minister, made his submission on the matter—and I shall quote the following excerpt from that statement:

At the time of the passing of the Statute of Westminster, an express provision was made at the request of the government of Canada, taking out from the general powers then conferred any power to amend or repeal the British North America Act, and the procedure therefore for amending the British North America Act remains as it was before the Statute of Westminster.

And in order to indicate what is meant by that clause of the statute of Westminster, I shall refer to a speech delivered by Mr. Edmund Harvey:

Mr. Edmund Harvey (Combined English universities): Surely the whole question depends on section 7 (1), of the act of Westminster, which was expressly put in at the request of Canada. I think that meets the point raised by the hon. gentleman the member for Altrincham (Sir E. Grigg). It was put in in order to protect the interests of certain minorities in Canada who at that period desired that, in the event of any change being requested by the Canadian parliament which they themselves did not unite in, there should remain the possibility of this parliament protecting the interests of the minority. It is an entirely exceptional position placed in the act.

I believe therefore, Mr. Speaker, that such are the exact wording and the true meaning of that clause inserted in the Statute of Westminster; for that reason, we must now wonder whether that clause, inserted for the protection of the rights of minorities, still constitutes the guarantee for which it was intended. In order to answer that question, I shall quote the speech delivered, in that same debate, by Sir Edward Grigg, and I quote:

Sir Edward Grigg (Altrincham): I suggest that it is really improper in present circumstances for the house to question the discretion of a sovereign parliament in the Commonwealth of Nations. It is only owing to a technical legislative peculiarity that it comes to the house at all, and it is very improper that the house should question the discretion of a national and absolutely sovereign parliament. I hope that that will be accepted by the house and that this legislation will be passed without further comment.

Which means, Mr. Speaker, that each time the Canadian parliament adopted a resolution similar to another brought down before the British House of Commons, the latter considered themselves bound by the majority vote given in this House of Commons and consequently cannot and will not discuss the question as to whether or not such a procedure endangers the rights of minorities in this country. We must remember that on that occasion, one of the provinces had signified its unanimous opposition to this amendment to the Canadian constitution, therefore, it is obvious that the protection which existed in the past was no more existent. Therefore I think I am right in saying, as I said then in the debate in this house on the proposed amendment that our constitution has simply become an ordinary law which a majority can modify at will and according to the good pleasure of the party in power. That is why it is urgent that this government set up an organization to inquire anew into this matter of vital importance to us. I would suggest, for example, that the federal government set up a commission of jurists, appointed not only by the Canadian government but also by the governments of the different provinces of the dominion. However, great care should be taken to include in this commission representatives of minorities in order that the sacred rights of minorities may be effectively protected. Such a commission I believe, could solve the problems that arise and would perhaps enable us to determine the procedure we would have to follow to amend our constitution ourselves without having to apply to the British parliament.

I said, Mr. Speaker, that the second condition we must fulfil to pass through what I would call the post-war crisis is to give to domestic problems the most equitable solutions. These problems, of course, are extremely numerous, but I believe that some are more important than others. There is for instance the problem of employment about which we have heard a great deal since the opening of the session. I do not intend to labour the point, but I wish to point out that last August, on the 20th to be exact, the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada sent to the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) a petition the conclusions of which I shall now quote. I believe that, if accepted by the government, these conclusions would go a long way to solve the problem. Here is the concluding part of that petition dated August 20:

We realize that it is impossible to do anything without funds; that is why we are in favour of maintaining war-time taxation, in accordance with our request of April last when we asked your government to raise the exemptions to $2,400 a year for married persons and $1,000 for single persons, during this crisis. To face the crisis we are now going through we urge:

(1) That every worker in an essential civilian industry be granted immediately a "reconversion salary" during this period of dislocation, namely one month's salary for each year of service up to three years.

(2) In order that the greatest number may benefit from available employment, the adoption of a maximum forty-hour week without salary reduction is recommended;

(3) To inspire confidence and maintain the purchasing power, all general salary reductions should be banned;

(4) Restrictions on building materials should be lifted and a housing programme launched with the same energy, ingenuity and industry which were applied to the production of urgent war material;

(5) The immediate launching of the required public works is suggested; as well as

(6) The speediest reconversion of all war industries which can serve in peace-time production.

To this problem of employment, the housing problem is closely allied. During recent sessions, we passed certain legislative measures intended to help Canadians build themselves new houses; but I must draw the attention of the federal authorities to the fact that these enactments, while they might easily apply in Canada's important centres and large cities, are altogether inappropriate in rural areas and in ridings similar to my own constituency of Charlevoix-Saguenay. As a matter of fact, I wrote the housing administrator not very long ago to inform him of the difficulties encountered by the people of the Charlevoix-Saguenay constituency when they applied to insurance companies for loans provided by the said enactment. Unfortunately, no solution has been found to the problem and the people of my constituency who wish to build homes in order to take advantage of this act cannot do so because the insurance companies claim that their needs are not sufficiently important and that it is not worth while to send inspectors to examine the projects and to supervise the work.

I wish to call your attention to the following letter which I received last July from the director of housing:

Sir:

Replying to your letter of July 6, I regret to inform you that we cannot do anything in regard to the reluctance shown by lending institutions to make loans in more or less remote communities.

The national housing administration cannot avail itself of any legislative authority in order to dictate to the authorized lending institutions where and when they shall make loans.

However, steps are being taken in order to enlarge as quickly as possible the field of action of lending institutions.

And this letter is signed by Mr. U. Mignon for Mr. F. W. Nicolls, director of housing.

[Mr. Dorion.]

Mr. Speaker, at this session this housing act should be amended so that it may apply as fully to rural districts as to urban centres.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is another matter which should not be overlooked, a matter which comes up from time to time, but which should certainly be settled if we are to live in peace and in harmony in this country. I refer to the grievances that are continually being aired because the rights of the French population of this country are not always fully recognized. In this respect, may I point out that too frequently official publications of the dominion government written exclusively in English are sent to French-speaking centres, both to civil servants and to French-Canadian taxpayers, who have difficulty in understanding them. Thus, for instance, I know that in regard to the selective service, the representatives of this service in the province of Quebec receive a great deal of literature written exclusively in English, and on account of their insufficient knowledge of the English language, they cannot become sufficiently acquainted with such instructions to be in a position to reply to the enquiries which they receive.

I also know that, within the last few months, the government have sent in French-speaking districts of Canada, some English forms for the use of the members of the armed forces who wished to be demobilized. In this case, however, I must give credit to whom credit is due. This state of affairs in the province of Quebec having been called to my attention, I asked for French forms and I was told that they were not quite ready, which fact explained the sending of the English version, but that I would receive them as soon as possible. I am glad to state that a few days later, a fortnight, I believe, the city of Quebec and all other French parts of the province, I suppose, were supplied with the French forms.

I bring this to the attention of the authorities, because I feel that all official documents distributed through the country should be printed in French and English, so that both versions could be sent to all parts of Canada at the same time.

Another point which has been the subject of numerous conversations and newspaper articles is the matter of family allowance cheques. It seems to me that it would be the simplest thing for the federal government to have all family allowance cheques printed in both French and English, and thus fulfil a general wish. To my mind, it would be only fair to the French-Canadian population of the dominion and I hope the federal auth-

orities will very soon see that those responsible have these cheques, which are distributed through the whole of Canada, printed in both official languages.

There is another point which I believe should be discussed and settled very soon, if we are anxious that peace and harmony be maintained in our midst.

A while ago, I referred to the amendment of the British North America Act, issued in 1943, in connection with the redistribution of electoral seats. All hon. members will have noticed that I have put on the Order paper a resolution concerning this matter and I hope we will be given the opportunity of discussing it in the house. I hope that this year, now that the war is over, all private members, resolutions may be discussed in this house. When the house passed this amendment in 1943 it was well understood that the delay was accepted on the sole condition that this redistribution of seats would be proceeded with at the very first session following the end of the war. At this session, the government should at least appoint a committee to study the matter so as to assure satisfaction to all groups of citizens.

Mr. Speaker, in all measures passed by the Dominion government and particularly in all social legislation, of ever growing importance, consideration should be given to the rights of each and every province. Of course, it may be difficult at times to conciliate provincial autonomy with all the social measures which this parliament is called upon to adopt, but care should be taken not to deprive the provinces of their rights, because, in my opinion, they are sacred and are the foundation of the structure of our constitution. Moreover, this autonomist feeling is certainly shared by the majority of our people throughout the country, and it is quite natural. As a matter of fact, if we are asked to state our preferences, we immediately think of our birthplace, of the places where we have spent our childhood, then of our district, of the region where we live, then of the province to which we belong. Therefore, in the matter of federal legislation, enactments must necessarily take into account the autonomy of the various provinces so that their rights may at all times be entirely respected.

Mr. Speaker, we are faced at present with another very acute problem to which I believe the federal authorities should give immediate attention. I refer to the status of young men who are on the blacklists of the Department of National Defence. I am concerned with those who, for some reason or other, did not answer the call to service or who, perhaps for some excellent reason, did not report for duty after having obtained leave from the military authorities.

Mr. Speaker, the war is over and it seems to me the federal government should show leniency and generosity. It should see to it that these young men are not treated as criminals and hunted down as they are at the present time. As an example I need only to relate what happened last week in my county, in the parish of Chateau-Richer. During the night of September 12 the military police raided the parish and forced their way into private homes. Let me mention a pitiful case. The military police forced their way into the home of a sick woman to search the premises, with the result that this woman is now seriously ill in the hospital.

Mr. Speaker, such a situation should be ended. These young men who are not criminals, but who may have broken the laws of the country in wartime, should no longer be pursued. To-day, now that the war is over, we should consider giving them the benefit of an amnesty. Besides, the Liberal members should have no trouble in understanding my request, as I could refer them to the speeches they made in 1919. At that time, after the last war, when the government kept on hunting down the recruits, as we se it done to-day, the members of the opposition of the time clamoured for, and rightly so, the amnesty of the so-called deserters.

These questions may come up again for discussion during this session, but I thought I would bring them to-day to the attention of the house and particularly of the government.

Mr. ALDERIC LAURENDEAU (Berthier-Maskinonge) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, it is customary for the hon. members of this house, at the beginning of a new parliament, to congratulate the Speaker on his election. I do so with much pleasure because he is a personal friend of mine who has had something to do with my entrance into public life, and who has studied in the same college and the same university. I am pleased to see him again to-day in the post which he now occupies in this house. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you will preside over the debates of this house with tactfulness and judgment and that, true to Liberal traditions, you will give your rulings with justice and to the satisfaction of all members of this house.

I also wish to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne.

Now, Mr. Speaker, allow me to take up another subject. We have all seen in the

newspapers, not long ago, that the smallest known part of matter, the atom, had been split with the resulting discovery of a tremendous war weapon intended for the destruction of humanity. A few days or weeks later, the newspapers informed us that the new weapon had saved thousands of human lives, however paradoxical that may appear. We have also read that great plants and splendid laboratories had been built for research work in that connection, and that scientists from all allied countries, and even some of German origin, along with others from Britain, the United States and even Canada, which fact honours us, had all had a share in that discovery. We find that this research work was achieved through cooperation to the best advantage of mankind. The point I wish to make, Mr. Speaker, is that it was absolutely logical that research work should be carried out in war time in order to save civilization. Now that peace has been restored however, I wonder whether those same studies could not be made on the human cell. We, physicians, do know the morphology of the human cell. Without entering into medical details, I say we know that this cell which is the basis of all the organs and tissues of the human body, multiplies itself while modifying its shape; this proliferation produces a malignant growth which reaches such proportions that it becomes necessary for the patient to consult his physician. In the great number of cases, I do not say in all cases, the physician diagnoses cancer. It is the death toll for the patient for, I must admit, to the confusion of the medical profession, that we know of no specific treatment for cancer and that we do not even possess any recognized symptom of incipient cancer. I know by experience, that ever since I have been in the practice of medicine, though I have no accurate data to offer, this disease has been on the increase, at least in my district. I need not describe the sufferings of the patients. I know of no disease more painful than certain cases of cancer. I have personally administered doses of seven to eight grains of morphine to relieve for a few hours the sufferings of a patient who was doomed. It is a fine thing to enact laws for the welfare and comfort of our citizens but of what avail will those laws be unless we enjoy good health. I therefore urge the government to set up as soon as possible a world organization equipped with the finest laboratories similar to those which were used in the discovery of the atomic bomb and to enlist the services of learned medical men from all countries so that through such total and complete world cooperation they may save mankind from the atrocious sufferings of this terrible scourge and find a cure for it.

I now wish to congratulate the government for its splendid social laws which lean toward a fair and moderate socialism. I congratulate the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) for having given us the Family Allowances Act. Therein, as in my previous comparisons, the family is considered as the foundation cell of society and when you protect that cell the nation is happy. I congratulate the government for having included in its programme the health insurance act. This is another social measure which will help to raise our national standard of living. Mr. Speaker, for over a quarter of a century I have been in contact with human sufferings and I know that very often when a mother is told: "Your child must be operated on", the financial resources of the majority of our good Canadian families are not sufficient to allow them to go to such an expense and for this reason the child is not operated on immediately and its health becomes more and more impaired. That is an example of the benefits which will accrue from this new social legislation laid down by the administration of the Right Hon. Mr. King. Some may object that we have a law of public assistance; I will not discuss it. I know by practical experience that it has not been satisfactory to the public. I am ready to assist the government with all the means at my disposal in cooperation with the medical associations, so that this legislation will be put into force as soon as possible.

I also wish to congratulate in a special way the Liberal administration of this country for having promised a national flag in the speech from the throne, a symbol which will rally every man of good will wishing to work in a spirit of cooperation for a greater, a more beautiful and more prosperous Canada. I would like to see expressed on this emblem in a tanglible way the symbols of our race and of our survival.

I wish to avail myself of this opportunity to declare on the floor of this house and before my colleagues that I am a sincere Catholic and in doing so, I think I am voicing the sentiments of every French-Canadian member and of the citizens of every other race in this country. I want the government to understand that if we have fought this war in order to protect our civilization, our way of thinking and of living and our democracy, we have also done so to safeguard our language and protect our faith. In order to ensure national unity, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the deep religious feelings of the French

Canadians be clearly symbolized on the new Canadian flag, as well as in the splendid improvement projects of the cities of Ottawa and Hull which the government intends to undertake as a legacy to future generations. Then, Mr. Speaker, you shall see the French Canadians of to-morrow defend their new flag with the same courage, energy and love that our forefathers displayed for the French flag, in the early days of the colony.

The government also suggests the adoption of a national anthem as a complement to the flag. I feel that the most appropriate national anthem would be the splendid Canadian song, "O Canada", written by Calixa Lavallée, and I believe that all Canadians would unanimously agree to its acceptance.

I may not be a talented speaker, but I have a practical outlook on life and I believe my suggestions are the expression of the sound aspirations, the deep feelings and the sincere religious convictions of all Canadians anxious to promote national unity.

(Text): And now, Mr. Speaker, I cannot close my remarks without congratulating our good friend, the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton), upon the friendly sentiments he has expressed toward my fellow citizens, the French-speaking Canadians. I wish, in the interest of the welfare of Canada, that hon. members on both sides of the house would follow his example.

On motion of Mr. Reid the debate was adjourned.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Thursday, September 20, 1945.

The house met at three o'clock.

PRISONERS OF WAR

REPATRIATION FROM THE FAR EAST—ARRANGEMENTS FOR RETURN OF CIVILIANS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) asked me some days ago if I would give to the house a statement with respect to the repatriation of Canadian prisoners of war and civilians in the far east, letting the house have such information as would help to bring the position up to date. The statement I have to make is as follows:

All Canadian prisoners of war liberated at Hong Kong have, with one exception, been evacuated to Manila, where they are awaiting transportation to Canada. The exception is the case of one man whose lack of strength at the moment rendered it inadvisable for him to be removed.

Some 500 Canadian prisoners of war liberated in Japan have been evacuated, half to Manila and half to Guam. As of September 20, 1,086 prisoners of war have been officially reported safe in allied hands. Thirty-two liberated prisoners have already reached Canada and nineteen more are known to be on their way.

Brigadier Kay, Canadian Military Attache at Chungking, having completed his mission at Hong Kong, is now returning to Chungking.

Satisfactory reports on the progress of the liberation of Canadian civilians are being received. As was announced yesterday, a small group of eleven Canadian missionaries has already reached Oakland, California. Official word has been received of the liberation of 200 of the 600 known Canadian civilians. A list of these was recently given to the press. Some of the 600 are missionaries and persons who made their homes in the east and who may wish to stay there. On the other hand, there are a number of Canadians who are not known to us and a number of British subjects not included who will be coming to Canada to join their families here.

As reported in the press, Mr. E. H. Norman, of the Department of External Affairs, accompanied by two other officers of the department, has set up headquarters in Manila to look after arrangements for the relief and repatriation of Canadian civilians. They have been joined by two officers of the Canadian Red Cross whose primary function will be to look after the welfare of Canadian civilians.

It is hoped that the larger proportion of prisoners of war and civilians will be transported direct to Vancouver and arrangements have been made there by all the departments concerned, together with the Canadian Red Cross, for their reception. However, a certain number will arrive at United States west coast ports. The army has made arrangements for the reception of liberated prisoners of war and the Department of External Affairs has sent an officer to San Francisco who will be in touch with the United States authorities at all ports and with British consuls. The Canadian trade commissioner at Los Angeles will assist in the handling of any Canadians who may arrive there. In addition, the Canadian Red Cross will station one or two officers at San Francisco and will send on other personnel as may be needed from time to time.

All prisoners of war and civilians arriving at United States west coast ports and destined for Canada will be sent to Vancouver. Provisions for medical care and for the supply of clothing, comforts and small luxuries are being made by the services for prisoners of war and by the Canadian Red Cross for civilians at all points where they are likely to arrive.

The Canadian government has informed the United Kingdom that the Canadian authorities and the Canadian Red Cross will be glad to afford every assistance possible for the repatriation of liberated United Kingdom prisoners of war and United Kingdom civilians from the far east who may be repatriated by way of Canada. If shipping facilities across the Pacific make it possible for the United Kingdom to make use of this route, large numbers of repatriates destined for the United Kingdom may arrive at Vancouver and be transported across Canada.

WHEAT

POLICY WITH RESPECT TO FLOOR PRICE—MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT UNDER STANDING ORDER 31

Mr. P. E. WRIGHT (Melfort): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to move, seconded by the hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Bentley), the adjournment of the house under standing order 31, for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the government's policy with respect to a floor price under wheat as announced by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and its effect upon the income of the farmers of western Canada.

In support of the urgency of this matter, Mr. Speaker, I would beg leave to point out to you that this may mean a possible decline of thirty-five per cent in the purchasing power and income of a large area of our agricultural industry.

Mr. MACKENZIE: On a point of order, the hon. member cannot debate his motion now.

Mr. WRIGHT: Therefore I believe it is a matter of urgent public importance.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to make a motion for the adjournment of the house for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance. I must draw the attention of the hon. member to the fact that this question is already before hon. members in the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne. It is the privilege of every hon. member to make any suggestion and any recommendation to the government, and to discuss any matter which comes under government responsibility; therefore I do not see any urgency and cannot allow the motion to be made.

Mr. COLDWELL: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to dispute your ruling, but I should like you to reconsider the ruling in the light of the circumstances—

Mr. MACKENZIE: Order.

Mr. COLDWELL: —in which this house may be placed from time to time. Under such a ruling almost anything that an hon. member wished to place before the house could be ruled out.

Mr. MACKENZIE: It is not debatable.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must say to the hon. member that I have already rendered my decision and it is not debatable.

Mr. COLDWELL: I am not disputing it, but I am asking for reconsideration.

CONSULTATION WITH FARMER ORGANIZATIONS AS TO SETTING OF PRICE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. W. BURTON (Humboldt): Did the government confer with any farmer organizations in regard to the setting of the price of wheat, announced yesterday by the Minister of Trade and Commerce? If so, what organizations were consulted? Further, did anyone agree to it, on behalf of the organized farmers?

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask the hon. gentleman to be good enough to place his question on the order paper.

REQUEST THAT 1945 BE DECLARED A CROP FAILURE YEAR IN ALBERTA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. VICTOR QUELCH (Acadia): Would the Minister of Agriculture say whether or not it is the intention of the government to declare the present year a crop failure year in the province of Alberta?

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not see any urgency in the question of the hon. member. It should be placed on the order paper.

BARLEY

MEASURES TO COUNTERACT REDUCED YIELD IN WESTERN PROVINCES

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the house and before you proceed with the next item I should like to read a statement on barley which I promised to the house yesterday.

Due to drought conditions extending over the greater part of the crop growing areas of western Canada the yield of barley has been greatly reduced and action has been taken to counteract this condition so that the live stock production programme of Canada will not be jeopardized.

In order to protect Canada's live stock feeding programme and because of the short crop of barley, the agricultural supplies board is of the opinion that all barley marketed in 1945-46 from the 1945 crop should be made available for the domestic market. With this in mind the feeds administrator advised the grain trade on August 22 last that no further export permits would be granted during the crop year 1945-46 for barley, whether whole, ground or processed.

To enable farmers to purchase and feed the higher grades of barley, some of which would normally receive a premium, when sold to domestic maltsters or exported, it has been decided as a temporary measure to add five cents to the advance equalization payment, thus raising the amount from fifteen cents to twenty cents per bushel on all barley marketed in the prairie provinces, the Peace River block of British Columbia and Creston-Wyndall area, British Columbia, during the crop year 1945-46. This increase will be made retroactive to August 1, 1945, on all barley delivered and sold since July 31, 1945, without receiving the malting premium. If any barley has been marketed and sold since that date without receiving the full five cents per bushel premium, then payment will be made up to the five cents. Regulations in this regard will shortly be released by the Canadian wheat board and these regulations will fix the effective date for payment at country points of the twenty cent advance equalization payments as farmers deliver their barley.

These regulations will also change the present methods of payment of malting premiums by domestic maltsters. Instead of paying the malting premiums to the seller of the barley, the maltsters will be required to pay five cents per bushel on all barley purchased into the equalization fund. The same system of paying the premium into the equalization fund will be used by exporters, if the assurance of domestic supplies will permit the export of some barley later in the crop year. The effect is, therefore, that the increase in the equalization payment replaces for the present crop year the malting premium that would otherwise have been paid to some farmers on barley sold to domestic maltsters or exported.

To further safeguard the feed situation throughout Canada, the present policy of holding reserve stocks of feed grains at Fort William and in eastern Canada, on which the government pays interest and storage charges, has been extended to cover part of the prairie provinces and British Columbia.

Mr. SENN: Is it the intention of the government to continue the freight assistance policy for the movement of feed grain to the eastern parts of Canada during the year?

Mr. GARDINER: As I remember it, the present position is that the order in council authorizing that assistance earlier provides for the payments until further announcements are made, and there has been no announcement made of any change with regard to this year.

Mr. LOCKHART: Is this subsidy, if that is what you call it, to apply to eastern as well as western barley?

Mr. GARDINER: This provision has to do with the control of the barley crop in the western part of Canada.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

SURVEY OF POST-WAR EMPLOYMENT PROSPECTS—REPORT OF INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): May I direct a question to the Minister of Labour, of which I sent him notice earlier to-day. Will the minister table the interim or completed report of the survey on post-war employment prospects made by his department last year, which on March 23 last he stated was incomplete? Further, will he also table the report which I understand was made in August last by an interdepartmental committee, appraising employment prospects in war and civilian industry.

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): I want to thank my hon. friend for giving me notice of this question; but I think he will agree that it has become an established precedent in this house that memoranda submitted to a minister by officials of his department are not subject to being tabled.

Mr. COLDWELL: Were they memoranda, or were they surveys?

HOUSING

BUILDING MATERIALS PRIORITY FOR SOLDIERS' HOUSES IN ALBERTA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. PATRICK H. ASHBY (Edmonton East): In view of the serious shortage of building materials in Alberta, will the govern-

ment empower and authorize the local emergency shelter administration in Edmonton to commandeer what supplies are available and give priority for their release to returned men where houses cannot be completed before winter sets in unless such action is taken?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction): The distribution of lumber is handled by the timber controller, and there is quite an organization responsible for that distribution. I feel quite certain that to have another authority intervene, even in one province, would lead to confusion; therefore I believe the present system, which we are trying to perfect as much as possible, is the only feasible method of handling the situation.

Mr. ASHBY: Then may I ask a further question. In view of the serious shortage of plumbing and other building materials in Alberta, will the minister say whether the air force station at Penhold could be dismantled and the material made available for the construction of houses in Edmonton for returned men? I am informed that sufficient material would be thus made available for all their needs.

Mr. HOWE: That is not a question which could be answered on the orders of the day, because it will be necessary to obtain information from my officers and, as a matter of fact, from another government department. I suggest that the question be placed on the order paper.

PLUMBING MATERIALS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF SOLDIERS' HOUSES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. NORMAN J. A. M. LOCKHART (Lincoln): A day or so ago I directed a question to the minister in this same connection. I thought perhaps a statement might be made as to whether or not this material is available, because houses are being held up waiting for equipment. It seemed to me a statement in this house would be timely in order that the people might know the situation.

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction): I gave an extensive answer to that question when I spoke in the house on Monday last. Perhaps if the hon. gentleman will read my speech he will find the answer there.

Mr. LOCKHART: The minister said, "No, no, no," but this equipment is lying idle.

[Mr. Ashby.]

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Arising out of the last question I should like to ask: might we be informed what the question was, and what was the answer?

Mr. IRVINE: Put your question on the order paper.

MUNITIONS AND SUPPLY

QUESTION AS TO TRANSFER OF CONTROLS TO PRICES AND TRADE BOARD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. K. FRASER (Peterborough West): Are the controls that have been carried on by the Department of Munitions and Supply being transferred to the wartime prices and trade board?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): The controls carried on by the Department of Munitions and Supply have to do with scarcity, and those controls are not being transferred. Some of the controllers often act for the wartime prices and trade board as administrators of prices; they are subject to a dual jurisdiction, and that situation is not changed. If the scarcity control ends, the price control is left where it always has been, as the responsibility of the wartime prices and trade board.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

HOSPITAL ACCOMMODATION IN TORONTO

On the orders of the day:

Hon. H. A. BRUCE (Parkdale): May I direct the attention of the Minister of Veterans Affairs to a report which appeared in the newspapers this morning in regard to the serious shortage in accommodation available at Christie street hospital, and the lack of sufficient staff to deal with the situation? I should like to ask the minister if he will make a statement in the house shortly dealing with the whole subject, and with particular reference to the progress being made in the construction of Sunnybrook hospital.

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): I shall be very glad to take my hon. friend's question under advisement.

MEAT RATIONING

AVAILABLE SUPPLIES, STOCK FOR SLAUGHTER, AND SHIPPING CONDITIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): On Tuesday I asked the Minister of Finance if he would be good enough to consider mak-

ing a statement to this house with regard to the meat supply in the country, the possibilities in regard to stock for slaughter, and the shipping situation, in order that we in this house might understand the position. I am not opposing rationing, but I should like to get the information with which to answer many of the inquiries that are coming to me

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): I read in *Hansard* the remarks of my hon. friend, and I am considering whether I should make a brief speech during this debate, if it lasts long enough, to put some of this information on *Hansard*.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Wednesday, September 19, consideration of the motion of Mr. W. M. Benidickson for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Bracken, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Mr. THOMAS REID (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, in complimenting you upon your election to the high office of Speaker of this house let me also commend you for having drawn to the attention of hon. members the rule prohibiting the reading of speeches. If I am to judge by past years your task is not going to be an easy one; and as one of the twenty-five or so hon. members who have sat in the house since 1930 or prior to that year I await with some interest your enforcement of the rule, after the new members have made their maiden speeches.

We on this side may be pardoned if we seem to take pleasure at the return of the Liberal government to office in Canada after six years of war. It is a unique record in the political life of any government, and I think it well that we take note of the fact that in no other country has the government been returned after holding office during war-time. This government is faced with a difficult task in the period which lies ahead of us; but, as was pointed out by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) our plans are being well and truly laid, and in fact are further ahead than those of any other country in the world to-day.

Much has been said about Canada's enviable record, and the splendid contribution in men and material this country has made toward the defeat of Germany and Japan. Another record has also been made, one which to my mind will be of great help during the critical years lying ahead, and that is that this country for the first time has undertaken a great financial effort through and by its own people. We have not borrowed, nor have we had lend-lease; yet billions of dollars have been expended, all of which have been contributed by the Canadian people.

In an endeavour to be as brief as possible it is my intention to touch upon only one or two matters. In the speech from the throne the matter of a Canadian flag was touched upon, and has been discussed by some hon. members. I think more people in Canada to-day will welcome the fact that the government has decided to have a Canadian flag. If the choice were left to me I could see none better than the one which flies above the parliament buildings. The red ensign is beautiful and distinctive, and carries all those symbols which I believe would please all groups in Canada. Certainly it is more striking than the flags of either New Zealand or Australia—and I shall refer to those countries later. If I were to change anything on the red ensign it would be to place thereon the maple leaf, something which I suggest might be done to good advantage. Now that we have decided to have a distinctive flag, I trust that any discussions in regard thereto will be free from recriminations from any section of the country.

Mention has been made of old age pensions. While I had not intended discussing that subject in this debate, I must say I was disappointed in the proposals for the betterment of the present old age pension plan, as outlined by the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Claxton). I should like to see something more, and to have heard proposed a proper contributory system, retiring everyone who so desired at the age of sixty-five years. Under such a system, any person receiving the benefits would receive them by right rather than as a matter of charity.

I have one criticism to offer. When members of the C.C.F. party deal with social security measures, and proceed to tell what has been done in other lands, for reasons best known to themselves invariably they do not tell their audiences that in most of those countries, if not all, the people or the workers involved make a direct contribution toward the social security provided. By that omission they leave the impression that the money comes from the state as a whole; whereas, if one will look at the record concerning most countries, and particularly Great Britain, New Zealand and Australia, they will find that the people there, and especially the workers, pay in large measure—and, Mr. Speaker, as I shall show in a minute or two, they pay plenty.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) referred the other evening to conditions in New Zealand. Before proceeding to dissect his remarks may I point out that if we are to have discussions in Canada about New Zealand or Australia, and if it is to be suggested by any party that the policies in those countries are the ones we should follow, then I say for any sake let us have all the facts, not just part of them. I am prepared to discuss the facts, as I know them, from official records of New Zealand.

Mrs. STRUM: Is the hon. member aware that New Zealand began as early as 1939 to pay old age pensions at the age of sixty?

Mr. REID: If the hon. member were to read my past speeches about New Zealand, she would find that I am perfectly well aware of the social measures of that country. What I have said is on the record.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre mentioned first of all, the price of food. If hon. members will recall, or will look at *Hansard,* they will find that I interjected, and that the hon. member was good enough to take his seat to permit me to ask a question. I asked him, if food was cheaper in New Zealand, what were the farmers receiving?—because, after all, it is they who produce the food. Let me assure hon. members, however, that when one is dealing with percentages he finds that at times they do not always reveal the complete picture. Be that as it may, in the cost of living index for New Zealand it is shown that the cost of food is only some 29·52 per cent of the entire living costs. The remaining 70 per cent is made up of manufactured goods, including rents, all of which must be paid for. Those manufactured goods purchased by the people of New Zealand cost from two to four times as much as the same articles in Canada.

Not only are lower prices paid to New Zealand farmers, but their labour costs are higher, and the farm machinery they use—the same kind used in Canada—costs far more than the same machinery would cost in this country. Had I the time I would be prepared to talk costs in dollars and cents. Sometimes, I realize, that is not always a complete picture; but I could tell the house what farmers have to pay in butter, wheat and eggs for farm machinery in New Zealand, as compared with what like machinery would cost in Canada.

Mr. KNOWLES: Would the hon. member give the source of the information he is now giving the house?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: The New Zealand year book.

Mr. MacINNIS: Where did you get it?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I will lend you a copy.

Mr. MacINNIS: You are not making the speech.

Mr. SPEAKER: Again I must call the attention of hon. members to the fact that when a member is addressing the house no interruption can be allowed without his permission.

Mr. IRVINE: We have a right to know the source of the hon. member's information.

Mr. TUCKER: Oh, you are the only people who know anything, probably.

Mr. COLDWELL: We want its source.

Mr. REID: This speech seems to be a thorn in the flesh of the group now interrupting, because they have been speaking so much on the subject, and do not like to hear an answer. Now we find that an hon. member asks for the source of information before I have given that information.

Mr. KNOWLES: We want the source of the information you have already given.

Mr. REID: Well, wait until I give it—and if there is going to be a free-for-all, then all I ask is that they come one at a time.

Mr. KNOWLES: As you did the other night?

Mr. REID: I am sorry, but the other evening I asked a real question, as the hon. member knows.

At the last session, information with regard to taxes in New Zealand was put on the record by myself, and so I shall not weary the house by repeating it; in any event I have not the time to do so now. But the amount paid in New Zealand for income tax is set out in a speech of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) which I hope every member will accept as official. I am sure that will be good enough authority. He gave the information last year when he brought down his budget, and it can be found in *Hansard.*

Let me now put on the record just what the man in New Zealand has to pay for his social security measures—because some hon. members are leaving the impression that what is done in New Zealand is done without any direct contribution from the people. First of all, everyone employed pays five per cent on his wages, and seven and one-half per cent for war tax, making a total of twelve and

one-half per cent deduction from his wages or salary as a start. Then each year he has to pay £1, or $3.60, as a registration fee. There is also a sales tax of twenty per cent, and another item which may interest some hon. members, although it does not interest me—a tax on beer of nine cents per pint. If a man in New Zealand drives a car, he pays twenty-five cents per gallon on the gasoline used, and if he owns a radio he has nearly $6 per year to pay. There are, I believe, other taxes, but perhaps these examples will be sufficient for the moment. I hope that people in this country when they hear these members talking about New Zealand will do what I have done—investigate and find out for themselves what is being done in that country. If they do, they will hesitate a long time before they elect the C.C.F. to office. We are hearing a lot of what if I were outside the house I would call loose talking, but as I am in the house I will say it is just piffle.

An hon. MEMBER: You are right in your own line.

Mr. REID: If you want me to tell the line you should be in I can do so. The C.C.F. talk about more social security and a reduction of taxation. In New Zealand—we are keeping to New Zealand because the C.C.F. introduced it, and I am glad they did—it is a matter of soaking the low wage earner and letting the man in the higher brackets off as far as income tax is concerned.

Mr. MacINNIS: That is why they vote for the Labour party.

Mr. REID: We will likely hear plenty about the Labour party. I said that we would not hear much about New Zealand after I made my last speech in the house, and I was quite right. Is it any wonder that the leader of the opposition in New Zealand, whose remarks must be taken to be just as authentic as those of the opposition to this government, who says that in New Zealand the farmer is the forgotten man? The Labour government of New Zealand are becoming perturbed about the farmer because they realize that the stranglehold they have on him and the things they have done to him are not going to last much longer. I ask hon. members to note what is now taking place in New Zealand. The New Zealand Labour government, which has few, if any, farmer cabinet ministers, are now out to take some representation away from the farmer constituencies. At the last election the farmers nearly outvoted them and so it appears that before the next election comes along the New Zealand government plans to reduce the representation of the farmer constituencies so that the balance of power will be held by those in the cities.

Many people in this country are carefully watching the new government which was elected in Great Britain. I came from that country in my early days, and it is my humble opinion that the people of Great Britain will take less during the serious days that lie ahead with better grace from a Labour government than they would do from a Conservative or even a Liberal government. Probably that is all to the good. Have you noticed however, the change in the attitude of certain people in this country and the United States since the Labour government was elected? We did not hear much about Great Britain from the C.C.F. members in this house before the war, although we heard a great deal against the British empire and the British commonwealth of nations. Hon. friends opposite now seem to have a kindly feeling toward the British government. This has arisen only since the election in Great Britain.

Be that as it may, I am going to quote what one of the cabinet ministers in that Labour government had to say. I ask hon. members to note the dissimilarity between the policies of the Labour government in Great Britain and those of the C.C.F. in this country. I quote from the Ottawa *Journal* of September 5, which contains a report of a speech made by Herbert Morrison to the national conference of labour. The article is headed "Nationalization no 'magic cure', says Morrison".

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. REID: I am glad hon. members say "hear, hear". The article says:

> The test of success will be whether those industries will be better run, whether they will show a steady increase in technical efficiency and public spirit from top to bottom.

And then later on:

> Morrison warned that if people in industry —both labour and management—lose their spirit of enterprise, then the new Labour government will be helpless and unable to better Britain's standard of living.

Mr. COLDWELL: What is wrong with that?

Mr. REID: Nothing. The labour men of Great Britain believe in free enterprise; they believe also in private enterprise and in profits. They talk of their taking over the Bank of England, but we did that in this country ten years or so ago. We are not behind the times here; we are abreast of the times, because we took over the Bank of

Canada long ago. There are those who speak about the socialization of industry. That is what the C.C.F. have been talking about, and I should like to give another interesting picture. I quote from the Ottawa *Journal* of September 15, where reference is made to a report by Sir Keith Murdoch, who owns a number of newspapers in Australia and who I think is in a good position to discuss the affairs of that country. Here is what he said:

The annual money losses have been fantastic since 1915. They reached a zenith of £10,000,000 in 1931, and in the year before the war were still £2,750,000.

I trust I am speaking loud enough so that all will hear.

Socialism really got going in the state of Queensland and there many enterprises were socialized. During the period of state operation they lost:

£1,669,804 plus £324,000 uncharged interest on cattle stations and closed them down.

£28,014 plus £3,396 uncharged interest on butchers' shops.

£143,000 on a cannery.

Then follows a long list of other socialized industries which they now have let go back into private hands.

Mr. COLDWELL: What country is the hon. gentleman speaking about?

Mr. REID: Australia.

Mr. COLDWELL: A Labour government in power two years.

Mr. REID: In that country they have states just as we have provinces. I say this because we are now having socialized industries tried out in Saskatchewan, where they have gone into the brickyard and other businesses. I am interested in that brickyard and will want to know how it turns out, and other socialist ventures, too.

The experience of other states in Australia has been about the same. Let me give a few of the high points. The state of Victoria had a socialist mine, the product of which was wholly taken over by the government. That mine always had a loss. After four years it had a total loss of one million pounds.

New South Wales, another state in Australia, took over a coal mine, and charged two shillings and sixpence a ton more for their coal, yet they are losing something like £300 per week.

Mr. GILLIS: A worn-out operation before they took it over.

Mr. REID: Sir Keith was asked the reason for these failures, and this should be of interest to the people of Canada. I quote:

Why then have these socialist ventures failed in Australia? Sir Keith says that many of the Australian enterprises had capable managers who knew their business. The failure was due to other causes. Sir Keith puts them into a few paragraphs:

"Australians . . . are, alas, so very human that, when governments have gone into industry, those concerned have used their unions and their pressure politics, their votes and their influence to get personal advantages."

And again after observing that managers and executives were capable, he says, "They have been powerless against constant political interference, leading to over-development, over-capitalization and faulty finance."

And finally:

To-day nearly all these state enterprises are back in the hands of private enterprise after having proven inefficient and a huge drain on the taxpayers.

In fact to-day it is open to question whether Australia has more state enterprises than Canada, and they are not as successful as those in Canada. From what I know, Mr. Speaker, they are not nearly so successful as the government enterprises we have in Canada. I thought it advisable, in view of what the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre said in introducing this subject, that I should put the other side of the picture before the people of this country. In passing, if we are going to discuss these questions, I say let us have the entire picture. I do not want to be accused as I was on former occasions, of intending by my remarks anything derogatory to the people or the country of New Zealand, but I do feel that when a party in this house is constantly dangling before the people of Canada what New Zealand has been able to accomplish, we ought to know just what the facts are. These hon. gentlemen have been pointing to New Zealand with pride for three or four years, but before the people of this country turn over all they have to an untried socialist government, I say we should know what the actual facts are about New Zealand and Australia.

Mr. KNOWLES: Will the hon. member permit a straightforward question?

Mr. REID: Certainly.

Mr. KNOWLES: I asked it once before, but perhaps the hon. member did not hear it. Will he give the house the source of the information about New Zealand that he has placed on *Hansard* this afternoon? I have before me the official New Zealand Year Book, and my hon. friend's information does not tally with the official record.

Mr. REID: I think that is a fair question. The last time I spoke on this subject I stated, in answer to a question put by the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis), that I was quoting from the official New Zealand Year Book, the latest edition obtainable in

the library, and the figures I gave of income tax comparisons I took from the speech which the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) made in the house last year. I have already given the source of the information which I quoted to-day.

Mr. KNOWLES: Oh, no.

Mr. COLDWELL: Just newspaper reports, Lord Beaverbrook's.

Mr. KNOWLES: The hon. member gave us the sources he says he used last year, but he has not stated the sources of the figures he has given the house to-day.

Mr. REID: These statements come from New Zealand, and most of the information from the statement of the Hon. Mr. Nash, the finance minister of that country. He dealt at great length with their social security measures and the payments which workers and the people were called upon to pay to support these socialist ventures. I have a copy of it here. I think that when the Minister of Finance gives these figures they should be accepted as authentic. Who could give a truer picture than the minister of finance?

Mr. COLDWELL: It does not sound to me like one of Mr. Nash's speeches and I have read many of them.

Mr. REID: I shall be pleased some time to show the hon. member the documents.

Mr. KNOWLES: Send them across.

Mr. REID: Not until I am through. You do not catch me like that. I know that old game.

It was not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to say one word about the Japanese this afternoon, but the subject has been introduced into this debate. I have one question to propound to the member for Winnipeg North Centre, who spoke of the great deeds of the men of the Winnipeg regiment, who are now returning from Hong Kong. When it comes to the time to dispose of the Japanese in Canada, I am just wondering whether my hon. friend would leave the decision in that matter to those Winnipeg men who are returning from Hong Kong. If he would not, I would like him to tell the house why these men should not have some say in this matter. I do not want these words of mine, Mr. Speaker, to be twisted around outside this house, as they have been before, to make it appear that I nurse some racial hatred against the Japanese. Those are tactics that have been resorted to in the past; they could not discount the arguments that we put up, so they talked of racial hatred.

May I say to those who have become the champions of the Japanese in this country, that I would be willing to abide by the vote of the people of British Columbia; and if that is not the democratic way to settle it, I would like to hear why it is not. I would like to be told a better way. I am sure that if this question were left to a vote of the people of British Columbia there would be no doubt as to what would be done with the Japanese in this country.

Mr. MATTHEWS (Kootenay East): Who brought them here?

Mr. REID: Not I, sir.

In closing I want to say one word about the atomic bomb. I think Canada has been rather too timid and backward in not seeking to take some credit for the development of the atomic bomb. Canada supplied the minerals, the scientists and other kinds of help in its development, and we are just as much entitled to credit, if credit is due, as is the United States. If I had my way, though, I would not divulge the secret of the atomic bomb to any other country, because if we pass the information around it is going to be more difficult indeed to keep it a secret. God forbid that there should be another war! But who can tell? When one looks round at the multitudes of people in the various countries some of whom are beginning to arm, I think that from a practical point of view we should keep that secret to ourselves, because the day may come when we may have to use it again.

Mr. H. C. GREEN (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, in opening my remarks to-day may I, as so many others have done, congratulate you on your appointment to the high office which you now hold, and may I say that judging from the manner in which you have fulfilled the duties of your office since the opening of the house, I am convinced you will preside over our deliberations not only with fairness but with quiet dignity and kindliness; that means so much to every member in the chamber. I believe you are a worthy successor to our former Speaker, the present minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Glen), who also possessed these gracious attributes in a very large measure.

The attitude of the government in this debate has taken quite a change during the last few days. When the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) rose to reply to the speech of my leader, the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken), he acted as though there were nothing to answer—nothing had been brought out that was even worth answering. He went

on to boast a bit about the election results, and I could not help admiring his nerve in doing so. Here we have a government which had approximately half its supporters defeated in a general election, now holding office by the support of a group of members who were formerly independent, a group who have shown considerable facility in changing their political coat, a group who will not be very comforting people to have behind one in a pinch, and yet the Prime Minister says: "Oh, well; we won a great election; what is there to complain about? Let us get on with the business of the house."

A few days after that, on Friday last to be exact, the Prime Minister went to his new riding of Glengarry. Apparently he is going to keep up his political fences a little better this time than he did in the last parliament. He went to the annual fair, and according to the press he made certain statements. He is reported as follows.

Mr. King said that the three most important things facing Canada to-day were demobilization, employment and housing.

So that so far as he at least is concerned the amendment offered by the official opposition has had some effect.

Now I notice that the ministers are being smoked out of their holes; they are coming out and making statements, and the whole attitude of the government is not at all as smug as it was a few days ago. I suggest they would be very well advised not to try to assume that smug attitude at any time from now on until the end of this parliament, because they are very much under the observation not only of members on this side of the house but also of the Canadian people.

I have mentioned the main facts set out in our amendment. Let me read the amendment again for the benefit of all our friends to the left. I do not see how any one of them who is dissatisfied with the government's progress on the questions mentioned in the amendment can conscientiously vote against it. I quote:

We respectfully submit to Your Excellency that Your Excellency's advisers have:

(a) failed to demobilize our armed forces on a fair basis and, in particular, have failed to prevent serious disadvantage to overseas service personnel;

(b) failed to provide a speedy and effective plan of reconversion from war to peace, and failed in particular to join in partnership with labour and industry in devising a workable scheme to provide jobs, with fair wages, for discharged service personnel and war workers;

(c) failed to take adequate and timely action to meet the ever-mounting housing crisis.

To-day I propose to say a few words about demobilization and housing, to emphasize two features of reconversion which have not yet been dealt with to any extent in this debate, and to conclude with some remarks on Canada's policy or lack of policy in the Pacific.

First of all, demobilization. Our amendment sets out the position of members of the Progressive Conservative party, and it has been adequately dealt with by various speakers from our party. But yesterday there appeared in the press certain statements from overseas which I think require an explanation from the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Abbott). They deal with the repatriation of N.R.M.A. troops overseas. They allege that N.R.M.A. men who were forced to go abroad, and who were never in action, are being sent home ahead of men who fought. Apparently this is being done because these N.R.M.A. men have a high point score, most of such points earned by long service here at home in Canada.

This article quotes from the Amsterdam edition of *Maple Leaf,* which is a Canadian army newspaper and as such is entitled to the most careful consideration of every member of the house. The clipping says:

The editorial asked why National Resources Mobilization Act personnel who hadn't left the United Kingdom for Europe by V-E day now were returning home with the first division—

Not the fourth or the fifth division, if you please, but the first. It added that thirty-one per cent of a draft from the Saskatoon Light Infantry, support battalion of the first division, consisted of N.R.M.A. personnel. It went on to put the situation clearly:

This sort of business isn't funny. Men who volunteered to come overseas, who either went into action as volunteers or did their best as volunteers, to see that the fighting men were equipped with the necessaries deserve better treatment. This is an appeal on behalf of the volunteers who made the Canadian army an army of which to be proud. All that is wanted is justice.

That statement by the army paper seems very fair, and I think the government policy, if it is as alleged in the army paper, is very unfair. The Canadian people do not believe in a policy of that type. I suggest to the Prime Minister and his Minister of National Defence that the Canadian people from one coast to the other believe that N.R.M.A. troops who are available should be used for the army of occupation and that those still in Canada should be sent over to relieve the volunteers as soon as shipping can be arranged.

Then, housing. Like demobilization, it has been dealt with by those who have preceded me in this debate. I think it is largely a question of supplies. After all, we have every-

thing here in Canada to build houses. The problem is to turn our resources into buildings. I advocate that the government should lead an all-out drive, the same sort of drive that enabled us to build ships and tanks. There is not yet any evidence that an all-out effort to solve this housing problem has been made. The government have many war plants; surely some of them could be put to use for the production of supplies and equipment needed for buildings. I see by this week's press that in the United States all restrictions on construction have been removed. Perhaps the time has arrived when that should be done in Canada too. The construction industry in Canada has always been a progressive and up-to-date industry. I know that is true in the west. Men engaged in building have always been a good deal ahead of most other industries, and I am sure that if they are given their heads, if they are given every encouragement, they can provide the buildings much more rapidly than buildings have been provided in the last few months. I agree that houses are the first need, but the need does not stop there. There is a great need for small stores. Hundreds of houses have been put up with no stores to service them. Office space is needed. Doctors being demobilized from the forces are unable to get offices. The same thing is true of other professional and business men. This question of building is going to be of vital importance to Canada for a long time to come.

So far as office space is concerned I suggest to the Prime Minister that he have a survey made of all the office space in Canada being used by governmental departments. I know in my city of Vancouver there are government departments scattered around in practically all the large office buildings; they are in the very best space available in the city. At the same time we have the government using the old Vancouver hotel as an army headquarters. I am quite sure that many of the governmental departments could be put into that hotel, thereby freeing large areas of office space. Probably the same condition exists in many other centres in Canada.

I now come to reconversion. The first feature of the reconversion plan is the complete and utter failure to consider the human factor. Let me take you to Vancouver. On V-J Day, August 14—and no doubt the situation was exactly the same in other cities in Canada—the people were rejoicing; everybody was happy because at last this terrible war had ended. Within forty-eight hours—in fact within twenty-four hours in many cases—thousands of our citizens were thrown out of work, not knowing where to turn. I think the minister responsible for that policy failed to realize its effect on the people. And, mind you, the Minister of Reconstruction said something the other night which shows that he deserves a lot of blame for that policy. At page 227 of *Hansard* he used these words:

> Personally I am the last man entitled to claim surprise at the end of the war, having known months in advance the approximate date of the use of the atomic bomb.

There might have been some excuse for him and his department if he had no idea when the war would end, but certainly the man on the street, the man in the war job, had no way of knowing that the war was about to end. He was being told by the press and public men that it would go on into 1946. There was not the slightest suggestion that it was about over. He had been making a great contribution; had considered himself a partner with his loved ones overseas. Remember that many of our fighting men came from families the heads of which were engaged in this war work. These people in war work were high-spirited; they had answered every appeal made by the government; they were paying heavy taxes with not much chance to save; many of them were putting what little they could save into houses and trying to become established; and then immediately after V-J Day they were thrown out of work. They were told to get out to the woods and the mines. Many of them were not physically fit to do so. Many of them, by this time skilled tradesmen, were told, "You go out and get a job in the woods." Very little sympathy was shown to them in official quarters. They were treated as though they were a commodity like lumber or steel; and, Mr. Speaker, that shook the confidence of the people in the whole reconversion plan of the government. It affected not only war workers but also men and women engaged in ordinary peace-time activities. Everybody was jittery. They said, "Am I going to lose my job too?" It had a bad effect on the morale of the people in our province; also it was a bad example to set for private employers; it gave the private employer an excuse to fire people in just the same way. I think it is a very serious matter that the official mind worked in this way, and if it worked in that way on V-J day it will do so again. To me that is a very serious matter. It might have been all right in 1939—I do not think it was, even at that time—but since then there has been a steadily increasing value placed on people, placed on the human factor. The whole trend has been in that direction. Take the

trend of legislation passed in this house—the social security legislation; the whole trend has been to think of people before we think of material things and of wealth. The Atlantic charter promised freedom from fear and freedom from want. That is what the Canadian people expect. Instead, after V-J day they got this vindictive treatment; were thrown out of work without any warning. I suggest to the Prime Minister that is not good enough in 1945 from any government, federal, provincial or municipal.

It was not necessary. Other methods could have been used. The Minister of Reconstruction and other members of the government could have explained to the Canadian people that there was now a great need for men in the construction industry, in the woods and in the mines. They could have asked them to change over, to take these jobs in other industries. They could have called on the shipyards in Vancouver—and I use Vancouver only as an example—to release a certain number of construction workers, of miners, of loggers, and might have augmented their wages for a period of three or four months until these Canadians had become reestablished in other industries.

I also think some provision might have been made for the expense of moving, and there could have been a delay in the dismissals, rather than throwing people out by the thousands without any notice, as was done.

Mr. MITCHELL: The hon. member says, "without any notice". They were given seven days' notice.

Mr. GREEN: I was there; I know what happened. They were given seven days' pay and kicked out. That is what they were given. The picture is this: it was put clearly by the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. Merritt) in a speech I heard him make during the election campaign, and no one had a better right than he to make the statement. He said: "You can lead a Canadian anywhere, but you cannot drive him one inch." That should have been in the minds of the government in starting their reconversion plan.

Let me refer now to the second feature of the reconversion programme. The Minister of Reconstruction the other night used the words, "peace-time pattern of employment." What does that mean? It means that we either have or will have a pattern of employment for peace-time, a plan that will say which industries are to be maintained and which industries are to be allowed to die, that will say, as a result, where people are to get jobs. That decision is in the hands of the dominion government to a greater extent than ever before. They have these government plants; they have interests in other plants operated by private industry; they are placing many orders; they have great influence in marketing, in deciding where our goods are to be sold and what goods are to be sold; in producing and distributing materials; and through the industrial development bank. It is largely in the hands of the dominion government to-day to determine what industries are to be maintained in Canada and where the people will have to go to work. That pattern, if there is one, should be made public, for every portion of the country is vitally interested. Take as an example the people of British Columbia. We should know the pattern, should have a chance to discuss it with the government, and to take some steps at least to help maintain industries which we believe should be carried on into peacetime. Now we are working in the dark; there is too much uncertainty.

Let us look for a moment at the aircraft and shipbuilding industries in British Columbia. At one time the Boeing aircraft plant employed, either directly or through its subsidiaries, over ten thousand people. Men and women were working not only in Vancouver but in other centres throughout the province, doing a great job. In the United States the bulk of aircraft manufacturing is done on the Pacific slope; yet now in Canada that Boeing plant has been shut down. We would like to know whether it is the policy of this government to stop manufacturing aeroplanes on the Pacific coast and, if so, why that has been done.

At one time we had more than thirty-three thousand men engaged in shipbuilding in British Columbia, and in that province we turned out over seventy per cent of all the merchants ships produced by Canada. Many other subsidiary engineering industries were built up, and in fact industries of all kinds; many skilled workers were trained. Now there have been extensive lay-offs. There is some talk that in future our shipbuilding industry will have to go on a repair and maintenance basis, merely doing the repairing of ships. That happened after the last war. We had a flourishing shipbuilding industry on the Pacific coast then, but after the war it died. It is true that at present some government work is continuing, but there is no certainty about the future. This government has not announced any policy in regard to shipbuilding, and really there is no excuse for not having done so. In July of last year the Canadian shipbuilding and ship repairing association presented to the government a brief in connection with shipbuilding; various representations

have been made by labour unions and by members of the last parliament; yet no one knows just what the shipbuilding policy is to be. Last September it was announced that an interdepartmental committee was being set up to review the proposals submitted by the shipbuilders. I do not know whether that interdepartmental committee has ever met. It was supposed to meet and then the shipbuilders were to be called in. Labour union leaders also should have been called in, but no promise ever was made that this would be done. Apparently there have been no results, although all this happened over a year ago. Now what do we see happening? The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, one of the firms which will be requiring many ships, is placing its orders in Great Britain. I have a press dispatch, dated August 28, to the effect that their first freighter already has been launched at Glasgow, and that three more are to be produced in Great Britain. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company will require many passenger ships, both for transoceanic service and for coastal service. The same is true of the Canadian National Railways. Is it the policy of this government that Canadian companies are to be required to use Canadian ships? We must have a peace-time pattern for both the aircraft and shipbuilding industries, and we must have it at an early date.

So much for the amendment of the official opposition. In conclusion I come to the question of Canada in the Pacific. The centre of world activities either is shifting or has already shifted from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Far-reaching decisions are being made in that area this very day. As an example take the decision as to what treatment is to be meted out to Japan. It seems clear that a very strong hand will be required. That is something which should be of concern to every Canadian. Press dispatches show so clearly the attitude being taken by the leaders of that country. I have here a press dispatch dated August 15, which tells of a Tokyo broadcast by the chief of the Japanese broadcasting corporation's overseas bureau, one Kusuo Oya, who was broadcasting to the troops on the fighting fronts telling them about the surrender. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) laughs; I have no doubt he has had to learn a great many Japanese names since he took over the administration of the Japanese in Canada.

Mr. MITCHELL: When you pronounced that name I said you were doing pretty well.

Mr. GREEN: This broadcast is significant, because here is what the man said:

> We have come to a point where it is useless to resist the enemy further. We have bowed to the enemy's material and scientific power. . . . We have lost, but this is temporary.

The press dispatch goes on to say:

> Oya added that Japan's mistake was the lack of "material strength, necessary scientific knowledge and equipment," and declared: "This mistake we must amend."

A few days later we had a dispatch in which the sultan of Johore quoted the former Japanese commander of Singapore as saying:

> We hope that peace will last for twenty years, and then we will be back here again.

Then General Wainwright, that heroic soldier who led the United States troops in their last stand on Corregidor, told the American people the other day that no soft peace must be given to the Japanese, and according to the press dispatch he stated that the Japanese—

> . . . are not sorry for what they have done to countless thousands. . . .
>
> They are not sorry for the torture they have inflicted. . . . It simply would not occur to them to be sorry, because they have done nothing which is at variance with their accepted philosophy.
>
> That is the point which should be clearly understood. I am a soldier and I do not pretend to know how long will be required or by what steps the bestial elements in their nature can be eradicated.
>
> But until we are assured that these qualities have been extinguished—not simply submerged—then the Japanese nation, powerless as it is to-day to make war, will remain a menace to our world.

A strong hand is needed with Japan, and Canada's voice should be heard. The Canadian flag should be flying in Japan to-day. Other nations are showing great interest in the Pacific. Here we have the United States planning now for bases in different parts of that ocean. Russia is edging in, having moved into Manchuria. I have a dispatch dated September 4, which reads:

> The Soviet Khabarovsk radio said to-day that Russia is planning a large scale development of her northeast Pacific coast and will build new harbours on the Kamchatka peninsula opposite Alaska.
>
> Khabarovsk also told men of the Red army that Russia would turn the twenty-odd islands of the former Japanese Kurile chain into "varitable bastions forming a screen of steel" protecting Russian Pacific waters.

Australia also is taking a great interest and demanding that she be treated as a principal power in the Pacific, not as a subsidiary power. There is also the question of trade. Everyone knows how vital it will be to Canada to develop a great trade across the Pacific ocean.

Canada should be one of the principal powers in the Pacific. And yet, what is

Canada's Pacific policy? Nowhere is our position more uncertain. Throughout, the government have been hesitant. True, Canada was the first to declare war on Japan. Then we had the ill-fated expedition to Hong Kong. When it came to taking part in the Pacific council the Prime Minister had to be pressed before he would have this nation join the council. He took the position that it only had to do with the southwestern part of the Pacific; that there was no hurry for Canada to join it.

Then came the Kiska force in August, 1943, when Canada sent troops up to that island. But when the island had been taken, Canadian troops were not sent on to take part in the fighting on the other islands of the Pacific, as had been done with the United States troops. Oh, no; they were brought home, and they did no fighting whatever until more than a year later, when some of them were forced to go over to Europe.

Within the last few weeks we have had the spectacle of the Canadian cruiser *Uganda* taken from the firing line across the Pacific and brought back to Canada, because of the man-power policy of this government for the Pacific—something which did little good to the fair name of Canada around the Pacific shores.

At the present time the government shows little sign of being interested in the Pacific. Well, the Canadian government, the Canadian parliament and people would be well advised to watch very closely what goes on around the shores both of the Pacific and of the Arctic, as well as the Atlantic. Canada must be prepared to play her full part, and the government must take the lead.

Finally I would say a few words about this House of Commons. We are most fortunate in having among our number so many new members who have served in the armed forces of the country during this last war. Those who have spoken have shown clearly—oh, so clearly—that they have an important contribution to make to Canada's public life. They and their comrades are the greatest asset of this nation. The young men and women who have been in the fighting forces of Canada are the biggest asset of this nation to-day, and will be in the years to come.

Hon. members of those forces who have taken seats in this chamber have shown a fine spirit. I might add, too, that that same fine spirit has been shown by other new members who were not privileged to serve in the forces. There is on the part of members of the house a keenness to serve which I suggest is truly remarkable; to me it has been inspiring. In the years which lie ahead I am sure the house can, if it so chooses, give the Canadian people real leadership.

Many Canadians have been afraid of the post-war years. There have been many head-shakers, many prophets of doom. They have been wrong. Canada has come through the war stronger than ever, largely because of the character, courage and intelligence of the individual Canadian. Canadians can surmount every obstacle in the future; but let me repeat that this House of Commons has a duty to give them bold and straight-forward leadership in facing such obstacles.

Mr. P. E. WRIGHT (Melfort): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate I should like first to associate myself with the concluding remarks of the hon. member who has just spoken (Mr. Green). At first I had not intended speaking in the debate. I had been enjoying the valuable contributions made by the younger members who appear for the first time in the house. The contribution not only of members from the armed forces but that of other members has been of a high standard indeed, and one of which we may well be proud.

A further reason for refraining from taking part in the debate was that during the six sessions I have been here it has always seemed to me we have spent too much time on the debate in reply to the speech from the throne. In those sessions we spent on this debate periods ranging from two to six weeks, with the result that invariably in the last few days of each session we found ourselves passing millions of dollars' worth of estimates without having given them proper consideration. Therefore in future sessions I suggest we give some consideration to having this debate conclude when the various leaders of the groups in the house have spoken. I would ask that this suggestion be taken into consideration.

To-day I was moved to take part in the debate because of what was said yesterday by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) respecting the setting of a floor price under wheat for the next five years. This is a matter of great importance not only to western Canada but to agriculture throughout the dominion. Let me say at once that I am not objecting to order in council P.C. 6122, which sets a ceiling price of $1.55 on wheat for export. It seems to me the reasons given by the minister for the setting of that ceiling price are logical and carry great weight. Under the conditions existing in Europe there is every reason why we should contribute to their betterment. I would point out however that in doing so we should not place the burden upon only one section of our Cana-

dian economy. Under this order in council that is what we may be doing, especially if we allow the floor price of $1 a bushel, f.o.b. Fort William to remain, as suggested by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon). I am sure all hon. members will agree that as applied to the average half-section farm in western Canada to-day, it is below the cost of production.

I stated that I believed the floor price for wheat was of importance not only to western Canada but to agriculture throughout the dominion. During the last twenty-five years, in our agricultural economy in Canada, wheat has been king. If one were to follow wheat prices he would find that with very few exceptions—and these always where there were scarcities—the prices of other agricultural products have followed the trend in wheat prices. When we have had prosperity in western Canada and have had a good price for wheat, there have been good prices for other agricultural products throughout Canada. In those circumstances not only was there prosperity in agriculture, but that prosperity reflected itself throughout the economic life of the dominion. Prosperity in western Canada meant jobs in eastern Canada, better prices for fruit in British Columbia, and better prices generally throughout the dominion.

Wheat has been our greatest exportable commodity, and I believe it will maintain that position in peace time. The climatic conditions of a great area in Canada are such that not only is wheat the easiest crop to grow, but it is the most profitable. It will be seen therefore that a floor price for this commodity is of great importance to the country at large, and it has particular significance to-day because it gives some indication as to what the government's policy is going to be with respect to floor prices for other agricultural products.

Last year we passed floor prices legislation. The government stated that the legislation was being introduced for three purposes. First, it was to compensate agriculture for the low prices it had received for many of its products during the first two years of the war. During those years prices for agricultural products were really below the cost of production. I can remember in 1940 when there was a frozen wheat crop in northern Saskatchewan, the district from which I come, and our wheat was selling at from twenty-seven to thirty cents a bushel for feed wheat. We were buying British Columbia apples at $1.80 to $2.35 a box. It took five bushels of our wheat to buy one box of apples. That fall I had the privilege of visiting British Columbia, and I saw some of the orchards in which these apples were being grown. I found that the fruit grower was getting from thirty to forty cents a box for his apples while he was paying $1.95 per hundredweight for our feed wheat. In other words it was taking six boxes of his apples to buy a hundredweight of our wheat, while it was taking five bushels of our wheat to buy one box of his apples. The result was that there were thousands of children in western Canada who never saw an apple, and many fruit growers in British Columbia were not able to diversify their production as much as they would have liked to do. That, I say, was one of the reasons the government gave for introducing floor prices under agricultural products.

The other reason was to compensate for the price which agriculture might have received had there been no price ceiling structure in Canada. We all know that had there been no price ceiling structure, the prices of many agricultural products would have gone above the prices which were paid. The present legislation is being brought in recognition of the fact that the price of wheat probably would have gone to $2 or $2.25 per bushel if there had been no ceiling, and the same with beef and many other agricultural products.

The third reason they gave for bringing in floor prices was that it was to give the producer the cost of production. These floor prices were supposed to represent the cost of production of farm products, plus enough to give the farmer a return on his capital investment and a reasonable standard of living. I want to say that I do not think that the $1 per bushel for wheat will do any one of these things. That $1 per bushel for wheat is not $1 per bushel on the farm. It is really 80 cents per bushel on the average farm in western Canada, and that does not compensate the farmer for the low prices he received in the early years of the war or for the prices he might have received had this order in council not been passed. Nor will it give him his cost of production plus a reasonable return on his capital.

If you are prepared to farm three, four or five sections of land as a corporation farm, it is just possible that with economical management you might get away under the present legislation, but not under any other circumstances. I wonder if it is the policy of this government to have large corporation farming become prevalent in western Canada—because that will be the result of this present legislation.

This legislation is important because it indicates what the government's policy is

going to be with respect to floor prices under other agricultural products. It means a reduction from the present price of approximately thirty-five per cent. That is, floors under agricultural prices are to be placed at thirty-five per cent under the existing prices. I had a great many inquiries during the election campaign; and I have received many since, as to what I thought the government policy would be with respect to floor prices. I must say that at no time did I answer that I thought the policy would be a reduction of over fifteen, or at the most twenty per cent under present prices. But here we have legislation which is going to mean a possible reduction of thirty-five per cent in the purchasing power of the largest group in Canada.

Mr. GARDINER: It is just twenty per cent.

Mr. WRIGHT: One fifty-five and one dollar; figure it out. If that is not thirty-five per cent I will have to go back to school.

Mr. GARDINER: The floor is now $1.25, and if you reduce it to $1, that represents only a twenty per cent reduction on the floor. This does not prevent the farmer from selling higher, if a market can be found for a higher level.

Mr. WRIGHT: The legislation under P.C. 6122 sets the selling price at $1.55. That is the price we shall be getting for our export wheat under this legislation.

Mr. GARDINER: It is $1.55 for wheat sold overseas, but it does not say that that is the highest price that can be obtained for Canadian wheat elsewhere.

Mr. WRIGHT: I admit that if the legislation had not been passed we might have received higher prices. I believe the government at the present time is selling wheat in Canada for $1.25 per bushel for domestic consumption. That is being sold to our millers and the farmer is getting nothing.

Mr. GARDINER: Worse than that; the wheat board are selling it at seventy-eight cents to millers.

Mr. WRIGHT: I was going on to say that not only were they doing that; they were paying a subsidy to the miller, which means that the miller was grinding wheat at seventy-eight cents per bushel, basis Fort William. I wonder if that is what the government considers as the floor price, seventy-eight cents per bushel, basis Fort William?

As I said, this matter of floor prices under agricultural products is one of the most important problems we are faced with in the reconstruction period. It has to do with the purchasing power in the hands of a group of people which represents the greatest market in Canada. These people purchase more machinery, they build more houses, they buy more clothing and equipment than probably any other group in the dominion. If we are going to reduce their living standard by thirty-five per cent, I want to tell you that there will be a lot of people out of work in the next five years.

We are in favour of the quota system for marketing our wheat. I think this has been generally accepted in western Canada, especially the quota with respct to deliveries. It is good legislation and it has worked out quite satisfactorily. This $1 per bushel which we are getting under the proposal by the government as announced yesterday is not $1 per bushel for all the wheat we can grow in western Canada; it is only $1 per bushel for the wheat we grow under the quota, which is fourteen bushels to the acre on eighty per cent of our 1940 acreage.

What does that mean in income? I have a neighbour who is farming a quarter section. He has a family of six. Under the quota he can sell only from twenty-three acres, which means that he can sell fourteen bushels per acre from twenty-three acres of land. Anything he grows over that he cannot sell. I ask hon. members to use a little mental arithmetic to figure out how far that man can go toward clothing, feeding and educating his family on that sort of income. It just cannot be done. I am positive that this floor is not the floor which will be accepted by the people in western Canada.

The minister has not given us any indication whether organized agriculture in western Canada was consulted or not, or whether organized agriculture in the whole of Canada was consulted. Was the Canadian Federation of Agriculture consulted? Were other farm organizations in Canada consulted? We do not even know whether the advisory committee to the wheat board were consulted.

The minister has not stated in this house, nor has any other member of the government, that this is a satisfactory floor so far as the farm organizations are concerned. I doubt very much whether it is. I know western Canadian agriculture well enough to know that it can never be a satisfactory floor for wheat from western Canada with prices where they are to-day for the things the farmer has to buy. We have no guarantee from the government that if wheat drops thirty-five per cent in price, the prices of the implements the farmer buys will go down with it.

Indeed, we know quite well from past experience that that will not take place. During the last war the price of agricultural implements and all the other items that enter into the farmer's cost of production went up and stayed up practically all through the depression. Prices increased then, and prices have increased since this war started, despite the price ceilings. Anyone who has bought agricultural implements knows that. I had to pay $2,050 just a few months ago for a tractor that I could have purchased for $1,600 in 1939, and that $2,050 was after removal of the ten per cent war exchange tax. The prices for the implements the farmer needs will stay up when our agricultural prices decline.

What agriculture in Canada wants is some tie-up between the floor prices the farmers are to receive for their products and the prices they will have to pay for the things which enter into their cost of production. That is what they ask for, but there is no indication of that in the legislation brought down by the government.

Here is another point. Is the government treating all other industries in Canada on the same basis as agriculture? We have a government board dealing with textiles and a government board dealing with lumber. I have not heard of any price ceilings being placed on what the lumberman may charge for his exports. It is true that they can export only a certain quota, but for what they can export they can get any price that the buyer wishes to pay. Lumber is just as important as food to the people of Europe. I was over there last fall with other members of the house and saw the destruction of houses that had taken place in Europe. Houses are important just as food is important. Yet we have had no indication from the government that they intend to treat other industries in the manner in which they are treating agriculture. I hope the minister when he speaks will give us some such indication.

What does agriculture in Canada want?

Mr. BURTON: A fair deal.

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes, my hon. friend says agriculture wants a square deal. That is all that agriculture asks for. Agriculture does not ask and has never asked for special privileges. Agriculture wants only a fair deal. It wants to obtain only its fair share of the national income, according to production and according to the number of people engaged in agriculture. That is all the farmers have ever asked for through their organizations, and they have never got it. The only time in my life when agriculture received its proportionate share of the national income was between 1915 and 1919, during the last war. Even to-day, with agricultural prices where they are, agriculture in Canada is not receiving its proportionate share of the national income.

The farmers believe that they can do a lot for themselves through the organization of their own industry. They have asked this government to pass a natural products marketing act which would allow agriculture to organize so as to obtain the best possible prices for their products. They want a natural products marketing act which will allow organized agriculture, when a majority of the producers of any agricultural product signify their desire for it, to have a marketing board through which all of that product would be marketed, so that a small percentage of the growers may not be able to disorganize the whole market. They would be prepared to abide by regulations passed by the dominion government or provincial governments with respect to the quality of their products, so that the consumer would be protected. Marketing boards and export boards which would take care of the exportable surpluses of agricultural products, so that when they were to be marketed in other countries the government would step into the picture and through long-term agreements with importing countries stabilize the export market—that is what agriculture is asking for.

Last fall I had the privilege of visiting England and talking to quite a few members of the present government there. I know that so far as the food of Britain is concerned, they do not want to see it go back into the speculative markets. They intend to buy through government agencies, and I am sure that they would prefer to deal with cooperative agencies and government agencies for their requirements in the countries from which they are importing. They would be prepared to make long-term contracts which could be negotiated on a satisfactory basis to both the consumers in Europe and the producers in this country. But the present legislation indicates just the opposite. It indicates that it is the intention of the government to go back to the marketing of wheat in the manner in which it was marketed in 1939, when the war started. That is, we are going to have a wheat board which will be prepared to accept delivery from the farmer. The Winnipeg grain exchange will function again, and growers who are not prepared to deliver to the board will be able to sell their product on the open market. The floor has been set so low now that it is going to force many farmers to sell on the open market if they can get an additional five cents a bushel for their wheat because the initial payment is not sufficient to meet their expenses.

But that is what your legislation amounts to, and that is not the desire of the western farmer as expressed through all his organizations.

Mr. GARDINER: The last resolution they passed asked for an initial payment of one dollar.

Mr. WRIGHT: That was not a floor price. I know of no resolution that has been passed by any farm organization during the war which states that one dollar a bushel would be a satisfactory floor price for wheat.

Mr. GARDINER: They have passed resolutions to the effect that the initial payment should be one dollar. That is the last resolution they passed.

Mr. WRIGHT: When was that passed?

Mr. GARDINER: In 1943.

Mr. WRIGHT: That is an entirely different thing from a floor price.

Mr. GARDINER: It was the last resolution. It asked for $1 initial payment, and that is the only way under our system that a floor can be established, namely, by establishing the initial payment.

Mr. WRIGHT: It was not dealing with initial payment. I have here the latest report from the Alberta Farmers Union and the United Farmers of Saskatchewan, and this is what they say with respect to floor prices:

> Until a proper system of parity prices is established, farmers must be guaranteed floor prices for their products on a scale not less than the prices including bonus received by producers in August, 1944.

And so on. That is what they state in their official publication.

Mr. GARDINER: The farm federation is the official organization.

Mr. WRIGHT: I have here the statement of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture with regard to floor prices. I quote:

> Full consultation with organized agriculture in the working out of the government's proposed post-war policy of floor prices on farm products.

I wonder if that has been carried out.

> The basic principle of such a policy to be to guarantee to producers, price returns properly related to costs of production and to the need of providing for security and good living for the farm family.

That is not by any means what this legislation does. Not by any stretch of the imagination could this legislation be regarded as complying with that request.

As I said, we should have export boards which would make long-term agreements with the importing companies so that we would have stabilized prices for agriculture. I believe that such agreements could be made at the present time. I believe that this government could have made agreements with those countries for a five-year period and at prices which would mean a better return to farmers than under this legislation. I am sure that $1.25 a bushel is the lowest floor price that should be set for wheat in Canada. That is a price which would give to the average producer a reasonable return for his labour and for the investment which he has in his farm and in his equipment.

This group have been accused by certain sections of the press of being opposed to export trade. That has never been the policy of this group; we have never been opposed to export trade. What we were opposed to was export trade carried on by international cartels and monopolies for their own private interest and gain. That is a type of export trade which in the past has led to international ill will—the effort of certain people to obtain special concessions over the raw resources of the world, and the pitting of one nation against another. You can see what took place in South America, and you can see it taking place in the eastern countries to-day, and in fact right across the world. They are pitting one nation against the other so that the international cartels and monopolies can make private gain for themselves.

What we want is export trade controlled by our governments and used as an instrument of government for creating good will and cooperation throughout the world and a better standard of living for all the peoples of the world. Almost invariably these international cartels have made their profits out of the exploitation of backward nations and backward peoples. That has been the basis of their profits. We think that, from the point of view of the government, that sort of thing should cease and from now on we should operate on a different basis, using our export trade as a means of creating good will and cooperation throughout the world and raising the standard of living of backward peoples and nations, so that we may all have a better living standard. That is the policy of the C.C.F. with respect to export trade—not that we should be insular but that we should trade on the conditions I have suggested.

Another thing that the present legislation indicates is the reopening of the Winnipeg grain exchange. The minister shakes his head; he suggests that it does not. I hope he is right and that when he makes his statement he will assure us that it is not the intention of the government to see that the Winnipeg

grain exchange again functions in the handling of either coarse grains or wheat in western Canada. If he does that he will have the blessing of every farm organization in the west, because they have been asking for that consistently for the last ten or fifteen years to my knowledge. I hope therefore it is the minister's intention to see that these requests of theirs are complied with.

Agriculture can never be prosperous where there is fluctuation of income to the extent that the income of farmers has fluctuated over the past number of years. This legislation indicates that it is the intention of the government to allow that fluctuation to continue over a thirty-five per cent range. There is no other industry in Canada that can be prosperous on that basis, and neither can agriculture. We have to have stable prices. We must know from year to year, when we sow our crop, what we shall obtain for it. We must know, when we start to raise a hog, what we shall get for that hog when it is finished. We must know, when we raise or buy beef cattle, that we shall get a reasonable return for them when we have them ready for market.

We did this during the war. We stabilized agricultural prices to a large extent then. There have been a few fluctuations, I admit, and the government knows quite well the objections raised every time there have been such fluctuations. Surely they will not again throw the agriculture industry back to the wolves of speculation and allow them to treat that industry as it was treated in the past.

Give agriculture a chance to organize herself, give her a reasonable chance to put her own house in order, and she will do it and make a real contribution to our Canadian economy.

There is another reason why we should have stabilized prices for agriculture. Our returned men are coming back now, and a large percentage of them are going back into agriculture. They are taking up land under the Veterans' Land Act, and they are buying land to-day on the basis of present prices. Land prices in Canada, the prices of good land in sure-crop areas, have increased from fifty per cent to seventy-five per cent since 1939. In my own area you could buy a very good quarter section for $3,000 or $3,500 in 1940 and even in 1941. To-day the same quarter section sells at from $5,000 to $7,000.

The boys who are returning will buy that land on the basis of these prices to-day, and we are saying in this legislation that we will allow a decrease of thirty-five per cent in our farm income, which means a decrease in farm values, which will entirely wipe out not only the grant the government is making to the returned men in the buying of farms, but their little nest egg which they themselves have accumulated through savings which they will put in as the ten per cent payment on the land. So that the returned man will find in four or five years' time, when agricultural prices have gone down, that we have entirely wiped out the savings which he made through deferred payments during his service overseas.

That is not a bright future, and it is exactly what happened after the last war. It is exactly the way we treated the returned men after the last war, and we are doing the same thing again in Canada. I remember quite well after the last war when school lands in western Canada were offered to the public in 1918 at an up-set price—I am thinking of one particular section—of $10 an acre by the department of national resources in Ottawa. They did not get a bid on it. The returned men came back and within six months offered $10 an acre and were told that they could not buy the land except at open auction. They were informed, three months later that the land had been turned over to the soldier settlement board and if they wished to buy it they could communicate with the board. When a returned man did communicate with them, what do you suppose they asked him for the land? They asked him $21.50 an acre for one quarter and $23 an acre for another quarter, and he could take it or leave it, whichever he liked. That is what we are doing here again. It is not fair; it is not fair to our returned men. The setting of a floor price under wheat where the government proposes to set it, according to the statement made by the minister to the house yesterday, means the wiping out of the equity of the returned men in their land, which they may purchase under the Veterans' Land Act.

Mr. GARDINER: May I correct the hon. member's statement? The order, as I read it, does not set the advance at all. What the order says is that any time in the next five years it cannot be lower than $1; it can be set higher.

Mr. WRIGHT: The Minister of Agriculture knows as well as I do that every time the government had done that very thing in the last years before the war, almost invariably the price of wheat went down and sat on that peg or very close to it during the full period. That has been the experience in the past and the minister knows that.

Mr. GARDINER: The order does not say that the government is setting the price at $1;

it cannot be set at less than a dollar at any time to July 31, 1950.

Mr. WRIGHT: We are having a different story now.

Mr. GARDINER: That is what the story is, and I am telling the hon. member that he is telling a new story.

Mr. WRIGHT: Maybe the minister does not agree with the policy of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) and is still fighting for a better floor price. I hope he is; I hope that the cabinet will listen to him. I know from experience in the past they have failed to listen to him in other matters.

Mr. GARDINER: The order in council the hon. member is discussing says that the floor shall not be less than $1. It does not say it has to be.

Mr. WRIGHT: I am afraid the minister is making his old familiar play on words. He has done that and kidded the people of Saskatchewan for a long time, but he came mighty near to not kidding them the last time.

Mr. GARDINER: I was one of only four in Saskatchewan to have a clear majority.

Mr. WRIGHT: That is simply because there were only two candidates.

Mr. COLDWELL: The other three are in the C.C.F.

Mr. GARDINER: No; two are over here.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Twenty-eight is a good majority!

Mr. WRIGHT: I hope that, as indicated by the Minister of Agriculture, this is not the final word with respect to a floor price under wheat, and that we shall have a reasonable floor price set for that product. That is the whole basis of the plea I am making to the government to-day. I hope that they will bear it in mind and that it will have some effect on them.

Mr. ROBERT FAIR (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, like the hon. member who has just taken his seat, I have been to a certain extent forced into this debate because of the announcement made yesterday by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon). I am very glad to know that at least some of the ministers of the government are not satisfied with the meaning we took from that announcement yesterday. We are hoping that something better is coming about.

Before going on with what I have to say, I wish to thank the editor of the Ottawa *Citizen*, for the help he rendered in getting me back to this parliament. The help was in the form of a left-handed compliment in an editorial of April 26 last. The editorial was obviously false and deliberately misleading. Of course the objective was the return of another candidate for the Battle River constituency. The editorial was widely advertised over the radio, in local weeklies, and in posters on many telephone poles in the Battle River constituency. However, the net result, thanks to the editor of the Ottawa *Citizen*, was that his candidate collected less than twenty per cent of the votes polled and made a contribution of $200 to the national treasury. I hope that the government will make good use of this money, because the man who lost it perhaps could ill afford to lose it.

On another occasion earlier in the session I introduced a bill to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act. As I stated in introducing that bill the object was to do away forever with the Winnipeg grain exchange. On Monday last the hon. member for Winnipeg South (Mr. Mutch) speaking in the debate—and his remarks can be found at page 207 of *Hansard*—mentioned the fact that I had introduced this bill, and undertook to uphold the grain exchange as an institution. I did not in any way attack the grain exchange of any of its members, and I feel that the hon. member who took their part is perhaps one of the residents among the sleek and fat operators of that institution, while I am here interested in the lean, overworked and impoverished victims of that organization.

At page 207 of *Hansard* of September 17, the hon. member had this to say:

> The Winnipeg grain exchange has been investigated by royal and other commissions more than a score of times within my own memory, and without exception it has been held to be making an important and worth-while contribution in the marketing of the products of the prairies. During the whole of that period it has been a simple matter in some sections, and in some areas it still is, to get an audience and a sympathetic hearing by detracting from that institution.

Any hon. member who is interested in the remainder of the hon. member's speech in that regard can find it at page 207 of *Hansard* as I have indicated.

I think we all know, some of us from sad and costly experience, that the grain exchange is something like the gold standard. During the depression years of robbing the farmers and other classes in this country we stayed on the gold standard, but in 1940, owing to the pressure of war financing, we went off the gold standard. That, I think, is sufficient proof for us that it is not good in a time of

need. We also found that during the war practically all the grain exchanges in the British empire were closed down. The Canadian grain exchange was the last of them to close down, as far as my memory goes. I believe also we read in the press that Mr. Ranke, of the British cereals purchasing agency, refused to buy Canadian wheat if the exchange were left open. I remember also one of the senior members of the cabinet who has now gone to another section of parliament for security in his old days, possibly because he was scared to face another election, went to England late in the fall of 1939.

As far as legitimate business of the exchange is concerned I believe that they are allowed to operate by legislation, but that legislation is not just as it should be. In the past we have had millions of bushels of wheat sold on the exchange that was never grown. It has been operated as a gambling den in most cases to the detriment of the farmers of western Canada. At the present time and for a number of years past the wheat board paid commissions to these operators, many of whom render no service whatever on sales of our wheat. I believe the same system is carried on in the old country where they are subsidizing some of the idle members of the exchange, so that they will have the gambling den all ready to set up after the war is over and the party is finished. I have often wondered why we did not sell automobiles and other types of merchandise on the exchange as wheat is sold. I am wondering why we do not put our money on the exchange or on some similar organization, and then we would hear some of those who are helping to conduct the Winnipeg grain exchange do a lot of howling. Personally, in case anybody should have any wrong impression as to where I stand, I am definitely opposed to the operation of the Winnipeg grain exchange for the sale of wheat or other grains. When I say that, I am uttering the opinion of all of the farm organizations in western Canada. The grain exchange is not run for our benefit. There is no question about that. I have taken part in the debate to-day and have said what I have because I believe the present policy of the government is heading us for further use of the grain exchange. If that is the government's programme, then I wish they had told the farmers of western Canada about it before June 11, and we might have had some different results on that day.

When the minister made the announcement yesterday I do not think he felt very happy about it. The minister is an honest man and knows conditions in western Canada much better than some of the other members of the cabinet. I think he was a little bit ashamed when he made that announcement yesterday. Of course, it is in his department and there was nothing else for him to do but make it. I cannot agree with the interpretation the Minister of Agriculture places upon it.

In yesterday's *Hansard* we find the following at page 289:

> In asking Canadian producers to forego such benefits as might be realized in the short run through higher export prices, the government recognizes the paramount need for relative stability of income to wheat producers. Toward this end, the government undertakes that in the five-year period ending July 31, 1950, producers will receive not less than $1 per bushel, basis No. 1 northern, in store Fort William/Port Arthur or Vancouver on the authorized deliveries for each crop year.

From the words "authorized deliveries" I take it that we are still to be on a quota basis. Let us go back a number of years and take the wheat crop of 1935. At that time the price was established by the wheat board at 87½ cents, as a concession, I believe, granted by a number of parties, the government, the wheat board, the grain trade and the pools. In any event, when I came to the house first the price was 87½ cents a bushel, but I think the house will remember that before long radical changes were made in connection with selling our wheat. We soon found the price down to eighty cents; then legislation was brought into this house fixing the price at sixty cents. Later someone wanted to get a pat on the back, and had the happy idea of raising it again to seventy cents. That figure did not mean seventy cents in the pocket of the farmer delivering his grain to the elevator. On the contrary, in my part of the country, for the average grade, it meant about forty-five cents for the best grain grown in the world. That price obtained until the 1941 crop was sold. For the 1942 crop the price went up to ninety cents, and in September, 1943, another change was made which brought it up to $1.25 a bushel. Now, in September, 1945, the Minister of Trade and Commerce tells us the party is over, that we are going to get down to business.

Perhaps some people think the farmers are getting too well off, and I readily admit that to-day they are in a much better financial position than they were when the war broke out. But I would point out also that farmers are working more than twice as many hours as any other occupational group in this country, and that their standard of living is not nearly as high as that of most other groups. Now we are to get a floor price, but I am

afraid that after this year we are going to break our backs reaching down to that floor. That is what I was afraid of right along, when the legislation was brought in last year giving us guaranteed floor prices. No one even hinted where that floor price would be, and many of us were afraid it would be down in the cellar, that the legislation would be good for election purposes only.

I am not satisfied even with to-day's level of prices for farm products. It does not make any difference whatever what may be the prices for our farm products unless the prices of the commodities we have to buy are kept in line with them. During the years 1930 to 1940 the average portion of the national income received by the farmers of this country was 9·4 per cent. That is, 9·4 per cent of the national income went to approximately one-third of the Canadian population, who in most cases, as I have said already, were working twice as many hours as any other group. Even if we go back and take in a few of the good years prior to the beginning of the man-made depression, we find that the farmers of Canada, still representing one-third of the population, received only 11·3 per cent of the national income. If we take one specific year, 1932, we remember that many of us who had good crops at that time and hauled them to the elevators did not get back the cost of the threshing, and that year the farmers of Canada received five per cent of the national income. The Liberals were not in power at that time, so that we cannot blame them, although most people say the Liberals and Conservatives are alike. In any event nothing was done then to help the farmers. No move was made in the direction of cutting interest, the settlement of debts or anything of the kind to relieve the position of the farmers, with the result that we had to take it on the chin and come through as best we could. The condition that existed on the farms during that period is reflected in the statistics concerning the men who tried to enlist in the armed forces during the late war. In one case, out of 93,000 men who offered their services to the air force, only some 15,000 were able to pass the examinations, or one out of six, which is not a very good record.

I am not going to go into a great many details in connection with these matters, but I believe that the floor price should not be less than $1.25 a bushel for the next five years, with participation certificates issued for the balance. That will net us less than $1 a bushel for the average grade of wheat produced in my particular section of the country, and still will not give us our proper share of the national income unless the prices of the commodities we have to buy are kept down or cut down and the prices of other agricultural products raised. This also would help to make up for the low prices we received during the depression and the early years of the war and would let us pay interest on the debt which, because of the policies of the different governments, accumulated during that depression period. At the present time labour is demanding a thirty-per cent increase in wages, and in some of the newspapers we read that labour wants a forty-hour week. Just where does the farmer appear in that picture? The farmer is not organized. Time and again I have told farmers that they have the remedy right in their own hands, and have tried to get them to apply it, but apparently some of them still have the wool pulled over their eyes.

We were not told by the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Minister of Finance that during the next five years prices of other commodities would be cut or controlled, and I am just wondering what their policy will be when they come to deal with some of the other commodities. As I said earlier, I believe the present programme is designed to prepare the lambs once more for the slaughter-house; that is, to prepare the farmers for the reopening and operation of the Winnipeg grain exchange. That is a definite detriment; and while twenty or more commissions have been appointed to look into the affairs of that institution, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Winnipeg South, my reply is that twenty or more white-washing jobs were done, through which the farmers can see very clearly. I remember that on one occasion we sent to the old country to get the services of an economist over there—Sir Josiah Stamp, I believe it was—and that he made an excellent job! But the fact remains that the grain exchange was in operation during the worst depression years we had, and that they did not in any way succeed in keeping the price of grain up where it properly belonged.

While I am speaking about agriculture, perhaps I might mention one other point, namely, the necessity for some amendments to the Prairie Farm Assistance Act. I suggest that act should be amended so that settlement might be made on an individual basis. In years past hon. members in this group have advocated that, time and again. I believe even the Minister of Agriculture would understand very well that a farmer on one side of a road allowance may have a good crop, because of rain, while the farmer on the other side of the road might not have had the rain and would therefore be without a crop. In my view this should be settled on an individual

basis, and we should also widen the scheme to include a proper and complete crop insurance coverage.

There is something further that is wrong in the act as it now stands. Some provision has, I believe, been made in the regulations. The point I have in mind, however, affects the farmer who is in a dry belt and qualifies for bonus, but moves out before a certain date in the fall. Even though he has incurred expenses during the year, he is denied the bonus provided by the Prairie Farm Assistance Act. This should not be allowed, and is a wrong which should be corrected.

Then, I say the eight-bushel yield is too low, and should be set back to the original twelve bushels an acre.

Then, in respect of a father and one or more sons operating their holdings with one outfit of machinery, I suggest all should be given the benefit of individual bonuses. Otherwise farmers' sons will be discouraged from starting up in agricultural pursuits.

I now come to rationing—and I have heard a good deal about it. I believe that the idea of sending meat overseas is a noble one, and that most people are in agreement with it. However, I have not yet heard of very many people who are in agreement with the programme or policy in that connection as set out by the wartime prices and trade board. I feel that this is one of the most disadvantageous times in which to bring it into operation, because we are now having large runs of cattle into the stockyards, and we find that the facilities there available are not adequate to take care of the offerings, unless, as the minister pointed out the other day, the stock can be shipped out at the rate of so many a day. I am not sure that that suggestion can be followed. It is something which may sound very nice, but the practising of which may present some difficulties, because of train services and for other reasons.

I do not believe that rationing will cure the problem. I think it will be found that large quantities of meat will spoil, as it did spoil on that earlier occasion when rationing was discontinued. Many people at that time refused to give up their meat coupons for cheap cuts of meat, or for the processed varieties. To-day merchants seem to be understaffed, and are complaining about the extra work placed upon them, if they are to keep records, and all that kind of thing.

Yesterday morning I received a letter which, in part, is as follows:

> Why should meat retailers in the Dominion of Canada be on the dirty end of the stick because of the short-sighted policy of the Liberal government?
>
> Any ten-year old kid could have foreseen a drop in hog population with the existing differential between coarse grains and live hogs.
>
> If Messrs Gardiner and Ilsley would use some of the money they have been taking from the public by taxation to pay a just price on hogs, we could have so many hogs that the existing facilities could not process them and meat rationing would not be necessary.
>
> You can rest assured we do not intend to carry on under this system for many weeks. The amount of labour at our disposal will not permit us to comply with existing regulations, nor can we afford to pay for additional help solely to make up the innumerable returns and statistics demanded—
>
> Unless meat rationing is lifted, without any doubt, a total strike of meat retailers across Canada will ensue.

Only this morning I sat in a barber shop for a few moments awaiting my turn. A man was in the chair and, although I do not know who he was, what he had to say about rationing, and what the barber afterwards told me concerning their general conversation, would not be allowed by you, sir, in this chamber.

As I said earlier, it is a noble thing to export our surpluses to feed hungry people in other countries. First of all, however, I suggest our own Canadian people should be fed. I believe, too, that other action might be taken which would help increase the production of stock, and possibly bring our production to a point where we could more readily feed other people, and ourselves as well.

In order to do this, I believe in inducements, rather than in compulsion. One inducement would be that the bonus of ten and fifteen cents a bushel on barley—I believe it is ten and twenty cents at the present time—which is being paid to hog or cattle raisers who do not grow their own feed, should be extended to all those who feed and market hogs, regardless of whether they produce their own grain. We may be told that this is impossible; but I should think our statisticians would certainly be able to estimate how many bushels of wheat, oats or barley, are required to raise a hog, under ordinary conditions. If a man receives pay on the basis of ten and twenty cents on the number of bushels used in raising a hog, I believe that the difficulty would be overcome. By that means I feel production would be encouraged, and I believe that some action along this line should be taken, because production in my part of the country at least, and I believe in other provinces as well, will decline much faster now that the war is over, and with conditions as they now obtain.

It has also been suggested that because we have very few veterinarians in the country

the government should assist in some way in training and in keeping these veterinarians available. This is a profession which is not practised to any great extent to-day. Unless something is done the life of valuable stock will be jeopardized because of the absence of veterinarians in communities.

I have another item before me, one which I do not believe I could discuss fully before six o'clock. This would come under the heading of unfinished business; and when I say "unfinished business" I mean it was left over from the last parliament. I believe hon. members will agree it is one of those pieces of unfinished business which have followed the first world war and which have not yet been dealt with.

I have been glad to listen to so many young returned veterans from the war which has just been completed, and I hope that their courage in supporting the proposal which I make to-day, and which I have made on several other occasions, will not fail them, as it did not fail them when they faced the enemy. I would hope that before this session ends we would do something worth while for men who, in some cases, are the fathers of hon. members who represent constituencies in this parliament. I refer to the old soldier settlers from the first great war. As has happened after this war, a number of soldiers who took part in the first world war were recruited from farming communities. After the cessation of hostilities a number of these men decided they wanted to go back to settle on the land. After some sifting out, we find that 25,017 of these men were finally settled on the land under the soldier settlement board. The former Minister of Mines and Resources, who administered this scheme until recently, told us that the scheme was a hastily improvised one, and I agree with him. At the time these men were settled on the land there was advanced to them $109,034,331, which amounted to $4,358 each. The rate of interest was five per cent on current account and seven per cent on their accounts as soon as they went into arrears. They were given twenty-five years to pay. I have a lot more detail which I am not going into. I wanted to give a rough picture of things, because anyone who is interested can find full details in last session's *Hansard*.

Hon. members will remember that agricultural, cattle and hog prices went down, and a number of these men found that they were up against an impossible proposition. First, the land was purchased at very high prices and even under ordinary conditions they would not have been able to make things go. When poorer times came there was nothing for them to do but to get out. Finally some sixty per cent of them did get out; they had sense enough to see that far ahead. However, many others who had not that foresight kept on battling against almost impossible odds.

I am using the date of March 31, 1944, as the cut-off date. If the government persists in its policy it will not be more than possibly ten years before most of these old veterans will be dead. The government will be able to get back the land and sell it possibly to some Japs or Germans or Italians at one-half of the cost of the land as they are doing under present circumstances.

The total amount repaid was $75,888,550, made up of $50,507,493 principal and $25,381,060 interest. I am giving these amounts separately because I should like hon. members to note that during the same period the cost of administration of the soldiers' branch only was $27,340,763 or approximately $1,100,000 a year for the period under review. If you take the interest of $25,000,000 and the cost of administration of $27,000,000 you have a total of $52,000,000 odd. The amount of principal repaid was $50,507,493. A number of necessary adjustments were made amounting in all to $44,000,000 up to the end of March, 1944, at which time there was a total amount outstanding of $7,715,954.

At that time there were 6,153 men still remaining on the land. By that same date only 4,130, or sixteen per cent of the original settlers had been able to obtain title. The 6,153 who were still on the land represented twenty-five per cent of the original number. The average indebtedness at the end of March, 1944 was $1,254. I am bringing in this amount for a definite purpose. The original debt of these men was $4,358 and, after twenty-five years' hard work, in many cases persecution by the officials of the board, each man still owed an average of $1,254. That is equal to twenty-nine per cent of the original purchase price. Under the present Veterans Land Act a veteran who keeps up his payments over a ten-year period gets a grant of $2,320 which is thirty-nine per cent of the original amount of credit extended to him. On many occasions the government has made promises to these men, and that is exactly what another government did. I have here an address of Sir Robert Borden, then Prime Minister of Canada, which he made in 1917 to the Canadian expeditionary forces. He said:

> The government and the country will consider it their first duty to see that a proper appreciation of your effort and of your courage is brought to the notice of the people at home, and it will always be our endeavour to so guide

the attitude of public opinion, that the country will support the government to prove to the returned man its just and due appreciation of the inestimable value of the services rendered to the country and empire; and that no man, whether he goes back or whether he remains in Flanders, will have just cause to reproach the government for having broken with the men who won and the men who died.

Similar promises have been made by the present government and I hope they will make a better job of living up to them. Back in March, 1941 an order in council was passed which I think is of interest to all Canadians. It has made many of us hang our heads in shame. At that time it was found that a number of veterans of great war I were enlisting to serve in the second great war. A number of these old veterans were soldier settlers and they found they could not keep up their payments. They saw a way, at least for the duration of the war, to provide a means of livelihood for their families and they enlisted. No payments were coming into the soldiers settlement board, and on March 19, the treasury board, on the recommendation of the former Minister of Mines and Resources passed this order in council:

> The board has had under consideration a submission of the honourable the Minister of Mines and Resources reporting that:
>
> 1. A considerable number of persons who agreed to purchase farms from the soldier settlement board or from the director of soldier settlement on long term contracts have enlisted in the Canadian armed forces.
>
> 2. In many cases the dependents of such enlisted persons continue to occupy their farms but no provision has been made for payment of instalments in respect of their contracts or of taxes in respect of their farms.
>
> 3. The director of soldier settlement has no authority to carry such accounts indefinitely and it is considered desirable to provide for deduction from dependents' allowances to cover local taxes and interest due.
>
> Accordingly the board recommended . . .

That is the treasury board about which we have heard so much, the board that has so much control over parliament and to which some consideration should be given at an early date.

> . . . that notwithstanding any provision to the contrary contained in any of the regulations providing for payment of dependents' or marriage allowances in respect of dependents of members of the Canadian armed forces, that in all cases where the dependents of an enlisted person continue to occupy the farm for which such person is indebted to the director of soldier settlement and in respect of which the contract terms are not otherwise satisfactorily provided for, there may be deducted from the dependents' or marriage allowance amounts sufficient to provide for payment of taxes levied by the local taxing authority in respect of the property in question and interest accruing annually on indebtedness to the director of soldier settlement, such deductions to be made monthly and in no case to exceed $20 per month except with the consent of the dependents concerned.

Promises were made to these men after the first great war and definite promises were made during this war; yet we find that order in council in operation. In the case of the ordinary man who enlisted in this war for the first time there are no deductions from the allowances paid to his wife and family. But those fellows who have offered everything for the second time are penalized simply because they have entered into a contract with the soldier settlement board and are not able, on account of conditions man-made, artificial and deliberately planned, to make their payments.

Again, for those fellows who felt they had a little longer lease on life than some others and wanted to continue, order in council P.C. 10472 was passed on November 19, 1942, providing that those settlers with courage who wanted to try to carry on a little longer could bring their cases before the board or committee that was set up, and if that committee saw fit it could reduce the man's indebtedness by a certain amount, and give him a further extension of twenty years in which to pay off his indebtedness—forty-five years of his life to pay for a quarter-section of land and starve himself and his family in the process, simply because of the policies designed by this and former governments.

The action of the government in bringing down the price of our wheat to $1 a bushel for the coming five years is a challenge to the men who are settling on the land under the Veterans' Land Act at the present time. By that act—and I expect that policy will be continued—the government are making it impossible for any man, no matter how hard he works, or what kind of farm he may buy, to carry on and ever get possession of his home. It does not take many years, even for those who have established themselves in the farming industry, to find themselves thrown out on the road, as many of my neighbours have been in past years, when they are compelled to sell below cost of production and pay exorbitant prices for everything they buy. Before this order in council is made effective the government should review its whole agricultural policy and programme and take into partnership with them representatives of the farm organizations and have the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) divorce himself from his unhealthy and unholy matrimony with the banks and other financial institutions.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. M. E. McGARRY (Inverness-Richmond): My first desire in rising to speak this evening is to put the house at ease, and I do not think I could do better than to announce that my remarks will be brief. I wish, however, to preface them by extending hearty congratulations to you, Mr. Speaker, on the great honour that has been unanimously conferred upon you by this house. In the last parliament you, sir, and my very humble self had a close association in being seat-mates in what you might call the suburbs of the House of Commons. Now we are separated by distance. There is an old adage that says, "absence makes the heart grow fonder." If I might be allowed to change the wording I would say that distance makes the heart grow fonder, and that would be applicable to our associations at this session.

I know, sir, you are quite conscious of the fact that with the great honour bestowed upon you there goes a great responsibility, and knowing you as I do, I realize your willingness to assume that responsibility. I know also you are quite competent to discharge the duties which will devolve upon you, and I think I can speak on behalf of the house when I say that in the performance of those duties you will have the cooperation of every hon. member. The very unanimity displayed in appointing you to the position you hold is a prelude to that cooperative assistance which you will receive.

I wish also to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne, and right here I think I should compliment those who had the selection of those speakers. I think their choice was splendid inasmuch as they selected two hon. members who had contributed a great deal to the conflict of war. Now they come into the house and are just as solicitous and as ardent in the conflict of peace. Young men as they are, they have projected, in this conflict of peace we are now undertaking, thoughts which may very well be given consideration in the rehabilitation and reconstruction era.

I have listened to the speeches delivered in this house and I have nothing but congratulations to offer; but if I may be allowed to be critical on one point it is this. I do not like that mist of gloom they seem to cast over the country now that we are undertaking a conflict which is just as serious as the conflict of war. Comparing the visibility of affairs in Canada to-day with conditions six years ago, one can say that six years ago the people of the Dominion of Canada were suffering the agonies of the damned and at that time they had very little hope of redemption. Finally peace came. The war was won and it was won at an exorbitant price. It was won in suffering; it was won in losses irreparable; it was won in the agony of our loved ones and in the torture of the innocent. That was the price we paid for war. A new era has now arrived. We are given an opportunity now to show whether we are worthy of that redemption, and I think the outlook is not too gloomy.

We have to-day in Canada, fortunately, a government that has carried on a gigantic war effort. We have a government that not only prosecuted the war successfully but have brought down measures designed to deal with the problems which they anticipated would arise and which are arising at the present time. When this conflict of war was on we in Canada were fortunate. We were fortunate because we had at the head of our war departments men who not only had great experience in military affairs but had the wisdom to select an executive that was competent to initiate, develop and carry on to a successful termination a gigantic war effort. I say we are fortunate in that we must always remember that despite the efficiency of our war ministers very little could have been accomplished in this war conflict had it not been for the cooperation we received from every element of our Canadian citizenship. Our labour men, our industries, our farmers, our fishermen, our transportation facilities and everything that could be integrated into the war effort assisted. Our young men volunteered and went willingly to the front; and comparatively old men, men who had passed middle age, who in the last war had gone through the experiences, the sacrifices, the hardships and the miseries of that struggle, volunteered and stood in arms to protect our country. Young women who were occupying lucrative clerical positions left those offices and went into war industrial departments and undertook the onerous employment of making implements of destruction.

Our people were not only generous; they were tolerant. They were generous to a degree. They gave not only of their savings but of their earnings to war bonds to supply a fund for Canada to carry on our gigantic war undertaking. They accepted the restrictions of rationing and all other regimentations without a murmur. They complained very little about the ever-increasing tax imposts. They regarded these as a matter of war necessity.

As a matter of fact, our civilian population conceived the idea that this was an all-out

war effort, and while they could not display the same equality of sacrifice they at least offered equality of service. There was something else that they did. They maintained the morale of the nation. Valour is a virtue. There is no doubt about that. It was a necessary virtue of those who were standing in arms against the aggressor. But it is no more a virtue with the fighting forces than it is with the civilian population, whose thoughts are bound up with those brave men who have to undergo the dangers of every day and face the uncertainties of the morrow.

So I say that while incidentally it may appear that I am offering some eulogy to the government, which they well deserve, neither this government, however efficient the ministers in the war departments might be, nor any other government, could have done what Canada did had it not been for the cooperation of our Canadian citizens. Let us not forget that the intelligentsia of Canada are just as much concerned in this conflict of peace to-day as they were in the conflict of war. Therefore it does not behoove us in the House of Commons to be throwing misty or gloomy shadows in front of the effort that is now being presented to the people of Canada. Six years ago I was not so hopeful that the conflict of war would be won. To-day, because of the measures that this government brought down in war time to deal with such great problems as unemployment, I am hopeful that we shall win the conflict of peace. I am perfectly sure that the speech from the throne reflects the spirit of a policy which will bring about a happy and successful rehabilitation and reconstruction programme.

When a country is at war there are two responsibilities which devolve upon the government. The first is to supply men, money and materials to carry on war projects. But just as important is the responsibility of maintaining the economy of the nation. I believe that this government did a very good job in that field. Mark you, three hours after war was declared this government established the wartime prices and trade board. We all know the effect of that action. The effect was that there was a check-up on hoarding and profit eering. We all saw the result of that. We did not see, as we did in the last war, men waxing rich on the blood and sacrifice of the people; we did not see our prices mounting to a dizzy height as they did in the last war, and when the fall came, not to ordinary peace-time level, but below, it was responsible for the depression which followed. The action taken by the government is one of the things which has kept Canada economically sound, and has made for a proper distribution of wealth throughout the nation.

May I recite just a few of the measures that are not promises but measures which are operative at the present time. First of all, there is the Unemploment Insurance Act. That is certainly going to serve a great purpose now It was timely inasmuch as it was introduced and put into operation at a time when there was no unemployment. The result is that to-day we have a repository of cash which will certainly render auxiliary assistance in the days of transition when there must necessarily be some unemployment. Mention might also be made of the amendment to the Land Settlement Act, a great improvement on the old act. It not only improved it but extended it. Then there was the compulsory employment act. One could recite many measures. These were all brought into force and will be of auxiliary service in this transition period. When we add to that the proposed measures contained in the speech from the throne I, for one, am greatly surprised that some hon. members say that this government has no plans for the future. I cannot see where there has been one omission. There was no lack of provision for what might be anticipated by any sensible government. I cannot understand why hon. members say that there is no planning. It must be that they have not followed the history of this government since 1940, or they say it for some ulterior purpose.

Inquiries have been made in the house as to whether or not the war was terminated so far as Canada is concerned. I do not think we can give an intelligent answer to that question until we find out the meaning of the two words "war" and "peace". I shall quote what one authority says about the definition of war. This is Webster's definition of war. He describes war as being "the absence or cessation of peace or cooperation; that condition of a nation or a community which is not at peace." Therefore, if we were to judge from the remarks of some hon. gentlemen opposite, we would come to the conclusion, following that definition, that Canada is still at war.

Mr. GILLIS: And will be for some time.

Mr. McGARRY: To confirm my theory of war, let us look at the definition of peace. Peace is "active cooperation by means of spiritual, mental and material forces between nations, states and rulers, and between parties in the same nation and state; the employment of spiritual, mental and material forces against evil powers at home and abroad, such as ignorance, injustice, ugliness, disease and intolerance." When these agencies are eliminated we are supposed to be at peace; but whatever

the meaning of the words may be, we cannot have any peace in Canada unless we have the active cooperation of these mental, spiritual and material forces.

Canada did not enter this war as an aggressor; she entered it for the purpose of preserving our democratic rights and to establish a lasting peace. Paradoxical as it may seem, it was necessary to go to war to have peace; we won military victories, and finally we won the last and most essential victory. But in a war for peace military victories are only milestones which mark the pathway that will lead to the haven of peace. But there is another conflict in which we must take part; we must enter into it with the same generosity, the same spirit of cooperation and tolerance as we did in the conflict of war, because I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, it is just as serious a conflict.

I would say to my hon. friends opposite, be a little patient; remember that we are only just now at the transition period between war and peace. I do not think any hon. gentleman can suggest more than this government is going to do, some of which it has in operation and some to be put into operation before this session closes. No one can deny that we have wise and effective planning, and I would say to these hon. gentlemen that they should not expect performance before planning. Take a little time. It took the greatest Creator and Builder of all six days to make this world. Now we are trying to build a better world, and some hon. gentlemen think that should be done, with our efficient ministers, in two weeks. They should not speak in that way; they should not be spreading these words of gloom among the people. If that sort of thing had been done at the beginning of the war, possibly we would not have come out of that conflict as successfully as we did. I am absolutely in earnest about that. Let no one make these gloomy assertions that we are working in the dark. Visibility is good, but, as I said before, we must cooperate; we must have generosity; we must have tolerance, and we need every help the people of Canada can give.

To the government I would say, make as much haste as you can. Translate into performance the plans already laid down; and when this programme of reconstruction and rehabilitation is under way, do not forget that you cannot have absolute peace in Canada while there is one section discriminated against, one section which does not fit into the general picture. I have certain appeals to make to the government in regard to my own constituency. I am not going to present them now, but I say that if we want to have peace and contentment in the whole of Canada we must see to it that no section of this great nation is listed among the forgotten units.

Mr. W. D. WYLIE (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, it appears that new members are having a field day, so to speak; and, being a new member, I wish to take this opportunity of discussing some serious problems pertaining to the constituency of Medicine Hat, which I have the honour to represent. As many hon. members know, my constituency was represented in the last parliament by Doctor F. W. Gershaw.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): A good man.

Mr. WYLIE: A very good man and a very good friend of mine, and a gentleman held in high esteem by all who know him, regardless of their political views. I am pleased that he is now in the upper house, and I am sure southern Alberta will be well represented in that chamber by Senator Gershaw.

I regret that I am unable to use the expression of some hon. members in describing their constituencies. I have heard many of them say theirs were the best constituencies in Canada. I can say that the people of Medicine Hat constituency are the best people in Canada; and if I cannot say that Medicine Hat is one of the best constituencies, that is because of the inaction of the federal government. When I say that I include also our Conservative friends to my right, because, after all, they were in power for a few years and nothing much was done in my constituency. We did sell our wheat for twenty cents a bushel, and our hogs for two to two and a half cents a pound, and I do not forget that in 1937, when the present government were in power, they purchased a good deal of stock in that area at the handsome price of one cent a pound, so that they did not do so very much better. From this I believe hon. members will understand what I mean when I refer to the inaction of the government.

The largest part of my constituency is in what is known as the drought area. We have an average rainfall of from seven to nine inches. A few small portions may have an average of twelve inches, but that would be only a very small part. We have three irrigation districts. The first is the eastern irrigation district at Brooks, comprising some 1,500,000 acres, with approximately 200,000 acres irrigable. This project is well known for its high production not only of grains but of alfalfa and all kinds of field crops, and also

the large number of dairy herds of good quality stock. They also take great pride in the wonderful buildings in that area, the homes of which they are so proud. This project is also known all over western Canada and parts of the United States for the wonderful pheasant shooting which may be enjoyed there. Thousands of dollars come into that area every fall from this source alone, and every available room in the town of Brooks and throughout the district is reserved a year ahead.

Then we have the Canada land and irrigation project at Vauxhall, which is much the same as the Brooks project, though not quite so extensive. Finally we have the Taber and Lethbridge irrigation district, which is known for the production of sugar beets. Here we have an industry that fits perfectly into the general irrigation farms programme. The growing of sugar beets gives the farmers a hoed crop which keeps their land clean, gives them an assured price for their product, and yields valuable by-products utilized in the now extensive live stock industry, which takes in the winter feeding and finishing of 25,000 head of cattle and 100,000 head of lambs. The Lethbridge feeder association alone does over a million dollars' worth of business each year. The sugar beet industry brings into the country several million dollars' worth of new wealth a year. The area under sugar beet production is approximately 30,000 acres; many growers are harvesting from twelve to fifteen tons or better per acre and receiving around $10 a ton for their deliveries. In addition, they have the valuable beet tops, beet pulp and molasses from the Raymond and the Picture Butte factories, at a nominal figure, for live stock feeding. Production has reached a point where additional factory space will be necessary, if production is to be stepped up; and the Brooks project has gone on record as wanting a factory. I see no reason why they should not have a factory. I know that all arrangements were made about two years ago for a sugar beet factory. The only thing required to establish it was a permit from the dominion government; but this permit, as the residents of the Brooks area know, was rejected.

Since coming to this part of Canada I have heard it said by many people that sugar manufactured from sugar beets is not of the same quality as that manufactured from sugar cane, and that fruits preserved with beet sugar will not keep. A statement of that kind is, in my opinion, entirely wrong. I believe that we in Alberta will recognize good, canned fruit as quickly as would any others, and I am quite sure that any canning done with beet sugar will keep just as long as if it had been done with sugar cane.

When I go back to Alberta, or perhaps before that time, I am going to suggest that the best thing our sugar factories can do is to put on an advertising campaign so as to advertise their product properly, and to let the people in eastern Canada know that we have just as good sugar in Alberta, produced right in that province, as is found anywhere else in Canada. It is an industry for which there is a big future, a future in which not only Alberta but all Canada will share. There is no reason at all why we should not be producing four or five times the amount of sugar we are producing to-day. I am sure most members from Alberta, and especially those from the southern part of the province, will recognize the truth of that statement. Southern Alberta's sunshine and fertile soil combine to produce flavourful vegetables, with the result that we have the development of the vegetable factories processing some 7,000 acres of peas, corn, beans and turnips. In addition, the only dehydration plant in the province is situated at Lethbridge for the processing of carrots, table beets, potatoes and turnips. In addition to all that, dairy herds have been improved and cheese factories are set up throughout the district.

From what I have said respecting his constituency it would almost seem that I am boosting the constituency of the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore). However, it shows what can be done by means of irrigation. In the greater part of my constituency we have two proposed irrigation schemes, namely the St. Mary-Milk river and the Redcliff-Ronalane. I am sure many hon. members have heard discussions in the house respecting this problem, and will remember particularly the contribution made to that discussion by Senator Gershaw. I do not think a session went by without the senator's having discussed that matter. Might I reiterate that, usually, before election there was a little more stress put on it. However, that is something which is essential to the welfare of that part of the province.

During the last election campaign the Liberal candidate for the constituency of Medicine Hat said that unless the people voted Liberal they would not get irrigation. Then, on the night he was defeated he said that he was pleased to see a Liberal government returned to power, but that the people of the constituency of Medicine Hat would still have to get in touch with him before they could get any government jobs.

I do not think irrigation should be made a political football. It has been played with for twenty-five years, and I suggest it is just about time the government got down to business and gave us some action in this respect. Anyone who has lived in that part of Alberta must know what hard times mean; they know what it is not to produce any crop. As the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) knows, the yield in the last three years has been very low, many townships averaging less than from two to four bushels an acre for wheat, and for coarse grains the yields have been even lower than that.

I have before me many telegrams and resolutions from various organizations in Medicine Hat, but I shall not bother reading them tonight. I might state briefly, however, that behind this project is the Medicine Hat council, and municipalities affected by the projects M.D. 13, M.D. 64 and M.D. 65, as well as the Medicine Hat-Lethbridge water conservation committee, the Bow Island board of trade and many other organizations. They are convinced that these projects must be completed; otherwise a dark future is in store for that area.

International waters are involved in the St. Mary's-Milk river project, and Canada has long neglected to use these waters. On the other hand the United States has built reservoir facilities to store practically the whole flow. In fact, they may claim them on the basis of prior use, if we keep on postponing the development. Canada should therefore at an early date construct the necessary irrigation works so as to protect and use its share of the St. Mary's and Milk rivers. The St. Mary's-Milk river project is feasible in every way. It has been surveyed and resurveyed, and I believe that even at the present time engineers are again on the Redcliff-Ronalane project. In the early days we had trails made by buffalo; at the present time I believe we can see trails made by surveyors and engineers, so that the scheme is feasible in every way.

The Milk river project would bring into irrigation around 345,000 acres at an estimated cost of $15,000,000 which in my opinion is not high when one considers the benefits that would be derived from the projects. There would be benefits not only for farmers already residing in the area but for farmers who reside several miles away. In drouth years those farmers would be able to purchase feed at a fair figure, something that many of them will have to do this year at a high figure. It would prove an insurance against crop failures in years of drouth and provide opportunities for the diversifying of crops to meet changing market requirements. It would increase land values because of the increased production and would provide an opportunity for home building with higher standards of living and improved social services.

We must not overlook the national benefits. There would be insurance against loss of the valuable national resource which I mentioned a few minutes ago. It would provide employment, a matter that is on our minds at the present time. The lands made irrigable would provide an opportunity for establishing returned soldiers and farm families now located on sub-marginal land, thereby effecting substantial savings in relief expenditures. The increased production and the volume of trade from the irrigation projects would result in business expansion through transportation, manufacturing and to the general benefit and advantage of Canada as a whole.

The construction of this project as well as the Redcliff Ronalane project is absolutely essential. They should not be regarded as projects to provide employment when unemployment develops, as was suggested by the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe). If the reconstruction policy of the Liberal government is based on unemployment, making it merely a job factory, then Canada is headed into an era of relief camps. How can Alberta and Saskatchewan go ahead without extensive irrigation projects? Prices for agricultural products must be maintained at a high level and never again allowed to drop below the cost of production. Prosperity in this country depends almost entirely on the income received by the farmer. This was so ably dealt with this afternoon by the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Fair) that I need not dwell on it this evening.

How can Alberta and Canada face the future without a vast network of first-class highways? Tourist traffic means a lot to any country and without first-class highways western Canada will not receive its fair share of the tourist trade. I have heard many farmers say that they have no interest in the tourist trade, that it simply meant increased business for service stations, restaurants and auto camps, but the fact is that this trade affects the whole economy. These people have to eat when they come here and they are going to spend money.

There is no reason why the transcanada highway should not be extended through western Canada. This highway should have the support of every hon. member from the west, not only those who believe they are located on the proposed route but everyone. I trust some consideration will be given to this matter and I hope the hon. members for

Calgary West (Mr. Smith) and Calgary East (Mr. Harkness) will come to our support and do what they can.

Mr. BLACKMORE: What about the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. MacKinnon)?

Mr. WYLIE: And the hon. member for Edmonton West too; there should be plenty of support from the hon. member for Edmonton West. The government should move now to give official approval to the building of the transcanada highway and the completion of these irrigation projects by voting in the new estimates a sum large enough to permit a start on these projects.

We should have more industries in the west. When I refer to the west I am thinking, of course, of Medicine Hat in particular. We have an abundance of natural gas. Few people realize the benefits to be derived from natural gas. As Rudyard Kipling once said, Medicine Hat is the only city in Canada with all hell for a foundation. All we have to do is to drill a hole, put in a pipe and there you have power, you have heat and you have light if you wish. I should like some of the eastern members to come out to that area and see what can be done, not only in the city but in some of our ranchers' homes. We can certainly do with more industry in the west.

I have listened with a great deal of interest to what has been said about the housing problem by members on both sides of the house, especially returned men. Hon. members on this side of the house who have returned from the war are just as anxious to have a housing programme that will work as are hon. members on the other side. They want the same thing. What they want are houses. They want a programme with action, not just talk.

I know as far as my own city is concerned, there has not been a single house built there by wartime housing or with government assistance. It was suggested that we could put in a small holding project of one acre plots outside the city limits. The land was surveyed several times, but it was decided it was not suitable because it would cost too much to put water on it. The majority of the residents never did think very much of that project and the city council and citizens of Medicine Hat could see no reason why returned soldiers should be placed outside the city limits. We believe that they should have the privilege of living with the other residents right in the middle of the city. There are lots available there for their homes, and the city council is quite willing to give them lots of from fifty or seventy-five feet by one hundred and thirty feet if the government will apply this project to the city. I believe that this proposal should have consideration by the government, and that Medicine Hat should have the benefit of small holdings within the city limits. We have plenty of lots right on the power line where all services would be available. After all, we all want the same thing; we want homes; but the whole building project is not advancing very fast. It will require the cooperation of everyone and of all governments to get the project really going.

I was pleased to see that the government is proposing to make changes in the Old Age Pensions Act, although I am disappointed that these changes may not apply until 1948. It is very nice to know that when you reach the age of seventy the means test will be done away with. However, I agree with the leader of this group, the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Low), that the age should be reduced to sixty years and the pension increased to $50 a month. I am sure that there is not a member of this house who would wish to live on a pension of $30 a month at the age of seventy or even sixty.

In the very near future I am sure that all civil servants, provincial and dominion, as well as the employees of most concerns, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company included, will be pensioned off at the age of sixty. The C.P.R. have that now, I believe, in some of their departments. In the civil service in Alberta the pension age is sixty-five; I am not sure about other governments, but I am quite sure that it will not be very long before they will all be superannuating at the age of sixty. I believe that is a good plan because it will enable people to enjoy a little pleasure in their old age, especially if the pensionable age is reduced and the pension increased to at least $50 a month.

I should like to say a word about education. I believe that the time has come when we should have uniform standards of education from one end of Canada to the other and that the government should make grants to assist in higher educational standards being attained. Education is the main training for any young person; it is something that will stay with him or her through life, and the more education they can have the better. I agree with the hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. McGarry), that Canada has a wonderful record so far as the war effort is concerned; I also agree with what he said as to the sacrifices that were made by our boys, and I believe that if we will only work as hard to win the peace as we did to win the war we

shall have homes for these heroes and a decent Canada for all to live in.

Mr. WILLIAM BRYCE (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I am in the fortunate position that I do not need to come to the house to tell about my constituency of Selkirk, because anybody who has gone to school has read about those hardy pioneers from my native land, the Selkirk settlers, who came up the mighty Nelson and up lake Winnipeg and settled at Selkirk, Fort Garry and along the Red river valley. Later on, people came there from Iceland, people with a democratic point of view which has enriched our own democracy. Still later, we had people come to us from the Ukraine and other parts of Europe, who have helped to develop that great interlake country and have added to the wealth of Canada.

When I sat in the last parliament, Mr. Speaker, I was many times reminded that there were only two official languages in the House of Commons. I can assure you, sir, that my French has improved slightly but my English is no better. I should like to remind you, sir, of that age-old alliance between Scotland and France and to assure you that your countrymen and mine still respect that, and I am quite sure that when you think about it you will have no difficulty in understanding what I want to convey to my hon. friends on the other side.

The hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell) asked the other day when the war would be over, and there was quite a little amusement among hon. members when he asked that question, but I can assure them that it is a serious question for the dairy farmers to-day. The dairy farmers are being kept in business by a subsidy. The consumer is able to buy the milk his children require because of that subsidy, and I should like the government to come out and tell us if and when it intends to cut off that subsidy. The dairy farmer wants to know that so that he can plan his work. How long will this subsidy last? I do not know whether the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) or the government can tell us that, but it is something that the dairy farmers require to know, and know pretty soon. We have practically no butter in the country. The government at the present time is paying ten cents a pound subsidy to make it possible for our farmers to produce cream. It is a disgraceful state of affairs that the dairy industry has to be subsidized by ten cents a pound to produce butter. Where will our butter stocks be if that ten cent subsidy is taken away? We shall be in a deplorable state. The dairy business is not something that you can go into to-day and step out of to-morrow. You have to plan ahead and make arrangements; you have to get the feed up this summer that you will use next spring. I appeal to the government, through the Minister of Agriculture, to let us know something about that in the near future. It would be nice to know, too, when the subsidy to the millers is coming off wheat.

I should like to add a few words to what the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Wylie) said a few minutes ago. He talked about the beet growers. I am interested in beet growers, because we took a great deal of trouble in Manitoba to set up a beet factory so that we could establish a better way of farming and get away from straight grain growing. We set up that beet factory for that purpose, but the position to-day is such that we can hardly keep going.

I do not want to go over the whole thing again. The hon. member for Medicine Hat explained how we can feed pulp in the winter time and make as good sugar from beets as ever was made from cane. I want to put on the record, however, some of the things that these beet growers are thinking about. They were good enough to invite me to their meetings, and since they are constituents of mine I feel it my duty to bring their demands before the house.

1. The establishment of a sound sugar tariff in which ninety-six per cent raw sugar is taxed with at least ninety per cent of the white sugar rate of $2.64 and $1.84 per 100 pounds.

2. The immediate reinstatement of the customs duties specified in items 135 and 135 (b) on raw sugar until change in tariff is made.

3. An investigation of the profits of cane sugar refiners in the last twenty years and their justification.

4. An investigation of the real purpose of the so-called "sugar equalization fund" and of its use.

5. Publication of the operation and accounting of the "fund" by the sugar administration from its establishment up to date amounting at present to over $16,000,000.

6. The immediate appointment of a beet man as deputy sugar administrator, which position at present is held by a man who has made his living practically all his life out of commissions on raw cane sugar imports.

I wish to call these matters to the attention of the Minister of Agriculture. The hon. member for Medicine Hat wanted to know the reason why we could not have four or five times the sugar we have. I am going to put certain information on the record. I do not know why he did not if he had it. I am quoting from Canadian Sugar Policy:

Another unfortunate condition in the complicated Canadian sugar business is the fact that the two Ontario beet sugar mills in Chatham and Wallaceburg and the two Alberta beet sugar plants in Raymond and Picture Butte are owned and operated by the Canada and Dominion Sugar Company and a subsidiary of the B.C. Sugar Refining Company respectively, which companies operate at the same time large cane sugar refineries in Montreal and Vancouver. These people will never go all out for the beet industry as long as there is more profit in the cane refining than in the beet business, and by holding down, in conjunction with the St. Lawrence Cane Sugar Refinery, owned by Mr. J. W. McConnell, who also controls the Montreal *Standard*, Montreal *Star*, and Montreal *Herald*, and with the Atlantic-Acadia Cane Sugar refineries, the expansion of the beet industry to the status quo, they assure themselves of comfortable monopoly markets for their cane sugar products.

Like other speakers, I wish to be brief and I do not want to say more about that. But everyone seems to have been talking about what I intended to talk about.

The Winnipeg grain exchange is pretty close to me and I endorse everything which the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Fair) said. I say to the government or any other government that follows it, heaven forbid that you should ever reopen the grain exchange, because every particle of stone, brick or lime in it was paid for by the sweat and toil of the western farmer. Do not ever forget that. Do not let it come back again. The wheat board has done a good job. It is not often that I hand bouquets to the government, but I say, you did a good job this time, although it can be improved on. In a world such as Henry Wallace talked about when he wrote of the century of the common man, did he expect that in 1945 or 1946 we would go back to gambling in the produce of the farmer? Certainly not. You can never again justifiably have gambling carried on with the produce of the farm. I am saying in pretty blunt words what I mean, but I mean it from the bottom of my heart when I say that we should never again allow gambling in this way. I do not think any man should have the right to gamble in the food of a nation; it should never be tolerated. I have nothing against the men on the grain exchange. They are all good fellows. It is the principle of the thing that I am thinking of. Why should they be parasites on the other fellow? Maybe I have said enough about that because I know there are a lot of people who want the grain exchange back. I do not know what the government was thinking about. I say to the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) that he controlled wheat, barley and oats, and then he took over the flax and did a good job on the whole lot. Then he left the smallest crop so that they would have the thin edge of the wedge to start gambling again.

What about September rye? When the farmer sold his rye on September 21 of last year, he got ninety-one cents. Look at the newspaper to-day and see what the price is. It is $1.62⅝.

Mr. BURTON: The same old story.

Mr. BRYCE: That is the same old story. They did it with the wheat and they are still doing it with the rye. I say, shame on the government for allowing them to do it.

Mr. IRVINE: Coming through the rye.

Mr. BRYCE: I am sorry that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) is not in his place at the moment, because if my constituents ever get him back in Selkirk—

Mr. MacNICOL: He will never be in his place.

Mr. BRYCE: —they will have a lot to say to him. In the first place the income tax level is too low. An exemption of $660 and $1,200 is not good enough.

May I come back to the dairy farmer? Nobody in this country has exploited his family like the dairy farmer, and I am one of them. When my children were going to school they had to milk the cows before they went, so that we could send milk to Winnipeg to have some money to spend. These things are not taken into consideration by the income tax people. It is unfair. What about the farm woman? The Minister of Finance said last year that every woman would want the same concession if it were given to the farm wife. I say that the farm woman does far more than the city woman. She has to get up in the early morning to have the breakfast ready for the men to be in the field at half-past six. Then she has to wash dishes the last thing at night. No city woman does that. The sooner the Minister of Finance revises the income tax regulations, the sooner it will be safe for him to go back to Selkirk.

I do not wish to say very much more about cream production, but the income tax is a big handicap to getting cream to-day. In the constituency of Selkirk there was one man who had not filled out an income tax form. The forms were brought in and he was asked about it. The reply was that he had never earned enough money to fill in one. The inspector said to him, "You received so much for your grain?" The man said, "Yes." The inspector

then said, "You sold some cows; what else did you sell?" He said, "I sold an old steer." The income tax man added these things up and made up a statement. He then said, "You sold some cream." The reply was, "Yes, we took a few cans of cream." The income tax man said, "Well, the dairy company in Winnipeg said you sold $400 worth of cream." He then tallied up the income tax form, gave him credit for the number he had in his family, and said, "You will have to pay income tax on $400." The farmer then got into the old car, or maybe the old buggy, and drove home. He then began to think about it. You see there are some people like that; they take a little while to think. He thought about it and he found that he was paying income tax on $400 that he and his family had earned before breakfast and after supper, and he said to himself, "I will never milk cows for Ilsley." The upshot of it is these cattle go to market and the country is deprived of another supply of cream. I want the government to take that into consideration. The man who is working a double day producing that cream before breakfast and after supper is entitled to some consideration in the income tax regulations; and do not let us forget the woman on the farm, because we would never get along without her.

Last year I asked the Minister of Agriculture some questions about condemnation insurance, and he assured me he would look into it. I am looking forward to having him tell us something about it because it still is as bad as it was. I showed the house that in 1943 the packing industry of Canada got about $800,000 more than they were entitled to in condemnation insurance alone. The figures all appear in government publications; there are no figures of mine in there. It is a disgrace that that should go on. They have given us a new schedule in the west, and they take so much a head, fifty cents for a female animal and thirty cents for a steer, half of one per cent on hogs, and so on. Why should that thing go on when we have established tuberculosis free areas in Manitoba? I live in a T.B. free area. Why should I have to pay condemnation insurance to the packer when I have no T.B. animals? Condemnation insurance has become a racket and the government should look into it. I can see the minister smiling. I assure him this is a serious business. We are still working on the T.B. insurance that was established a number of years ago when cattle were worth fifty or sixty dollars apiece. When I replace an animal in my herd to-day I pay $150, but I get only $38 from the government when they come and take it away because it is infected. That should be revised.

[Mr. Bryce.]

I ask the minister to revise that. Something should be done about it, because it is not a square deal.

I want to be as brief as possible, but I should like to touch on the cattle situation to-day. A few days ago the minister made a statement in which he said that we can be sure of the price for twelve or twenty-four months ahead. That is not the case. If I sell steers on Monday and get twelve cents for them and send the same quality of steers on Thursday and if there are plenty of steers on the market the packer will pay eleven cents. The only thing that happens is that the farmer loses another twelve dollars and the packer makes it, because the animal goes into the same grade as the ones he bought on Monday. The reason the twelve cents were paid on Monday is that there was not enough cattle on the market to bring down the price; on Thursday the market is perhaps flooded. Perhaps I can explain better what I mean if I quote from the Ottawa *Journal* of Thursday, September 13:

Board buying surplus lamb

The meat board is buying surplus Canadian lamb for export to Britain.

For lamb of exportable quality, and of 38 to 55 pounds cold weight, the board is paying one-quarter of a cent per pound below the ceiling in each marketing zone.

These lamb purchases, together with the board's action in buying all surplus mutton since July 24, assure Canadian farmers and ranchers a market for all their surplus lambs and sheep, said J. G. Taggart, chairman of the board.

That is not true. If there is a lean market it will work. The only person this protects is the packer. There is neither ceiling nor floor on live animals; it is only on the dead animal; when these lambs are dead they will be protected and the packer will have a market for them. But let you or me strike a market such as we had a year ago, when there were nine thousand lambs and sheep at Winnipeg; the minister knows what happened. We pleaded with him to open the market to the south; that was done, and what happened next morning? The packers had said they did not want those lambs; they were too leggy; they were thin; they were a poor type. Everything was wrong with them, but when we received the telegram from the minister saying that the market was open, the next morning the Winnipeg market rose $1.50, and one of the packers who said he did not need any lambs bought sixteen double-deck carloads. That is what happens, and I am sorry the government makes regulations like that. There is no protection for the farmer in a flooded market, because the packer can go in

and buy at his own price. I used to blame the Minister of Agriculture for these things. I used to think the packing industry dominated the Department of Agriculture. Now I am satisfied that the packers dominate the government. That is the state of affairs which exists not only on the Winnipeg market but on other markets. The farmer has no protection whatever when he goes to the market; he has to take what he is offered, and the packer, being a shrewd business man, will buy at the lowest possible price.

We also have that situation in the fish industry. Look at the fellow who catches the pickerel in lake Winnipeg; he gets ten cents a pound; but when I go to buy that pickerel in the store in Winnipeg I pay forty-seven cents a pound for it, filleted. There may be some fish men here, and I want them to understand that I know a little about fishing. I have been there in the winter and taken the fish out of the nets, and I have been there in the summer time also. When a fish is filleted it may lose fifty per cent. That would make it equivalent to twenty cents a pound, but there is an awful killing for someone between twenty cents and forty-seven cents. The primary producer, the man who risks his life to get the fish, does not receive his fair share. I asked about that. I went to the fish packers and asked why there should be such a spread between the amount paid the primary producer and the retail market price. They replied, "Oh, we have nothing at all to do with that. Donald Gordon set the price." Well, Donald Gordon needs to revise his prices.

Recently in this house, Mr. Speaker, we have heard quite a bit about rationing. I do not object to rationing; I am all for it if it is going to spread the meat farther. I think the mistake made by the government was in removing rationing when they should have kept it on. I imagine they would begin to see their mistake last February or March, and they should have started rationing again at that time, but I suppose it was too near the election for them to risk it. Let us be fair about this. I have my own flesh and blood in the old country, and to-day they are eating less than they did during the war years. Those are the people who came through the blitz. We know what our own boys have done and what they have suffered. Do not let us kick about a little rationing in order to let the other fellow have something that is coming to him. Some time age I read a story about a prominent citizen of Ottawa who was visiting the ruins in England during the blitz, when people were being dug out and so on. A little fellow came along and for something to say the gentleman from Ottawa asked, "What do you hope to be when you grow up?" The little lad replied, "Alive." Let us be true Canadians about this. Any sacrifice we make will be nothing compared with what they did for us.

I want to get finished within my time, Mr. Speaker, or I shall not be able to say I was brief. After reviewing all these things I believe it is apparent that the putting into force of the necessary long-time agricultural policy, which should be in operation, is prevented through the domination of government policy by the meat packers, the millers, the sugar combines and so on. The result is that the primary producer is left with uncertain returns and at the mercy of big business.

Mr. P. C. BLACK (Cumberland): Mr. Speaker, personally I should have preferred not to intervene in this debate at this time, but I think it only fair to my part of Canada that something more be said with respect to Nova Scotia and particularly Cumberland county. You have been offered many congratulations, sir, but the best I can wish for you is that at the end of your term you will prove to have been as acceptable to this parliament as your predecessor was to the last parliament.

This debate has been carried on largely by the new members, who have contributed many splendid addresses. There is no doubt that many of these new members will also make great contributions to our public life. Personally I miss the friendship of some who were here and with whom I was associated in the last parliament. I miss my friend Hon. R. B. Hanson, who was leader of the opposition for several years. Mr. Hanson had twenty-five years in public life; he served his country well.

I miss another colleague who sat near me, whom we called Billie Esling. He was, and is, one of the finest personalities who ever sat in a house of commons, respected and loved by all.

I should like to refer to another colleague who sat beside me. I have in mind Leonard O'Brien, who was an honour to any constituency fortunate enough to have him as its representative.

From across the way I miss a friend from my home town, Hon. J. L. Ralston, who served the people of this country in peace and in war, since 1908.

I miss, too, a friend who was with us a week ago, and whom I saw within twelve hours of his death, Hon. Norman McLarty, who was anxious to be helpful, and always extended to us his friendship.

These men and others we of this parliament miss. But we are glad to welcome the new members. Especially I would welcome the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. Merritt), a man of whom everyone in Canada and in the allied armies is proud. The hon. member comes in a direct line from one of the greatest, if not the greatest statesman Canada ever produced, his great-grandfather being Sir Charles Tupper. This evening, on behalf of the people of Cumberland I extend to this hon. member an invitation to return to the place where the war-horse of Cumberland lived, to the constituency he represented and from which he made such a great contribution to the public life of Nova Scotia and of Canada. This country would not be what it is to-day, had it not been for the statesmanship of Sir Charles Tupper.

I am also pleased to have in his proper seat our leader, Mr. Bracken. Throughout all his life he has served the public, and I believe he has still a greater service to render to his country. It is a great misfortune that party leaders have such difficulty in gaining election to parliament. Surely that is a reflection upon the voters and the opposing parties. One can look over the history of leaders of political parties in Canada, and he would recognize at once how unfortunate it has been that they have had so much difficulty in having themselves elected—and I am sure the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) will agree with me in this.

There are many subjects with which I could deal, but I shall make my remarks fairly brief. The subject of greatest concern in my province, is the future industrial prospects of Nova Scotia and, in particular, the county of Cumberland. It is only fair to say that they are very much disturbed, very much worried.

To-night I am going to read some of the statements made on Monday of this week by the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe). I have done what I could to assist him during the war, when he served as Minister of Munitions and Supply. At least I have not made his work any more difficult, and I have endeavoured to uphold him both in the house and in the country. I assure him I will give him all the support of which I am capable in the great task that is his in this period of reconstruction.

The people of Cumberland and of Nova Scotia generally have been very much disturbed, but if they could accept the statements made by the minister they would be completely reassured, and would feel that they could take their place in the industrial life of this country.

[Mr. P. C. Black.]

In the statement of the Minister of Reconstruction to which I listened on September 17, and which I afterwards read, he said, as reported at page 223 of *Hansard:*

I see nothing disturbing in the present situation as far as employment is concerned.

My constituents, and the people of Nova Scotia generally, will be very glad indeed to receive that statement, if they can believe it and if that promise will be fulfilled. In my town of Amherst there was an industry employing 3,000 during the war. The staff has been reduced to about 300, most of whom are working on inventories and records.

At a later point in his speech the minister said:

One thing that is abundantly clear is that there are at this moment two jobs open for each and every applicant for a job.

That is welcome news for people in my constituency, if they accept it, or hold the minister to his assurance.

Again he said, on the same page of *Hansard:*

The work of reconstruction has been in progress since early in 1944 and has been accelerated since the establishment of the Department of Reconstruction in the summer of 1944. The work divides itself into the following branches: First, over-all planning including studies of economics and statistics; second, industrial reconversion; third, research and development; and, fourth, control and distribution of materials.

My people in Nova Scotia will want to know what planning there has been; they do not know. They will want to know what industrial reconversion there has been in their province; they do not know. They want to know what research and development there has been; they do not know. They want to know what control and what distribution of materials there has been.

I could make many other quotations from the minister's speech, but I must hurry on. He stated further, as reported at page 225:

Reconversion is also under way in war plants owned by the dominion government. This is more difficult in that a sale of the plant to private industry usually is involved. For some months we have had a fairly definite idea of the nature of the peace-time industry which would use each government-owned plant.

We have government constructed and owned plants and buildings in the town of Amherst, and our citizens are most anxious to know what has been done or is to be done with them.

Further on he said:

As nearly as possible we endeavour to keep each plant in a line of work comparable with its former employment in order that the workers living in the vicinity may find employment in the same plant without too great a change of skills.

That is the best news the town of Amherst and people in other parts of Nova Scotia have heard since V-E day or V-J day, when our forces became victorious. But they want a little more evidence that this policy will be applied.

Then he goes on to say:

A limited number of war plants are being retained by the crown and rented for multiple occupancy as an incubator for small industries. Here again the demand for space exceeds any reasonable supply. The most promising small industries are being given preference, and it is expected that from these multiple occupancy plants will develop industries which will in time build and occupy their own premises.

That will be great news for the people back home. Then the minister goes on:

It is quite obvious that during 1946 we may expect an expansion of peace-time industry comparable with the expansion of industry generally during the war years. Many of the largest expansions of industry yet to be reported are now being processed in the Department of Reconstruction.

We would like to have more detailed information with respect to that policy as it applies to our part of Canada. Then the minister goes on:

In our earlier studies of requirements to provide continued full employment we estimated that one million jobs in excess of those obtainable in 1939 would be required. I can report that the one million additional peace-time jobs are definitely in sight, and that there is little likelihood of any over-all lack of employment in the near future.

The province of Nova Scotia and the other maritime provinces consider that it is within their rights to share in this reconversion and industrial expansion which the minister promises will be forthcoming to Canada. Many of our work men and women are walking the streets and many have had to leave recently for central Canada in order to obtain employment. I could go on to give further quotations and hold the minister to an accounting and ask that he apply these assurances to our part of Canada. I believe the maritime provinces have earned a right to sympathetic and fair treatment. I will help the minister; I will help the government and I believe every member of parliament should do everything possible in order that the maritime provinces may participate and share in this industrial activity or expansion that he promises is coming to Canada.

I do not want to make any complaint, but our part of Canada was the last to get wartime industry. The work men and work women of Amherst were enticed away, as were the people in the rest of the maritime provinces. I have under my hand advertisements which appeared prior to the establishment of war industries in our town by which working people were induced to go to central Canada. Here is one which reads:

Wanted

Women to work in a war industry.
Fifty miles outside of Montreal.
Must be between the ages of eighteen and forty.

Here is another one:

Wanted

Girls to help in the production of munitions which are urgently required by our armed forces, the war industry near Montreal requires immediately girls for the following classes of work:

A—Cartridge machine operators.
B—Cartridge inspectors.
C—Matrons.
D—Stenographers.
E—Typists.
F—General office clerks.

While we were slow in getting under way, we have made a good record. I believe the Robb engineering works has made as good a record in the production of shells as any plant in Canada. But this industry has now had to let out a large number of its experienced and skilled help. We have a good clothing industry and we have an aeroplane industry that employed, as I said, three thousand men at one time, but which now has only three hundred. Six or seven industries in the country were given the responsibility after the battle of Britain of assembling and building the Avro-Anson training plane, and one was located at Amherst. The first Avro-Anson training plane that flew in Canada was built in the Amherst plant. Many of the workmen in that plant were not trained, but they were natural mechanics. They felt they had a high duty and responsibility, and the result was that they did such efficient work that they built the first plane put out by any shop in Canada.

Certain information was brought out in the war expenditures committee, but we are not supposed to refer to it and I do not intend to do so. However, information came to me from other sources that the Amherst shop gave the best results of any aeroplane factory in Canada. It was not perfect because there was some waste and lost time; nevertheless its record was the best. They got the best results. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) will confirm that because he got full cooperation from labour, which gave him no difficulty whatever. I have here a report by the minister of labour of Nova Scotia which was given publicity on September 6. It reads:

Another high achievement has been emblazoned on the war record of Nova Scotia, it was ascertained yesterday when Hon. L. D.

Currie, minister for labour in Nova Scotia told Kiwanis club listeners that the province, man for man, had the highest percentage of production and the lowest percentage of absenteeism in the whole of Canada.

The province was also lowest when the count of men stopping work through strikes was tallied up.

The brisk town of Amherst led the dominion in single town performance, closely followed by Pictou, with Halifax following in third position.

This set of records was highly gratifying and throughout the war Nova Scotians paid attention to their knitting in sterling fashion.

Mr. Currie said there was no reason why Nova Scotia cannot continue in peace what she has done so magnificently in war.

All I ask on behalf of the people of Nova Scotia, of the maritime provinces generally and of my own constituency is that they be given an opportunity. It is the duty and responsibility of the minister to see that this is done. Our part of Canada has played its full part in building up Canada. It has played its full part in the war. Enlistments there have been as high as in any part of Canada. It has played its full part in industry. All it asks now is that it be given an opportunity to have a place in the peace-time industrial life of Canada.

The working people of Amherst will cooperate with the minister. I believe that every member of this house should be anxious to see Amherst and other places in the maritime provinces have a share in the industrial activity under reconversion. I do not want to take up much time but there are a few matters I should like to deal with.

During this session reference has been made to the building of the St. Lawrence waterway. I think the people of Canada are satisfied that that great waterway should be built. I am in favour of it, but I make this condition—and I believe every member from the maritime provinces should support me—that at the same time the Chignecto canal should be built. This portage was used by the early French settlers three hundred years or more ago when they crossed the isthmus of Chignecto. The building of this canal is justified from a commercial point of view. It is justified also from a defence point of view and we should have the cooperation of the United States in its construction. It would have justified itself in the last great war, and we in the maritime provinces are entitled to have this construction proceeded with. Cheap power should be available, either by the construction of power plants on the Petitcodiac river or by the use of coal at the mine mouths. With this power available, industry in the maritime provinces would be on a parity with industries located along the St. Lawrence waterway. I appeal to the people from all over Canada to see that some measure of fairness is extended to the people of my part of Canada.

I want to refer to the ferry boat *Kipawo,* which with its predecessor plied between Wolfville and Parrsboro' across Minas basin for forty years. It is the only ferry service in all Canada that has been discontinued during the war. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) will bear me out when I say that it was discontinued because the boat was needed for war purposes. I ask that that boat and service be restored.

I also ask that greater measure of justice be extended to the people of the maritime provinces as regards the cost of many commodities which they buy in central Canada. I pointed out to the house in the previous parliament that bicycles, for instance, with a ceiling price were sold at higher prices in the maritimes than in any part of Ontario or Quebec. Automobiles and trucks are also sold at higher prices in the maritime provinces than in central Canada. If we cannot build these articles and many scores of others in the maritime provinces I believe that there should be an equalization of freight rates so that the people of the maritime provinces will not be penalized by having to pay higher prices than are paid in central Canada.

In Nova Scotia there is also the question of the sugar refinery which was closed down in the early days of the war. I saw a short time ago a ship of 6,000 tons discharging its cargo of raw sugar at Halifax harbour, and that sugar and following cargoes were shipped through Nova Scotia to be refined elsewhere, while our Nova Scotia industry was idle.

The rolling mills at Trenton have been closed, and now the users of secondary products have to buy many of them in central Canada and have delays and the additional freight rate to pay in getting them delivered to their machine shops in the maritime provinces.

I want once again to refer to the marsh lands, and in this I know I have the support of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner). The marsh lands are deteriorating year by year. They are the most fertile lands in all Canada. While millions are being expended to develop virgin areas in the west—and I have supported it—we have never been able to have any complete programme undertaken by this government to protect these marsh lands from the tides, to drain them to utilize their fertility. We had the assurance from my leader when he was in the maritime provinces that such a programme would receive his

support. Again I say that as regards the marsh lands there has been no sense of fairness in what has been done for these fertile lands at the head of the bay of Fundy in comparison with what has been done under prairie farm rehabilitation in the west. I appeal again to the Minister of Agriculture and to the government that they do not allow this condition to obtain any longer.

An hon. MEMBER: Question.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): Mr. Speaker, some members are crying "question," but I have not taken up very much of the time of this house, and I am pleading now for some measure of justice and some measure of appreciation with respect to what is required in the maritime provinces.

A great duty devolves not only upon this government but upon the Canadian Car and Foundry company, which had its inception in the town of Amherst, its first president being the Hon. N. Curry. But central Canada has drawn its activities away from Amherst. Canadian Car and Foundry has a great record in this war. Its production has totalled over $300,000,000, and it has paid out in wages $121,000,000. It has undertaken projects for the British government, the United States government and the Canadian government when other industries were loath to do so. I repeat, it has a great record in the war, but if it is to be a real Canadian industry carrying the confidence of all the people of Canada it should make it its duty to see that some post-war industry is established in the town of Amherst that will employ one thousand workers. I appeal to the government to see that that company gets all the assistance to which it is entitled and that every means is taken to bring about the establishment of such an industry in Amherst.

I am not going to take up any more time, but I have felt it my duty to place before the house the situation as regards the maritime provinces, Nova Scotia and my own constituency of Cumberland. The Minister of Reconstruction and Supply gave a glowing report to the house the other night, but I want to tell him that the people in my part of the country are much disturbed over what is to be their fate in the post-war years, and they will hold the minister and the government and all the members of the federal parliament to an accounting that in the years that are ahead a greater measure of justice be done to the people of the maritime provinces than has been done in the last twenty-five years.

The house divided on the amendment to the amendment (Mr. Coldwell), which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Archibald
Argue
Bentley
Bowerman
Bryce
Burton
Campbell
Castleden
Coldwell
Gillis
Herridge
Irvine
Jaenicke
Knight
Knowles
McCuaig
McCullough (Assiniboia)
MacInnis
McKay
Matthews (Kootenay East)
Moore
Probe
Rose
Stewart (Winnipeg North)
Strum, Mrs.
Thatcher
Townley-Smith
Wright
Zaplitny—29.

NAYS

Messrs:

Abbott
Adamson
Arsenault
Ashby
Baker
Barrett
Beaudoin
Beaudry
Belzile
Benidickson
Bertrand (Laurier)
Bertrand (Prescott)
Bertrand (Terrebonne)
Black (Chateauguay-Huntingdon)
Black (Cumberland)
Black (Yukon)
Blackmore
Blair
Blanchette
Boivin
Bonnier
Boucher
Bourget
Bracken
Bradette
Breithaupt
Bridges
Brooks
Brown
Bruce
Brunelle
Cardiff
Case
Casselman
Charlton
Chevrier
Clark
Claxton
Cleaver
Cloutier
Cockeram
Coté (Matapedia-Matane)
Coté (St. Johns-Iberville-Napierville)
Coté (Verdun)
Coyle
Croll
Cruickshank
Daniel
Dechene
Denis
Dion (Lake St. John-Roberval)
Dionne (Beauce)
Dorion
Douglas
Drope
Dubois
Emmerson
Eudes
Fair
Farquhar
Ferguson
Fleming
Fontaine
Fournier (Hull)
Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Fraser
Fulton
Gagnon
Gardiner
Gariépy
Gauthier (Nipissing)
Gauthier (Portneuf)
Gibson (Comox-Alberni)
Gibson (Hamilton West)
Gingues
Gladstone
Glen
Golding
Gour (Russell)
Gourd (Chapleau)
Graydon
Green
Hackett
Hallé
Hansell
Harkness
Harris (Danforth)
Harris (Grey-Bruce)
Hazen
Healy
Hlynka
Hodgson
Homuth

Howe	Maybank
Ilsley	Mayhew
Isnor	Menary
Jackman	Merritt
Jaques	Michaud
Jean	Mitchell
Jutras	Mullins
Kidd	Murphy
King, Mackenzie	Mutch
Kirk	Nixon
Kuhl	Parent
Lacombe	Pearkes
LaCroix	Picard
Lafontaine	Pinard
Lalonde	Pouliot
Langlois	Quelch
Lapalme	Raymond (Wright)
Lapointe	Reid
Laurendeau	Richard (Gloucester)
Leader	Richard (Ottawa East)
Leger	Rinfret
Lennard	Ross (Hamilton East)
Lesage	Ross (St. Paul's)
Little	Rowe
Lockhart	St. Laurent
Low	Senn
McCann	Shaw
McCubbin	Sinclair (Ontario)
McCulloch (Pictou)	Sinclair (Vancouver North)
Macdonald (Brantford City)	Sinnott
Macdonald (Halifax)	Skey
McDonald (Pontiac)	Smith (Calgary West)
Macdonnell (Muskoka-Ontario)	Smith (York North)
McGarry	Stanfield
McGregor	Stephenson
McIlraith	Stuart (Charlotte)
McIvor	Stokes
Mackenzie	Tremblay
MacKinnon	Tucker
MacLean	Tustin
McLure	Viau
McMaster	Warren
McNaught	Webb
MacNicol	Weir
Maloney	White (Hastings-Peterborough)
Manross	White (Middlesex East)
Marier	Whitman
Marquis	Winkler
Martin	Winters
Matthews (Brandon)	Wylie—193.

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (Macleod): Mr. Speaker, before you put the question on the amendment I should like to say a few words.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Dispense.

Mr. HANSELL: I must inform the hon. gentlemen that I cannot possibly dispense with what I have to say. It may be wondered why I rise at this time, while the vote is in process of being taken; and some may wonder why our party took the position we did on the motion which has just been defeated. I may say that we regarded the motion, as it was worded, as a political motion, one of those I used to call, once upon a time, a double-barreled motion: you get heck if you do and you get heck if you don't. The wording of that motion was not particularly clear; at least there was one word in it we did not like, the word "alone." The motion said that the government had failed to propose the fundamental social and economic changes which alone—

Mr. IRVINE: I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is discussing a motion which has been dealt with by this house.

Mr. HANSELL: Perhaps I am out of order, but I was only explaining why we did not vote for the motion. If the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Irvine) will say out loud what he has just said under his breath I am sure this house and his constituents would like to hear it.

Mr. IRVINE: Don't worry; I will say it in a minute.

Mr. HANSELL: He will not repeat the words he has just used.

I wish to embark upon a subject which has not been mentioned this session and which indeed, during the time I have been in this house, has not been given the attention which I believe it deserves. I refer to the question of electoral and parliamentary reform. I do not speak on this subject with a claim to any superabundance of knowledge by reason of any particular research I have conducted. I base my arguments purely upon my own observations after sitting in this house for several years.

I have concluded, Mr. Speaker, that the most futile business in the world is that of a private member of this house. I have a desire to bring about in Canada a parliamentary system which at all times will get for the people the results they want. I notice quite a number of new faces in the house, quite a number of new members, some of whom I believe are distinguished gentlemen. I understand there are some who have the distinction of having won the Victoria Cross. I believe we have in our midst some high ranking military men. We have one hon. gentleman, who was also here in the last parliament, who on one occasion was lieutenant-governor of Ontario. These men should be of inestimable value to this country; but as time goes by and they sit here I think they will discover that their business here as private members is just about as futile as anything in the world. We have in this parliament some young men with all the exuberance and ambition of youth; someone has said that this is a young man's age, and I am glad to welcome these young men into parliament. I do not agree, however, that this is particularly a young man's age; I rather agree with Henry Ford, who a few years ago said that if you took out of the world all the brains over sixty-five you

would not have enough brains left to run it. I suppose these young men came into parliament with visions of doing great things. As they sit here as private members, I am afraid it will not be long before they will be sadly disillusioned. Before I came here to the session a gentleman stopped me on the street and said, "I believe parliament has been reduced to nothing more than a glorified debating society".

Mr. SINNOTT: You said it.

Mr. HANSELL: It was said by a gentleman in my own town, whose name my hon. friend would not know. He was a good Conservative, but that does not make any difference. I replied, "Well, you are wrong. It is not even a glorified debating society". It is not even a good debating society, for in a debating society the side that has all the arguments can win on points, but that never happens here. It does not make any difference who has the best of the argument; the government always wins. Before we ever start out in a debate we know who is going to win. So I say it does not make any difference how logical an argument may be, or how forceful it may be; the government always wins.

When parliament opens it does so with a good deal of pomp and dignity. There is the firing of guns, the playing of bands and the officials dressed in their official robes. Soldiers are there as their bodyguard; the mounted police stand at attention dressed in their bright red tunics, and the whole thing gives a tremendous air of importance. I have no criticism to make of that. Perhaps it is as it should be. But sometimes I wonder if all this is simply to fool us into believing that we are really going to do something.

I am sure we are glad to welcome the leader of the official opposition (Mr. Bracken) to the House of Commons. He is a public servant paid for guiding the opposition in the house. I believe he should be paid. Further, he should be paid all he is getting—and he should try to get all he can. I am inclined to believe that the leaders of other parties should also get just a little more for their efforts. However, be that as it may, what happens? In reality, what is happening is simply this, that the leader of the opposition is paid to be an expert in argumentation—and nothing else. Because even he, no matter how forceful his argument and no matter how logical, can never expect to win. The government always wins. And whether it be he or the leader of any other party, no matter how they may feel about their work, they are private members just the same and, so far as power is concerned, they have no more power in parliament than the little page boy who sits in a dignified position at your feet, Mr. Speaker.

The government is all-powerful in these things. What I am calling for is a real, democratic parliament. I am calling for a type of electoral and parliamentary reform under which each and every member of parliament would be directly responsible to the people of his constituency—and nobody else. But what we have in our present parliamentary system is not that. Let no one think I am wholly against the party system; what I am against is rigid party machinery, whereby a man when he is out stumping for the election is bidding for the people to send him to parliament on the basis that he will do what they want, but when he comes to Ottawa finds that he has to do what his party leaders want. That is the thing I criticize.

For what reason does this parliament exist? What, in reality, is its purpose? I do not know that I have ever read a definition of it, but I have prepared one of my own, and I would like hon. members to tell me if there is anything wrong with it: The Canadian parliament exists for the purpose of passing such legislation as will give to the people of Canada the results they want. I do not think there is anything wrong with that as a definition of what this parliament should be. But may I ask this: Do the people of Canada get the results they want?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. HANSELL: Of course they do not. Did they get the results they wanted between 1930 and 1940? Are the old age pensioners to-day getting all the results they want? We could go through the whole gamut of public life in Canada, and I am quite certain we could not say that the people have had the results they wanted.

Why not? Well, if parliament is here to legislate, surely it should be able to legislate without fear or favour, and with no strings attached, party or otherwise, so that legislation would be put on the statute books of Canada which would give to the people exactly the results they want. To a great extent, they do not get those results because of the impotency of parliament. Believe me, it is a brave man who will rise in his place on the government side of the house and vote against his party because he stands for great principles.

I am convinced that under our present electoral and parliamentary set-up the only democracy we have in Canada is the right to cast a ballot—and democracy ceases at the ballot box. Just the same, may I say I was very

glad when the gentleman who ran in the Prince Albert constituency, and whose name on the ballot appeared as the Right Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King, was defeated.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. HANSELL: Imagine my Liberal friends applauding my saying that I am glad he was defeated!

Do not misunderstand me; I was not particularly glad that he was not coming back here, or that it appeared that he would not be coming back. I am sure we would have missed him. It does not make very much difference to me whether it is a Liberal leader, a Conservative or a C.C.F. What I want there is a Social Credit leader. When I say I was glad he was defeated, it was not because of anything personal. Do not judge me too harshly. But I am glad that there is enough democracy left in Canada to say to any man, "We do not want you."

Some hon. member suggests that he could go somewhere else to get elected. That supports my argument, because there is still enough democracy left in Canada that one section of the country cannot dictate to another.

Does anyone suppose that in Germany at an election anyone could have defeated Adolf Hitler?

An hon. MEMBER: He is dead.

Mr. HANSELL: Do you suppose they could have put out Mussolini?

An hon. MEMBER: He is dead.

Mr. HANSELL: Do you suppose that to-day the people of Russia could put out Mr. Stalin?

An hon. MEMBER: No.

Mr. HANSELL: Has it been noised around that Russia is to hold an election? I say, we have a democratic heritage we must safeguard. What we must do, further than that, is to make it a real and effective democracy. I want a democracy where the people themselves are all-powerful at all times. Are they to-day? I do not think I shall be contradicted —perhaps my Liberal friends will contradict me—when I say that one man in Canada under our present political system is all-powerful. I am not concerned with the name of this man; I do not care who he was twenty years ago or who he may be five years from now, but I refer to the man who holds the position of Prime Minister of Canada. There has been plenty of proof for my statement in days gone by.

I need to refer only to the by-election held in Grey North some months ago. What happened there? The Prime Minster said, "I want to find a seat for my Minister of National Defence. If the people of Grey North are prepared to nominate him I shall have him run in Grey North." Personally I think he should have won the election and had his minister here, but that is not what happened. Before nomination day the Prime Minister said that he hoped his minister would not be opposed. It is a nice thing to be able to send out a feeler. However, other parties had a right to nominate candidates, and they did so. Then what did the Prime Minister do? Before nomination day he threatened that if his candidate was opposed and national issues were discussed he would call a general election.

Do you mean to tell me that one man in Canada should be able to do that. That is being all-powerful. National issues were brought into the picture and then the Prime Minister said that if his candidate was not elected he might not even have a session of parliament; he would call a general election before the session. That was quite a threat. Imagine all that power in the hands of one man. Is it right that in an effective democracy one man can talk to 12,000,000 people in that way? That is the position.

Take the matter of the calling of an election. Who decides when we should have an election? Is the leader of the opposition consulted? Is anybody consulted? I do not know whether the Liberal party is consulted, but certainly the country is not. Who sets the date for an election? One man. Why? Because that one man is all-powerful. I am inclined—I am not expressing the views of my party because I have not discussed it with them, although I know they are in favour of parliamentary reform—to favour the United States system with respect to the calling of elections and have elections held constitutionally on a certain day of a certain year, whether it is every four or five years does not make any difference. I believe that would be more democratic. Under such a system the country would not be left in suspense as to the immediate future when rumours of an election appear upon the horizon.

There is another thing I should like to refer to with respect to our parliamentary procedure. The Prime Minister of this country together with his cabinet should at all times be the servants of this house. It may be said that they are and there may be an argument there, but it does not work out that way in practice. In practice the government bring down the legislation. They say, "Here it is,

boys; take it or leave it." The party machinery gets going; the whips get going; you know beforehand that the legislation they bring down is what they have determined must pass, and it passes in spite of anything else.

I claim that that is not free democracy. The cabinet of Canada should be the servants of this house. Again I rather favour the United States plan. There the President and his cabinet have no seats in congress. I am not going to be extreme on this, but I am making a suggestion that the cabinet of Canada should not have seats in this house. They should constitute an executive body to administer the legislation that this house passes whether they want it or not.

I know what the argument against that will be. It will be said, "You do not mean to say that that executive body would have to do something they would not want to do?" Could there possibly be anything they would not want to do that the people's representatives, who are the mouthpiece of the people, decided the country wanted done? Of course there would not. They might offer some excuse and say that there were other factors, that we would want them to do something that was impossible, but surely the members of parliament would not be so stupid as to put legislation on the books that was physically impossible of accomplishment.

But I know the reason they would take that view. The reason is that money is their master. Many of the new members may not realize that it is against parliamentary procedure for a private member to bring down a measure involving an increase in expenditures. I think that is one of the most vicious things in our parliamentary system. It simply means that parliament is subject to the money powers. The cabinet, which would be the executive body, is tied hand and foot by that which finance dictates. It has been said by us over and over again and it was said the other day by one of my friends to my right —I think he copied it from us—that that which is physically possible must be made financially possible. If anything is physically possible and is desirable, is there any reason in this world why the cabinet, the executive body, should not be the servant of parliament and do that thing which parliament says is physically possible and desirable?

Another matter. I am not satisfied that just because a motion moved in the name of the government is not passed it should constitute a want-of-confidence motion. I never could bring myself to believe that it should, and yet that is the big club which the government uses all the time over the members of this house and over their own party in particular: you must vote for this motion or it constitutes a want-of-confidence motion and that means an election; so you cannot vote for the motion. Surely, if parliament is supreme, we can vote against government policy without meaning that we want these men in the government to cease administering the affairs of the country. They do it in the United States and in other countries. Personally I must really confess I am not in agreement with all my colleagues in that I have not any particular grievance with the way the government has been managing affairs.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. HANSELL: I do not know whether I appreciate that applause or not. What I am against is government policy. I believe their policy is all wrong. But if it is business administrators you want, I do not know why the Liberal party should not have just as good administrators as any other party. That is my personal position. I know there are a lot of little things wrong and things wrong which appear on the surface to be big things—housing, the return of our troops, and that sort of thing. But I want to be fair. I realize that in this transition period these are big jobs. Why should not parliament be able to say "yes" or "no" to any government legislation without running the risk of plunging the country into an election?

I have offered these suggestions which I think are reasonable ones. What I say is all in favour of the argument for some type of electoral and parliamentary reform. I believe that there should be some reform of the senate, but I am not going into that to-night except to say that seats in the senate should be won by election and not be granted by appointment. But seats in the senate have largely become a system of political rewards, and that should never be in a democratic country.

A word about money. Why should the government say: We cannot do anything because we haven't the money. Let parliament tell them what should be done. We do not say: You cannot run any trains because we have no tickets. We do not say: You cannot make any cloth because we have no more yardsticks. We do not say: You cannot have any roads because we do not have any miles. Physically it is possible to do all these things. If this parliament should decide that a thing is physically possible and desirable, that should be legislated, and the government of the country, who are supposed to be the ser-

vants of the people, should forthwith act accordingly. Then they would be the true servants of the people. Then we would have an effective democracy.

There is a good deal more to say along this line, but I see that it is getting towards eleven o'clock, and I suppose it is only right that I should stop speaking now because I have an amendment to the amendment to propose which I now move, seconded by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Low):

That the amendment be amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

and has further,

(d) failed to meet the needs of Canada for a prosperous peace and in particular, to provide a means of ensuring that the national production shall be kept at a sufficiently high level to provide every Canadian with a standard of living commensurate with Canada's ability to produce;

(e) failed to provide this country with an effective and scientific financial policy for distributing to all Canadians their fair share of the national production without increasing the burden of taxation or the national debt.

On motion of Mr. Matthews (Kootenay East) the debate was adjourned.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Friday, September 21, 1945.

The house met at three o'clock.

MEAT RATIONING

STATEMENT ON CONFERENCE BETWEEN OFFICIALS OF THE WARTIME PRICES AND TRADE BOARD AND MEAT DEALERS

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I was asked two or three days ago to make a statement about meat rationing in the light of the discussion with the representatives of the meat dealers who were here this week.

A meeting was held on Wednesday between officials of the wartime prices and trade board and a delegation representing the meat dealers' division of the Retail Merchants' Association of Canada. In the course of these meetings the members of the retailers' delegation adopted a resolution requesting the immediate suspension of meat rationing in favour of a plan to requisition the required percentage of Canada's productive capacity in meat and meat products sufficient to enable the government to meet its commitments to the United Kingdom and liberated Europe, permitting the balance to be distributed through the regular channels of trade, subject only to the provision that the dominion government, through the wartime prices and trade board, use the board's existing facilities to ensure equitable distribution.

The resolution went on to request that this plan be tested out for the remainder of this calendar year and if it failed to function satisfactorily, the retail merchants' association offered its further cooperation in endeavouring to work out some other plan that would achieve the objective of both meeting our overseas commitments and ensuring equitable distribution to Canadian consumers.

The delegation of retailers made it quite clear that they were opposed to consumer rationing in any form. Without prejudice to their main recommendation, however, they also made a number of suggestions with respect to technical details of the rationing system.

The very sincere representations which were made by this group have received careful consideration. Hon. members will appreciate, however, that their main recommendation is not a new one, and in this connection I would refer to the statement which I made to the house on September 13, appearing on pages 140 and 141 of *Hansard*. As I said at that time, no one welcomes rationing, neither the officials who have to administer it nor the consumer, nor the industry, nor the trade. Before rationing was decided upon, both the officials of the wartime prices and trade board and the members of the government gave most careful and prolonged consideration to ways and means of achieving our objectives with the minimum of inconvenience to all concerned. Our dual objective is to reduce domestic consumption so that we may be able to provide the United Kingdom and liberated Europe with the meat which we contracted to supply and the additional amounts we undertook to endeavour to provide, and at the same time to ensure fair shares at fair prices to all Canadian consumers.

I do not want to repeat everything that I said here a week ago yesterday, but I should like to reemphasize the following points:

(a) Only meat originating in inspected plants can enter into interprovincial trade or be exported. It is meat from these inspected plants which supplies a large part of the necessary meat requirements of deficiency-producing areas such as the maritime provinces, the northern parts of Ontario and Quebec and British Columbia, and in addition, the larger metropolitan centres in Canada.

(b) The requisitioning of meats in sufficient quantity to fulfil overseas requirements would shorten the supplies, with the effect that areas of surplus production would have abundant

supplies, amply sufficient to meet the entire consumer demand, and the deficiency areas would go extremely short. Throughout these deficiency areas and large urban centres the serious maldistribution would breed black markets and lead to a breakdown of price controls.

(c) The meat trade is a highly complex organization with highly complex channels of distribution. The wartime prices and trade board has been able to devise no practical means other than rationing whereby meat could be directed through these complex channels in any way that would assure fair shares to retailers and to consumers in all parts of Canada.

Members of the retail meat dealers' delegation which made the above recommendation are reported to me to have said that they were prepared "to take their chances" on getting their fair share of meat. We are convinced that in fact each would not get his fair share, and we believe that in a very short time the dealers in the areas I have referred to would be demanding redress as they did late in 1942 and early in 1943 and as they were beginning to do in the spring of 1945 when temporary shortages began to appear in certain eastern cities.

If the retailers were the only persons who would suffer by such an experiment there might be something to be said in favour of trying it. But the real sufferers, the final victims of the maldistribution which we are convinced would occur, would not be the retailers but the families who depend upon them for supplies. The government do not consider that they would be justified in gambling where the stakes at issue are the essential food of hundreds of thousands of Canadian families.

The policy of the government, therefore, is that meat rationing will remain in effect until it becomes clear that we can fulfil both our overseas responsibilities and our responsibility to our own consumers without it.

Hon. members are also aware that apart from the principle of rationing, we have been receiving many representations respecting the details of the rationing system. I believe that most of these complaints are the result of unfamiliarity with the details of rationing which is inevitable during the first week or two of its operation. Already we are receiving evidence that a great part of this misunderstanding is disappearing, and that both consumers and the trade are rapidly adjusting themselves to the new situation.

On a number of points it is still too early to form a fair judgment as to whether complaints are simply due to unfamiliarity or represent actual defects which should be corrected. During the next few weeks numerous conferences will be going on with a view to smoothing out both the real and the apparent difficulties.

The wartime prices and trade board, however, has decided to make one immediate change, and it has to-day issued an order temporarily removing from the ration what are sometimes termed "edible butchers offals" and sometimes "fancy meats," that is, such items as livers, hearts, kidneys and tongues. The reason for this temporary suspension is that these meats are relatively more perishable than others, and that there appears to be evidence that their sales have slowed down in some areas to a point where actual spoilage threatens to occur.

It is estimated that in a full year the quantity of these meats normally available for consumption in Canada is about 50 or 60 million pounds. The permanent removal of these from the ration would therefore mean that consumers would have available to them 20 or 25 million additional coupons with which they could purchase other meats, which would in turn reduce the quantities available for overseas shipment.

The board therefore proposes first to re-examine the practicability of putting these items back on the ration at a date, say, six or eight weeks hence, by which time everybody will be readily familiar with the rationing system, or if that seems impracticable the board will take some other appropriate step to keep over-all meat consumption within the target set, such as widening to two weeks the gap between coupon validity dates once every three or four months.

In the meantime, the meat board, under the Department of Agriculture, which handles all export commitments, will be authorized to requisition such additional quantities of edible offals as may be necessary to fill export demands as they arise.

The wartime prices and trade board realizes that the lifting of the ration on these items will probably result in considerable maldistribution of them in many centres. In order to meet this difficulty as far as possible, the board is directing all inspected plants to maintain pro rata equitable distribution of their supplies of such products as between secondary meat processors, public eating places, hospitals and institutions, and retail outlets. It will be impossible to guarantee equitable distribution between areas and between retailers, but the board will endeavour to see that undue proportions do not go to secondary processors or hotels and restaurants. It will be understood, of course, that public eating places will still

be prohibited from serving liver, hearts, kidneys, tongues and the like on meatless days.

Another question was asked by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) involving the presentation of certain statistics. I am afraid I shall not be able to make a complete presentation of those until Monday, but I intend to put them on record at that time.

With regard to the difficulties of the meat dealers, I may say in conclusion that the government has the greatest sympathy with the administrative embarrassment that the meat rationing system causes to members of this trade, and is willing to do anything within reason to help them meet their problems. But the considerations involved in meat rationing are so much broader and so much more important than this, that the decision to go on with it or to cease must be based on those broader considerations.

PACKERS AND DEALERS—FREEZING SPACE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. K. FRASER (Peterborough West): I should like to ask the minister what arrangements have been made by the government to take meat from the packers or meat dealers so they will have ample freezing space. A report was broadcast over the radio, and also appeared in the press, that an official of the wartime prices and trade board told a meat dealer, Mr. Kline, of the civic abattoir in Toronto, that he could throw the meat into the lake if he did not have sufficient freezing space. Is the government taking that meat off the hands of these people, or what arrangements have been made?

Mr. ILSLEY: To begin with, I do not know whether there is any foundation whatever for the report to which the hon. member refers.

Mr. FRASER: The minister has heard of the statement?

Mr. ILSLEY: I saw some reference to it in the press.

Mr. KNOWLES: There are many things in the press.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes. I would be very doubtful if anything like that was said. In regard to the cold storage situation, I am not in a position to make a statement, but I am informed that there is some congestion in regard to the facilities for what is called sharp freezing, which they hope will be cleared up within a week. With regard to cold storage proper, I am told that the facilities are ample and there is no congestion.

Mr. FRASER: This statement is reported to have been made to Mr. Kline, manager of the killing plant of the Toronto civic abattoir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The statement of the minister is not debatable.

WORKERS IN HEAVY INDUSTRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ROBERT FAIR (Battle River): Has any action been taken by the wartime prices and trade board to make available to miners, loggers, threshers and others, increased quantities of meat? This question has been raised on at least three occasions in the house, and I am wondering what has been done.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, I would ask the hon. member to put his question on the order paper.

Mr. FAIR: Mr. Speaker, only this morning I received a telegram from Drumheller stating that some of the miners' unions out there intend to go on strike by Wednesday next, or at least to consider going on strike if something is not done. A copy of the telegram has been sent to Mr. Donald Gordon. I suggest there is an emergency here.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member would put his question on the order paper, even if it is urgent, it could wait a few days, and the minister would have time to look into it.

Mr. FAIR: The question was asked a week ago, and on two different occasions since. I suggest we should have an answer.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would call the hon. member's attention to the fact that in giving my decision I am only following what the house itself decided.

BRITISH COLUMBIA LOGGERS

Mr. G. A. CRUICKSHANK (Fraser Valley): May I have an answer which was promised by the minister in connection with the action contemplated or intended in respect of meat rationing in so far as the loggers of British Columbia are concerned?

Mr. FAIR: Order paper.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask the hon. member to put the question on the order paper.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Mr. Speaker, the minister promised me an answer.

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): I wrote the hon. member two or three days ago giving him the information. I did not

realize that he necessarily wanted it made public.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

HOSPITAL ACCOMMODATION—CHRISTIE STREET—SUNNYBROOK

On the orders of the day:

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Yesterday I was asked by the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Bruce), who does not appear to be in the chamber at the moment, a question in reference to hospital accommodation for veterans in the city of Toronto, and particularly with reference to the question of congestion relating to out-patients at Christie Street. I may tell the house that a week ago we took active steps to meet and deal with that situation, by sending a senior medical officer and a senior administrative officer to Toronto. We are now endeavouring to obtain downtown premises in Toronto where out-patients may be interviewed and those screened who do not require to go to the hospital for treatment.

In regard to the general hospital situation in Canada, I intended to deal with this matter later on when my estimates were being considered by the house, but it may interest hon. members to know that we now have in Canada in this department a normal bed capacity of 9,603, with 7,226 patients and 2,379 vacant beds. There is either being constructed or about to be constructed accommodation for an additional 6,000 beds, of which 1,200 will be for health and occupational centres. It may also interest hon. members to learn that all battle casualties with the exception of twenty-six have been returned to Canada, which reflects tremendous credit upon the Minister of National Defence and his staff.

In regard to the second portion of the question asked by the hon. member for Parkdale, dealing with the progress of the construction of Sunnybrook hospital, I would ask permission to have that answered by my colleague the Minister of Public Works, who is in charge of that work.

Hon. ALPHONSE FOURNIER (Minister of Public Works): Last week the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church) and yesterday the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Bruce) inquired as to the progress of the construction of Sunnybrook hospital. I have now a report from our consulting engineer. This hospital is composed of six units, and I have been given a summary of the progress of the work.

The status of the work is as follows:

Boiler house. The building is completed, except for finished floors which are not ordinarily laid until all machinery and piping work is done. The chimney is up to sixty per cent height, but work suspended awaiting more of the special brick. All three boilers are well advanced, and should be completed next week. Pumps and other equipment have been set on their bases, and piping up is proceeding. Most of the piping in the tunnel leading to neuro-psychiatric building has been installed.

As to the neuro-psychiatric building, the plastering is finished, except the putty coat on halls and a few rooms on two of the floors. Terrazo and wall tile work are substantially completed. Owing to delay in decision as to paint colours, this work has not been started. Heating, plumbing and electric wiring are substantially completed, except for installation of fixtures. Elevator guides are being set, and other work around elevator shafts is proceeding.

As to up-patients building, concrete subfloor in basement is ninety-five per cent finished, and considerable tile partition work done for storerooms and refrigerators. All concrete floors and roof slabs have been placed in north and east wings, except roofs of main and elevator penthouses. Stone, brick and tile work in exterior walls is about sixty-five per cent completed. This building should be closed in by about September 30.

As to the active treatment building, all the structural steel framework is erected, and about fifty per cent rivetted up. Three of the concrete floors in the east wing have been placed, and exterior wall stonework of the said wing started.

As to the out-patients building, concrete work in the basement walls and column shafts is proceeding, and erection of structural steel framework was started on September 10.

As to the Red Cross pavilion, the foundation concrete work is within about a week of completion, and brick walls of south wing are partly finished for a height of one story.

Services. Sewers, water and fire mains are all laid, except a few short branches to buildings. All this piping is now in course of being given final tests. Roadway grading is substantially completed, and sufficient base course has been laid for construction use. The permanent electric service to and including the substation is completed.

Mr. FLEMING: Can the minister give us a projected date for the over-all completion of the work?

Mr. FOURNIER (Hull): I would not attempt to give that information, because of

the labour situation and the difficulties in respect of materials we have had. However, I shall consider making a report to the house later on.

Mr. SKEY: Perhaps the Minister of Veterans Affairs would permit a supplementary question on the subject of Christie Street hospital and the new facilities the department is endeavouring to provide. I understand that the difficulty in connection with out-patients at Christie Street hospital in Toronto arises from lack of facilities for medical dispensation, rather than floor space.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let me remind the hon. member that he cannot make a statement when asking a question, nor can he set out particulars. He may ask only the simple question.

Mr. SKEY: I regret having transgressed the rules of the house. May I ask the Minister of Veterans Affairs if additional facilities for medical dispensation are planned for the out-patients at Christie Street hospital, Toronto?

Mr. MACKENZIE: The answer is yes.

PRIVILEGE—MR. McIVOR

POST-WAR INDUSTRIAL CONDITIONS—CANADA CAR

On the orders of the day:

Mr. DANIEL McIVOR (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. On Tuesday last I quoted the hon. member for Cartier (Mr. Rose), who had quoted a statement from the Montreal *Standard* which was detrimental to President Drury of the Canada Car. These are the words I quoted at that time:

> The party is over. Not only will there not be enough jobs but wages will have to be brought down to former peace-time levels. If the employees won't take a cut in wages, the plant will have to close down. We can't afford to have our profits cut into by paying the high war-time wage levels.

I find now that the *Standard* has corrected that, with these words:

> The inaccurate interpretation of the interview referred to above appeared in the September 1 issue of the *Standard*. The *Standard* regrets the error.

My own statement at this time is that from the time I first met the late President Butler, to the present time, I have been proud of Canada Car. I am thankful now that President Drury is not in favour of low wages or fewer jobs, but rather of going all-out to work in cooperation with the Minister of Reconstruction.

[Mr. A. Fournier.]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS APPEARING ON THE ORDER PAPER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (Macleod): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Prime Minister. Inasmuch as questions on the order paper cannot be answered until this debate is concluded, I wonder if he would not make some motion reversing the order, so that questions on the order paper may be answered at regular intervals—say even as early as Monday. Otherwise, since the debate may go on for another week, questions now standing on the order paper will not be answered until that time.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Order paper.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I call the attention of hon. members to the fact that at the opening of the session it was the House of Commons that decided to give precedence to the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne. That decision was made by all hon. members. Therefore I believe the hon. member will have to wait until the debate on the address is completed.

TRUCKS AND TRACTORS

AVAILABILITY TO RETURNED SERVICE PERSONNEL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. F. E. JAENICKE (Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe). Was the sale of army trucks and field artillery tractors to farmers in Markham, Ontario, by the War Assets Corporation, as set forth in a Canadian Press dispatch of September 20, held with the approval of the government? Is it the intention to hold sales of such trucks and tractors on a similar basis . . .

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member's question should be brief and to the point. I think this is the type of question that should appear on the order paper.

Mr. JAENICKE: In view of the urgent need of trucks and tractors I should like to ask the Minister of Reconstruction a question. I may say that I sent him notice of this question. Is it the intention to hold sales of such trucks and tractors, as was recently held in Markham, Ontario, on a similar basis in western Canada? Has the government given consideration to conferring priority in the purchase of such trucks and tractors upon returned veterans—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is out of order. I would ask him to put his question on the order paper.

Mr. COLDWELL: Mr. Speaker, I am not disputing your ruling, but I would point out that this is a matter of urgency. Trucks are needed to take the grain away from the combines.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. COLDWELL: The hon. member is simply asking if some arrangement could not be made to facilitate the sale of trucks so that farmers and others in western Canada may get them. It is a matter of urgency.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have given my ruling and the hon. member must abide by it.

IMPERIAL CONFERENCE

QUESTION AS TO DISCUSSIONS LOOKING TO MEETING IN OTTAWA OR ELSEWHERE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether or not any discussions have been entered into in the last three months between the government of Canada and the government of Great Britain or any of the members of the commonwealth with regard to the holding of an imperial conference at Ottawa or elsewhere?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): In reply to my hon. friend I would say that there have been no discussions between the British government and the Canadian government during the last three months with respect to the holding of an imperial conference at Ottawa or elsewhere. My hon. friend will recall that when the council of foreign ministers was about to meet in London to take up matters which arose out of the Potsdam conference, the Prime Minister of Great Britain sent a communication to the prime ministers of the several dominions. Mr. Attlee said it would be of help to himself and his colleagues and mutually advantageous if the prime ministers of the different dominions might be in London at the time that the council was meeting, but he recognized that probably in all cases that would not be possible. He suggested that where it could be arranged conveniently a representative who could speak in the name of the Prime Minister might be present to ensure closer consultation and continuous discussion.

The council of foreign ministers is a body composed solely of the foreign ministers of the five great powers. There was no invitation extended to any dominion to be represented at the council. I should like to make it clear, because there seems to be misunderstanding in some quarters on this point, that the council is not authorized in any way to conclude treaties of peace or territorial settlements. It is a body called together for the purpose of doing essential preparatory work on draft treaties and draft proposals which will be submitted later to all the united nations concerned with the settlement of the peace.

In reply to Mr. Attlee I said that I regretted that it was not possible for me to be in London for purposes of consultation with him while the council was meeting. If it had been possible at all I should have been happy to go over to be in England just at this time, as there are a number of questions about which I feel it would be desirable if at all possible to have personal conferences with the members of the new government, the Prime Minister, the Foreign Minister and the Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs. I have been turning over in my mind what might be possible in that way, and it may be that when the house gets along a little further with its business I shall ask the house to allow me to visit London for that and other purposes which I may take occasion to mention later on.

TEXTILES

REDUCTION OF MONTHLY BATTLE DRESS REQUIREMENTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. S. HARKNESS (Calgary East): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. In view of the present shortage of textiles and the fact that demobilization is going on rapidly, why have monthly requirements of battle dress only been reduced from 75,000 to 70,000 units and—

Mr. SPEAKER: This question should not be asked on the orders of the day.

Mr. HARKNESS: May I ask the question in this form?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already ruled that this question is of the type that should be placed on the order paper.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE IN REPLY

The house resumed from Thursday, September 20, consideration of the motion of Mr. W. M. Benidickson for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Bracken, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Hansell.

Mr. J. H. MATTHEWS (Kootenay East): Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Benidickson) was moving the address in reply to the speech from the throne he spoke of himself as taking his first faltering steps in national politics. I believe those words found an echo in many of our hearts, for there are many of us who are here for the first time. We are indeed taking our first steps in national politics. We have much to learn about the rules, regulations and privileges of this house, but I am sure that under your gracious guidance, sir, we shall be kept on the right track.

I want to say that our work here is not made any easier by the bad acoustics of this chamber. Many hon. members speak in conversational tones, and consequently much of their wisdom is entirely lost to us. I hope the hon. member will forgive me for using his name as an illustration, but I do want to confess to a very high regard for the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley). I think he has done a remarkably good job in a very difficult period, and I hope he will maintain that fine record during the life of this parliament. But I am afraid he will fall from the pedestal upon which some of us have placed him unless he speaks louder. I have noticed that when he rises to speak, members lean forward, and the visitors in the galleries cup their ears to hear what he has to say. The same shortcoming might be imputed even to the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). Surely, sir, if there are two men in this house who ought to be heard well and correctly, they are the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance. Fortunately there is a remedy. We are living in a scientific age. Why, then, not put to full use our scientific discoveries by placing amplifying equipment in this chamber? I noticed in the press recently that in the new British houses of parliament both loud speakers and air-conditioning units are to be installed. If Great Britain in her war-impoverished state can go that far, surely we in Canada, with all our wealth, can do the same.

Ministers of the gospel, Mr. Speaker, are sometimes criticized for being long-winded in the delivery of their sermons, especially if they go beyond the usual twenty-five or thirty minutes. I am afraid that if some of the ministers of the crown were to occupy the pulpits of this dominion they too would be criticized for taking the whole of forty minutes, the time allowed them here. Be that as it may, I can assure hon. members that I am not going to transgress the rules, neither am I going to be longwinded. In fact, I may establish a record for brevity. There are one or two things in which I am deeply interested, of which I should like to speak.

First I would suggest to the government that there is need of immediate revision of the Indian Act to bring it into conformity with present-day requirements. Some hon. members may think I am speaking on a subject with which I am not familiar, but I do know something about the Indians in this dominion, because I have spent some twelve years of my life as an Indian missionary, living on their reserves and ministering to their needs. I am speaking now particularly of the Indian tribes of the northwest Pacific coast, particularly the Tsmpsheans of the Prince Rupert area, the Bella Bellas, the Kitamaats and the Haidas of the Queen Charlotte islands. Some people think it is very funny to say that the best Indian is a dead one. With that I must disagree, because among our Indian population there are many very worthy people indeed. They are thrifty, honest, industrious, intelligent, and very ambitious.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I should like to pay a tribute to the splendid work that is being carried on among the Indians of Canada by the various Christian churches of this dominion, which over a period of years have consistently tried to lift up the economic, moral and spiritual life of these wards of the government. In this endeavour I believe they have succeeded to a very remarkable degree. The time has come, or is fast approaching, when we should give earnest consideration to changing the emphasis, and thinking not so much of building up the Indians to our own standards of living, as of developing a programme that would prepare the hearts and minds of our own people to receive the Indians on a basis of equality—because, sir, there are many Indians who are our equals now, in knowledge, in ability and in courtesy. Indian young men and young women from our reserves have gone through our high schools; some of them have gone through our normal schools and have received their teachers' certificates and joined the teaching profession. Yet these young people are not citizens; they have not the right to vote. I believe, sir, that the time has come when a large section of our Indian population should be enfranchised and given full rights of citizenship. I would suggest that a standard of education be set up; that our Indian young men and women should be encouraged to reach up to and to pass that standard, and that the prize for so doing should be full citizenship. I am satisfied that if that were done, many of our Indians would

do just as much honour to our citizenship as many of our other citizens.

May I remind the house that many Indians in the Dominion of Canada have served, and served splendidly, during this war. I have in my hand a news letter emanating from the Windermere district of the Columbia valley. It tells me that Mr. J. Coleman, inspector of Indian agencies for British Columbia, has been visiting in the Windermere district and says:

> Mr. Coleman, giving credit where credit is due, emphasized that well as the Indians throughout British Columbia have responded in the war, those from this Cranbrook agency have exceeded all others by far. The corollary, of course, is that more Indian veterans are among the men returning to this area. It is up to the council and the community to see that these men who have worn the king's uniform with credit and distinction and who have been correspondingly treated in English and Scottish homes are not forgotten with the indifference, which would appear from Mr. Coleman's talk to be part of the reason for the backward life of our local Indians to date.

In this connection too, sir, I would also suggest, when you are thinking of full citizenship rights to the Indians, that they be conferred without forfeiture of any of their rights on the Indian reserves. I know there are many people in this country who think that Indian rights are non-existent, or were surrendered when treaty agreements were entered into. As a matter of fact there never have been any treaty rights so far as the British Columbia Indians are concerned. Not one dollar of treaty money has ever been paid to the Indians of British Columbia. Let us, then, give to those who are deserving the full rights of citizenship, whether they live on reserves or whether they do not.

I should like to say a word concerning the constituency of Kootenay East, which I have the honour to represent. It was created in 1914, thirty-one years ago, and like many of the other electoral districts it has given to the parliamentary life of this country men of high distinction. First of all I should like to mention that East Kootenay is justly proud of Hon. J. H. King, who is now Speaker of the Senate; also of Hon. H. H. Stevens, who served the Conservative party so ably and so well; and last but not least, my predecessor in office, Mr. G. E. L. Mackinnon, of Cranbrook, who I am sure is held in high esteem by hon. members on both sides of this chamber.

East Kootenay is one of those glorious areas of country of which one might almost say that "every prospect pleases, and only man is vile." For beauty of landscape and abundance of resources, Kootenay East stands unbeatable. We have coal in abundance, coal to burn. Why, sir, I know of one seam of coal which has been burning for the last fourteen or fifteen years. It would be difficult to say how many thousands or millions of tons have been consumed in that time. The fire is still burning, and will burn, because apparently it is no one's business to put it out. We have gold and silver; we have lead, and zinc, and many other of the base metals. Our big game areas are something to dream about; and I can assure you, sir, that the wonderful and luscious fruit which comes from the Creston valley is equal in quality to anything that comes out of the Okanagan valley or from Ontario. However, I am not going to bring any peaches in the house to-day. It is enough to speak of them to make your mouths water.

But despite the beauty of the landscape of the Kootenays there are a few blots on it. We have some company towns, communities where every house is identical in construction and where all are alike as far as dilapidation is concerned—houses which lack all the modern conveniences which help to make for a happy home life.

The hon. member for Edmonton East (Mr. Ashby), addressing the house on Thursday of last week, spoke of the four freedoms of the Atlantic charter, and of their relationship to the animals upon his farm yonder in the far west. I believe he made his point quite clear, that those four freedoms had been achieved for the animal world but not for the world of men. To use a current phrase, "that will be the day" when those four freedoms are made a reality for mankind. He would be a bold man indeed who would dare to say that we now have freedom from want or freedom from fear, even in Canada. I know very well that in the coal mining area of the Crowsnest pass we have not freedom from fear. The coal miners in that area have vivid recollections of those depression years which we speak of as "the hungry thirties", when the coal mines were operating only two days a week, and now they are beginning to fear very much the threat of the "hungry forties". And why, sir, should this be? We have coal in abundance, the mountains are full of it; and we have the miners, as brave and heroic a band as you will find anywhere, men who go down into the heart of the mountains day after day to dig the coal, always under a strain, always risking life and limb.

The hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis) spoke on Monday evening of the casualties among the workers in the coal mining industry. I know something of what he was talking about, because it has been my

sad duty to bury many of their broken and mutilated bodies.

What we need now in the Crowsnest mining area, and all of British Columbia as far as that is concerned, is an expansion of our markets. We have the coal, we have the miners, but we need an extension of markets even as far as Ontario. I hope some day to have the privilege of addressing a question to the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Glen) asking for the figures as to the amount of coal which is imported into Canada, especially into the Ontario market from the Pennyslvania coal mining areas. I know that there is a point somewhere between our western coal fields and the eastern coal market beyond which it is not economically sound to bring our western coal because of the increased subsidy which would be required; yet I also know that it is not economically sound to continue importing coal from the United States and have our own coal miners idle, our coal mines not operating, and the miners existing on relief allowances, as they did during those depression years.

I have brought down with me to-day the copy of the brief presented by the Western Canada Bituminous Coal Operators' Association at the Calgary sitting of the coal commission on April 7 of this year. I have no thought of wearying the house by reading all of this brief—that would be imposing on good nature indeed; but I should like to read, if I may, one paragraph from the summation, which is as follows:

> In dealing with the industry we have emphasized chiefly the production of our products. We need hardly point out that in its relation to the economy of western Canada, that is only one part of it.
>
> Around our coal mines have grown up towns housing the mining population, and businesses catering to them. Railways and bus lines serve these communities, and the products of the mines goes out in revenue freight. Railway employees share in the created work, and when the product reaches its destination other hands take over and in turn find their livelihood in distribution, in turn enabling them to take their places as citizens in the communities of their choice.
>
> From all go a portion of the receipts of their activities to support government, municipal and rural districts, and from the mining communities with which we are most intimately connected, none can say that it has not been freely and generously given.
>
> It is the coal industry, but it is also an integral and vital part of the life of Canada.

Before taking my seat I should like to refer to one other subject, namely, the Prime Minister's plan to beautify the city of Ottawa as a national war memorial. With this plan I am in fullest agreement, provided that it does not in any way detract from an over-all plan to give our Canadian people, no matter where they live, decent and desirable homes. It is all very well to make Ottawa a city that will compare with, or even surpass, other foreign capitals, but let us first of all make Canada a land worth fighting for, and a land to love. That will be a memorial indeed of which we can all be proud.

Mr. R. H. WINTERS (Queens-Lunenburg): Mr. Speaker, you will note that I brought my notes along with me, so that, despite what you said to the contrary, I hope you will not be too harsh on me if I refer to them occasionally and perhaps somewhat closely.

So far I have had the pleasure of listening to a great many speeches in this house, both by new members and by seasoned veterans, and I must say that I find the quality uniformly high. One gets the impression as a new member that he is among orators. I gather that a great many of the speakers have had experience outside the house owing to the fact that they are lawyers or clergymen or have other backgrounds. I should like to say at the outset that I am an engineer, and I feel sure that other engineers in the house will agree with me when I say that engineers generally are not expected to rise to any great heights of oratory.

Mr. WEIR: You are doing very well.

Mr. WINTERS: At this point, Mr. Speaker, if I am not too late, I should like to compliment you on your elevation to your high office. It is gratifying to note that recently you were selected in a prominent Montreal weekly paper as the "man of the week."

I would join with the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Gibson) in congratulating the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Bridges). I freely admit that we cannot compete with British Columbia in the size of our timber. Some of the finest production methods I have seen anywhere have been in the sawmills of Alberni; but I think when it comes to fish we can put up a fair race.

Mr. REID: Just fair.

Mr. WINTERS: I said "a fair race." The biggest single source of income in Queens-Lunenburg is the fisheries. In my opinion, to have a Minister of Fisheries from the maritime provinces is clearly justifiable on the grounds that the maritimes produce more fish than any other single province in Canada. I think that statement is fair when size and density of population are considered.

As hon. members know, I have the honour to represent the constituency of Queens-Lunenburg where the people for generations

back have the reputation of being sincere, hard-working and industrious citizens. To the rest of Canada they are known as sea-faring folk. Indeed, many derive their living directly from the sea, and others depend indirectly on undertakings associated with the sea such as shipbuilding, ship repairing, fish curing, fish packing, and the like. Manufacturing, which was carried out only on a small scale before the war, flourished during the war, and this constituency made a worth-while contribution to Canada's over-all manufacturing war effort. In my opinion there is every reason to believe that, given the same facilities, this constituency could do just as good a job in manufacturing as the larger centres of Canada.

Farming, too, plays an important part, particularly in those regions remote from the seacoast. I do not know whether it is generally known, but there are many fine apple orchards in the Queens-Lunenburg constituency, and although they have suffered the misfortune of having a poor crop this year, as has the rest of Nova Scotia, the orchards are normally very productive.

Hon. members who sat in this house in former years have heard all this before; they have heard of the wonders of this constituency from the former stalwart members, now senators, Duff and Kinley. My point in bringing this up at this stage is that since September 6 I have listened to a great flood of criticism of the government from opposition members, and I feel it is worth while to reiterate these points at this time because the constituency represents a fair cross-section of Canada. It is significant that a constituency representing a fair cross-section of Canada can still decide to place its faith in a Liberal government. Then, too, as a new member I find this criticism carried to the point where to me it is amazing. When opposition members rise in their places they invariably say that they want to be constructive. All of us, regardless of party, profess our good faith in working toward the common interest of Canada. There would appear to me to be no good reason to believe that all the good faith should be on one side of the house; yet, despite what the government does and proposes to do, there are those who rise and immediately criticize the government for falling down on the job; shirking its responsibility; doing too little or doing it too late.

I believe that everybody realizes the value of constructive criticism; but I sometimes wonder whether hon. members of the opposition, who criticize the government for not carrying out the programmes which are being pursued with all possible vigour, can convince themselves that they are being constructive. In this connection I recall an incident which occurred in a large industrial plant where I once worked. The department head called a meeting of his staff to try to get to the bottom of some irregularity, and each member in turn blamed some other department for falling down. Finally the department head cut in and said, "Don't try to tell me that all the brains of this company are in my department, because I don't believe it." I think that statement should be applied in this house. I have found it helpful and I believe we might all learn something from it.

There is no doubt in my mind that this government is doing the best it can in the interests of Canada. I have seen no evidence in any of the departments that they are not willing to get on with the job. It has been recommended by hon. members in the opposition that what may be needed with respect to programmes such as housing and reconversion are "expediters." In this regard may I say that both as a civilian and as a member of the armed forces I have had very close contact with the Department of Munitions and Supply, particularly in those trying days when supply was tight and production was hard to get. Most of us feel that this department and "expediters" are synonymous. Officials of this department have, in my opinion, been chosen for their ability to crack the whip and get things done. Those of us who know these "expediters" and realize what they have done under trying conditions can hardly believe that the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) is pulling his punches now or has taken off the pressure.

May I now say a word about the armed forces. We have all watched the navy, the army and the air force grow from a small nucleus to the large forces they are to-day. I think my own corps is a good example in that regard; that is, the Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, commonly known as R.C.E.M.E. It was not in existence at all at the start of the war; the functions it now performs were carried out by engineers and other technicians in ordnance. But with the growth of technical equipment and the mechanization of the army it was found that some other way was necessary to keep this equipment in operation. The British army experimented and finally formed a separate corps, the Royal Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, commonly known as R.E.M.E., which proved itself in North Africa; and based on this experience we formed our own

corps on May 15, 1944. It is a good example of the growth of all the forces, that this corps grew from nothing to the point where at one stage the first Canadian army had more than 20,000 R.C.E.M.E. personnel alone under its command. It is true that there were controversies on various points in connection with the armed forces, such as those best known to the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Pearkes), but the net result was that, in every case, the force did more than was required of it, and brought great credit to Canada.

These forces are now being repatriated, demobilized and rehabilitated. I compliment the ministers of national defence on the efficient way these troops have been returned to Canada. It bears repeating, too, that Canada's rehabilitation programme ranks with the best in the world. There is one point, however, on which it appears to me that more specific and definite action should be taken by the government; that is, in the declaration of policy regarding its permanent forces. Many really good men who are thoroughly trained on army equipment and in army methods, and who would undoubtedly remain in the army if that policy were clear, are now being lost to the army. The two-year interim establishment does not provide sufficient inducement to these men because the policy beyond the two-year limit is not clear. This is particularly true in technical corps when tradesmen are in great demand by industry. In these corps, too, the army has a heavy commitment of work; they are still held responsible for getting out the job. Yet because of the demand from industry for tradesmen and the absence of a clear-cut permanent force policy we cannot hope to hold them, and we are losing them at the present time. I suggest that all possible action be taken by the government at the earliest day to clarify this policy. I think, too, that in the field of development and research as applied to army equipment, a policy should be laid on as quickly as possible. The present state of scientific development can be attributed to a large extent to the armed forces, and we should not take any chances on losing ground at this time.

I will pass on now and say a few words on reconstruction. In this connection the problem in Queens-Lunenburg is far from easy. There was little manufacturing before the war; but, as I have stated, a good effort was put forward during the period of the war. In particular, several well equipped plants expanded and assumed responsibility for the repair of naval ships. They carried a heavy load, and carried it well. A great contribution was made in the building of wooden ships of all types. Since the constituency of Queens-Lunenburg is well adapted to work of this kind and is not blessed with the all-round facilities of the larger centres, any work along these lines will be welcomed in the post-war period. I do not think it is sufficiently well known that several plants in this constituency manufacture gasoline engines complete. These engines are designed locally for rugged use, and there are few complaints that they do not stand up under what may be conservatively termed adverse conditions.

I now come to fishing, which is the real core of our existence in Queens-Lunenburg. It is well known that Lunenburg in particular is the home of the fishing fleet on the east coast. I have no doubt this house has been reminded of this fact a good many times. Most of the industry and enterprise is allied to fishing, either directly or indirectly. In the past few years great strides have been made in modernizing fishing methods, improving ways of marketing fish in a more attractive way. Cold storage methods have, of course, helped a great deal in this regard. I would recommend to the Minister of Fisheries that a programme of research be pursued with a view to improving facilities and conditions for fishing and providing advice on marketing. It is suggested that a great field of development in the use of fish by-products remains to be explored more fully. I would expressly urge that all possible action be taken along these lines, on the ground that it will play an important part in the reconversion programme, and will prove in future a good investment for Canada. In this regard I was interested to see this morning an editorial in the Ottawa *Citizen* dealing with the Department of Fisheries and placing it perhaps more in the spotlight than it has been previously. In time I think this department will grow in the eyes of the public and assume its rightful position, higher than has been the case in the past.

Apart from the deep-sea fishing, for which my constituency is best known, there is a great potential source of revenue in the inland fisheries. The Medway river, for example, in Queens county, is one of the best salmon and grilse streams to be found anywhere. It attracts many tourists, most of them from the United States; and I am told that the ratio of money coming into Canada because of this stream, in proportion to the pounds of fish taken out, is very high. This particular river also provides water power for a number of

small industries along its course. I think it could well be termed a multipurpose river. I mention this river only as an example. The government is well aware of its potentialities. I believe that a development programme is already on the books, but that during the war it has been held in abeyance. I would urge that now we should lose no time in exploiting this river to the full, and getting on with the development. The same may be said, of course, for many other equally productive streams in Nova Scotia.

Further, in connection with fishing it is urged that a complete and thorough survey be made of the coast-line, with a view to providing adequate and satisfactory shelters, harbours and wharves and other docking facilities for fishermen operating small boats along the coast. These fishermen receive little or no publicity but contribute in great measure to the economy of Canada.

Complete dredging facilities to be used where and when required should also be provided; buoys, too, should be provided and located on a more generous basis. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that these matters are already in hand, and will be carried out when more facilities become available after the pressure of war time production is terminated.

I should like now to say a few words about communications—and by communications I mean what is known in the trade as communications of intelligence by electrical means. With the exception of the United States, Canada has the greatest number of telephones, per capita, of any country in the world. In my opinion the telephone companies have done an outstanding job in providing service under most adverse conditions. There have been practically no serious break-downs or even delays in having communications established and maintained.

Manufacturers of communications equipment have given an exceptionally fine account of themselves. They have met their commitments well, and have done so under adverse conditions of tight schedules and shortages of materials. In most instances, it must be remembered, that they have been dealing not with routine items, but rather with highly complicated technical devices, including radar. These points have complicated their problems to a considerable extent.

My point in discussing communications is that I feel that at this time we should consider extending the facilities to localities lying on the fringe of the present systems, and to the small islands lying off the coast which, at the present time, have no means of two-way communication, with the exception of their boats and, in some instances, horse-and-buggy communications.

Off the coast of my constituency there are many islands. I have in mind two in particular, those of La Have and Tancook, which are practically isolated during the winter months. The coast-line is rugged; the weather is severe, and there are days on end when they find themselves quite out of touch with the mainland and with other centres. The developments resulting from the war, and the simplicity achieved in electrical communications, whereby we have means for putting many messages on one pair of wires, or of using one wireless or radio set to transmit many messages at the same time, bring these means of communications within easy reach of all. I would urge the government to take whatever steps are necessary and possible to make these facilities more adequately available.

In this I would also include communications to lighthouses, which are notoriously isolated. Then, too, I believe there is a field to be exploited more fully in connection with radio location devices for ships, and even in the application of radar for meteorological uses, and other uses which are now reasonably well known because of the publicity recently given to the development of radar.

In conclusion, I believe it is fair to say that the constituency of Queens-Lunenburg has demonstrated during the war, as did the rest of Nova Scotia, that it can rise to an emergency. We, too, are anxious to hold what we have gained. We are looking forward, beyond this period of transition, commonly called a reconstruction or reconversion period, and to the fullest extent we will cooperate with this government in its efforts to improve our common lot.

Mr. W. G. CASE (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, until the amendment to the amendment was moved last night I had not intended taking part in the debate. Now that the opportunity is offered to me, however, I should like to join with those who have preceded me in the debate in paying my compliments to you, sir, upon your elevation to the highest office within the gift of the House of Commons. I feel that you have already given ample evidence of your willingness and ability to discharge the duties of your high office with dignity and dispatch, and to the satisfaction of all.

I have listened with much interest to hon. members who have spoken in the debate, and must say that I have been impressed. I

believe all hon. members after hearing these special references to the various constituencies, their advantages and their special features, will have a greater appreciation of this great Dominion of Canada.

I was interested, too, in the remarks of the hon. and gallant gentleman, the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg (Mr. Winters), who has just addressed the house. May I say to him that criticism is not in any sense of the word confined to His Majesty's Loyal Opposition. His observations indicate that there is reserved to members supporting the government the right to criticize the opposition —and I suppose that is as it should be. But as a loyal subject of this great British commonwealth I am always prepared to bow before and pay tribute to constituted authority.

I have never been a narrow partisan, and I am sure I will not be misunderstood if I say that under the present administration we are likely to enjoy reasonably good government —even though I might reserve the right to say that I believe we would have had better government had my own party succeeded in its appeal to the people of Canada. The fact remains that we shall have government, although we differ, largely in the matter of policy. Our basic approach to government varies but little from that of those who occupy the treasury benches.

This is not so with my C.C.F. friends. I do not want to appear to be too critical, because in the few years it has been my privilege to enjoy some degree of public activity I have learned to appreciate more and more those who have ideas. However, when one approaches the problem of a radical change in government I wonder sometimes if it is realized that of the twenty-eight members in this house, twenty-five of them do not enjoy the majority support of their constituents. They may believe that they have the system that will produce pie in the sky or utopia, but as yet they have failed to sell themselves in their various constituencies. I am not unmindful of the fact that there are other minority representatives; as a matter of fact we have no less than 149 minority representatives in the house. In the main, however, we are not advocating a radical change in the system of government.

It would appear that the C.C.F. would seek to have hon. members believe that they are friends of labour. I am not going to deny that, because why should they not be friends of labour? I would remind them that the labour unions are the greatest evidence of freedom, that they exist only in democratic countries. That is something we should consider carefully. Where other forms of government have been adopted, governments of a dictatorial or totalitarian character, labour unions have soon become submerged. Under those governments labour lost much that they had gained.

I would say that business is the heart of our social life, and profits are the vital incentive to enterprise. I have listened to my friends refer to the profit system. If it was all a profit system we would all soon become very wealthy. However, there is another side to the picture which is seldom mentioned by those who are ready to cry down big business and soak the rich. I refer to the loss possibility. When I view this great country of ours—and it has been my privilege to see quite a lot of it—I cannot help feeling that we owe something to those who have been willing to take a chance and willing to pioneer. I want to be a twentieth century citizen; I want to be able to recognize the need for social security, because I realize that freedom is an empty farce if our people do not enjoy some sense of economic security. Yet I wonder if in our determination to fix things so that everyone will enjoy the good things of life we may not rob the people of their individuality and finally become a nation of leaners rather than a nation of leaders. As those who have studied ancient history would tell you, the pattern of the past may be repeated in the future and we may cause a deterioration of our greatest asset. I have heard reference made to our streams where fish are in abundance, to our forests, to our mineral wealth and to our great agricultural fields, but the greatest asset that any nation can possess is that nation's people.

We must indeed be on guard. We learn more as we travel into the future, because the future only is ours. Some one has said, "I expect to spend the rest of my life living in the future." That is very true. We always expect a great deal, but we do not always attain that which we expect. It is only when the forces that seek to hold you back are actively at work that the best you have comes forward. There is a story told of a farmer who took a hog to market. When the hog was weighed he turned to the purchaser and said, "Well, it does not weigh as much as I thought it would, but I did not think it would." I suppose that is exactly our own position in life. We do not get exactly what we expect, but I doubt if any of us expect that we will get as much as we do expect.

As far as our Social Credit friends are concerned, I feel that I can speak kindly of them, because they provided an opponent for me in the immediate past general election. Our

people were thus able to hear something of the theories they are putting forward. As I said before, I like to think of myself as one who admires people with ideas. I do not know why they call themselves the Social Credit party, because there has never been much sociability in any credit that I have ever enjoyed. They say that if you want a short winter just give your banker a three months' note in the fall. You will then find out how much sociability there is to it.

With reference to their amendment, which I think has considerable merit, I wish to say to my hon. friends that I do not think Canada, of all countries in the world, is in a position to give leadership in monetary reform. We produce a tremendous volume of goods in this country, and we must find a market for them in the markets of the world.

Mr. KUHL: How about the home market?

Mr. CASE: The home market could never consume the amount of goods we produce, because we produce enough for 50,000,000 people. The productive capacity of this nation during the war absolutely staggers human imagination. If those with whom we seek to trade were to discover that we were using a monetary base which resulted in subsidizing our goods to the detriment of their standard of living, I am sure they would soon find means of applying dumping duties or an embargo to prevent us from finding our way to their market. The whole matter is greatly involved. I am glad that there are those who have the courage to come forward with these ideas. I like to think of myself as being a student of monetary reform—sometimes I think our system should be reformed—but I have yet to be convinced that Social Credit policies will fit in with our plan of world affairs.

I feel I would be remiss in my duty if I failed to pay tribute to those who have made it possible for us to enjoy the advantages of a free parliament. This, after all, is the greatest monument to freedom, to liberty and to civilization, that one has the right to be able to express oneself in a free parliament as the representative of people who have selected him by their ballots on election day. I happen to be a majority representative. There were many candidates running in opposition to the Progressive Conservative candidate in Grey North, and two of them failed to get their passports out; they lost their deposits.

I am not unmindful, Mr. Speaker, of the tremendous sacrifices that have been made by our service personnel for you and for me. It is difficult indeed to assess their great contribution; but we can, I believe, prove ourselves worthy of that contribution, by seeking to bring about the Canada they felt they were fighting for, a country of golden opportunity, a country that will be a challenge to every red-blooded Canadian. I only hope that we shall capture something of the spirit of the pioneers and seek to roll back our far-flung frontiers and tap the treasure chest which remains hidden in the bowels of the earth in our great hinterland. Here we are, a population of a little over eleven millions, blessed with a great country, the prize indeed of the civilized world. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this country is worthy of us and of our best traditions, and I simply ask myself: Am I worthy of Canada?

There are some things that can be done for our service personnel. I believe—and I have mentioned this before in the house—that the reestablishment credit should be made available to a soldier's widow. Had he survived he would have received the reestablishment credit. Having lost her husband, the sacrifice of the widow is all the greater, and she needs this reestablishment credit. Many of our lads who have fallen were married shortly before going overseas. Others have left several little children who need a mother's care, and they need to live in better surroundings than they have at the present time. Therefore I would urge the government to give consideration to making the reestablishment credit available to the soldier's widow.

Another matter which might well engage the attention of the government is the granting of loans to soliders to help establish them in some small business. I know that a grant is made to help the soldier acquire farm land, and that is good in itself, but all soldiers are not going to be farmers. At the present time many soldiers are using up their gratuities to acquire a small business, and the government might well give consideration to the making of loans to help the soldier play some part in rehabilitating himself in some small business enterprise.

There is another matter which has come to my attention more recently. Transportation should be granted by the government to soldiers who desire to reestablish themselves in some particular part of Canada. I am sure that the soldiers would appreciate this. They have rubbed shoulders with their fellows from various parts of Canada, and many may wish to reestablish themselves at some place other than the point of their enlistment. Every effort should be made to provide them and their families with transportation to the point where they feel they can best reestablish themselves.

We have heard from speakers on the government side of the house and many others, and in the main the suggestions offered have been constructive. But in two instances that I have in mind, members apologized for sitting on the government side of the house. I do not know exactly why they did this, but it is perfectly all right with me. One of the most courageous statements made in this debate was made by the hon. member for St. Boniface (Mr. Viau), and I offer it as an answer to those who suggest that this party would interfere with unity in Canada. Nothing could be further from the truth, because we are all loyal Canadians desiring to bring about unity within this country.

The hon. member for St. Boniface said, as reported at page 99 of *Hansard* of September 11:

> If the government will implement this programme and assure the house that one or two years of military training will be given, we shall have better citizens, and we shall not witness those incidents which took place in the House of Commons when some members from Quebec, those ultra-nationalists, were ready to betray their country when it was at war and the enemy almost at its shores, and insisted that we take no part whatsoever in a war which was then in progress. That attitude in the House of Commons will remain a blot on the history of our country. As a Canadian of French descent, who has lived in western Canada, I say that attitude was sorely felt and will never be forgotten.

I have never pleaded that I have been misquoted in anything I have said during an election, but I know that sometimes my words have been improperly transposed. No member of this house has a higher regard than I have for our brother Canadians in the province of Quebec, and I have never criticized them at all. All that I have criticized has been the leadership to which they were subjected, and not the French Canadians themselves. I think there is a challenge to this house and every loyal Canadian to seek to bring about that sense of national unity which we all profess to admire. No doubt an opportunity will present itself before very long to do something for national unity when we come to consider some major items having to do with our national life.

I said earlier that I had not intended to take part in this debate, and I believe I should not detain the members at great length. But I must say this. Outside this chamber, outside this building, there is in Canada a vast army of business men, industrialists, farmers, soldiers seeking to be rehabilitated, labour men, all of whom want to know what this government's taxation demands are going to be. They will find that out only when the budget is presented to this house. I hope that the budget will have some regard for our position at the present moment. I believe that the country will become very critical, and in a sense properly so, if the bringing down of the budget is unnecessarily delayed. Further, the government will soon be seeking to sell a post-war victory loan of immense proportions, and they will be appealing to all classes of our people, to business men, industrialists, farmers, our service personnel and labour to subscribe to the loan.

We shall do well to consider the matter of taxation. Ability to reduce our taxes will place us in a more competitive position to take advantage of market conditions in the post-war period. In my humble opinion our problem has never been one of overproduction, it has been one of distribution. Statisticians to-day, by means of modern facilities of communication and transportation, can make an accurate estimate of world production and world consumption; and we know now that in the dark thirties—when our granaries were bulging with wheat and we were slaughtering our cattle and wasting them on the prairies—in distant China, which is now one of our gallant allies, they were living on locusts, and in India they were starving; so that statisticians will tell us now that a falling off in world production of ten per cent means that millions of people will be in distress, and that with a falling off of twenty per cent, millions will starve. Therefore, with the tremendous productive capacity this nation enjoys, a tax structure which will encourage private enterprise to give of its best, with some feeling of confidence in its planning, will do more to see us through this reconversion period than anything else I can think of.

I also recommend that controls be removed as rapidly as possible to give the individual a chance. At the present time wartime housing have practically a monopoly on building material. In my home city, Owen Sound, they are going to erect fifty of their houses, and every one will be built on posts. The building by-laws in our city would not permit a private builder to build a house unless it was put on a concrete or stone foundation, but this is the concession we have had to make to wartime housing in order to have them go there and provide shelters which I am told will cost around $3,900 per house. Whether those figures are accurate or not I do not know, but I know that private enterprise in the building trades of this country could give wartime housing spades and aces if they had the leadership and an opportunity to do so, and we would have a better class of construction.

So that I say that we have an opportunity now to prove our real worth. We are here charged with a definite responsibility. I wonder how many of us realize how critical this hour is in Canada's history. If we allow our people to become uneasy, to lose their confidence, wondering whether they are to be unemployed and what the country has in store for them, the responsibility will be largely ours. We must so apply ourselves as to give the necessary leadership and encourage all our citizens to play their full part. After all, the history of Canada for the years which are before us will be largely written in this chamber. I realize that a country's history is largely a story of sacrifice, particularly on the field of battle in war time, but now the responsibility is in our hands. The history of the world is nothing more or less than the history of the world's peoples, those who have played their part in the onward march of civilization.

Reflect for a moment on the contribution which this young country has been privileged to make, and the wealth of leadership that has been provided by this greatest of all empires, the British empire. It is time we were a little more "chesty", a little more proud of the great position we occupy in world affairs; and when someone would dare to suggest a lessening of the ties which bind us to the motherland, I say, and I want it to be clearly understood, that if we ever lose our British connection we shall lose the greatest bargaining power we ever had. With the British empire everything is possible of attainment. It gives us strength; it gives us moral courage. I am proud to say that where the great old union jack flies, there you will find freedom. That is something which we possibly value lightly; yet it is the most precious possession we have.

During the war days we had in the city of Owen Sound a Polish legion. Those who know the history of Poland know that for 120 years prior to 1917 they were a subjugated race. As a matter of fact the flag which flew over the Polish camp at Niagara-on-the-Lake in 1917 was the first Polish flag to fly from the masthead in over 120 years. Following the great war they hastened to obtain their freedom; and it is to the credit of the Polish people that the Fuehrer, Herr Hitler, was never able to set up a puppet government in Poland.

Mr. REID: It was the influx of Scots which helped.

Mr. CASE: The Poles were prepared to die to the last man rather than part with their freedom. One thing I always appreciate about the Scottish people is their faculty of making themselves heard and understood. I believe I can say that with the kindliest feeling toward my good friend, because of the little bit of Scotch that is in me, and of which I am very proud.

I was saying that freedom is something you must cherish and guard; if you ever lose it you may never recover it. Many great sacrifices have been made for it in the years which have passed. Do we, I wonder, fully appreciate all that it means to us.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment moved by my honoured leader is indeed fair and has a claim to the support of all those who are not already pledged to support the party in power. Let me reread it so that you will know we have tried to make constructive suggestions while criticizing the government's neglect to give effect to matters contained in the amendment:

> We respectfully submit to Your Excellency that Your Excellency's advisers have:
>
> (a) failed to demobilize our armed forces on a fair basis and, in particular, have failed to prevent serious disadvantage to overseas service personnel;—

I have ample evidence to support this, and I would be absolutely remiss in my duty and unfair to those who depend on me if I did not support that clause of the amendment.

> (b) failed to provide a speedy and effective plan of reconversion from war to peace, and failed in particular to join in partnership with labour and industry in devising a workable scheme to provide jobs, with fair wages, for discharged service personnel and war workers;—

There is concrete evidence that the government has not taken labour and industry into its confidence in planning for reconversion.

Paragraph (c) of the amendment is as follows:

> (c) failed to take adequate and timely action to meet the ever-mounting housing crisis.

I think I have substantiated that in my reference to wartime housing in my own community; therefore, Mr. Speaker, I propose to support the amendment, and I leave it to the good judgment of my hon. friends to my left to rally to our cause in this instance.

Mr. MAX CAMPBELL (The Battlefords) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate you for having been selected to preside over the debates of this house. Your high qualities and your parliamentary experience give us the assurance that you will discharge your important duties with dignity and impartiality.

I also wish to congratulate the hon. members who respectively moved and seconded the address in reply to the speech from the throne.

(Text)

I am not trying to impress the house with my limited knowledge of French, but there is one thing that I have been trying to do for many years, namely, to bring about national unity. I was born in the city of Montreal a great many years ago, too long a time to think about. I left there as a boy and have spent the last forty-one years in western Canada as a grain grower. I had a great many French-speaking friends while I was in eastern Canada as a boy, and I have also made a great number of French-speaking friends in the west. I have tried to say a few sentences at the beginning of my speech in the French language.

I thought possibly that I might find time to study the French language after I came here. As a boy I did have a smattering of French; but since I came here I found that if I start learning the French language I may possibly have to learn some other language. We had a demonstration of a peculiar sort of language last night, and I thought that if we could just have a Swede from Saskatchewan make a speech here now it would make me feel more at home in this house.

At my nominating convention and during the election campaign I emphasized this point of national unity. I said during that campaign, and I have said it for a long time, that one of the things that Canada needed before we could have national unity was Canadian citizenship. I am pleased to see that at last the government realizes that, and I hope that we are going to have our own Canadian citizenship in the very near future.

One other great need in the bringing about of unity in Canada is an economic policy that will give all of the people of Canada a square deal. I like to call myself a socialist. I may say that I did not arrive at the decision to believe in the socialist philosophy overnight, and I did not do so because I listened to soapbox orators. I possibly had pretty much the same sort of environment in my early days as most hon. members. I was brought up in a good home where we had modern conveniences and modern comforts. Then I went to a new country, a country where settlers from practically all over the world went to build up a home for themselves. I went through the struggles with those people; I have studied some of the reasons why those people had to suffer so many hardships and get so little for the things that they produced, and I came to the decision, after I studied the different monetary reforms that have come on up during the last years, that what we needed was a different sort of economic system, an economic system that would put human values first. In this country we have a system that puts the dollar first; we have a dollar economy. I say, and we in the C.C.F. say, that that must be changed.

I am pleased with the fact that we have a large number of new and young members in the house. I think youth is the great hope that this country has. In the future I believe we have to look largely to our young people because they are the ones who will have to solve the problems that our older people were not able to solve.

I was interested in hearing the last speaker say that we must have foreign markets. We in the C.C.F. realize that we must have foreign markets, we realize that we produce great quantities of natural products that we cannot possibly consume in this country; but practically all of the politicians of the old parties have emphasized for the last fifteen or twenty years the necessity of foreign markets, and they have absolutely overlooked the tremendous potential market we have right here in Canada.

We went through a good many years of trying times in Canada, especially in the district from which I come. During all these years, from 1930 until the war started, we had all the things that the Canadian people needed to have a very high standard of living; we had natural products, natural resources, all kinds of man-power, machinery and practically everything that we needed to give the people of this country a high standard of living. I ask hon. gentlemen who have been in this House of Commons in the last twenty years why have the Canadian people not had these things?

An hon. MEMBER: Lack of purchasing power.

Mr. CAMPBELL: It was mentioned here last night that the people of the old parties gave the C.C.F. the opportunity to ask "Why were these things not done?" Of course we are asking that question. We realize that the whole motive for keeping our machinery going in the past and to-day is the profit motive. We contend that we must get away from the profit motive to where people's whole ideas are not based on the making of profit.

An hon. MEMBER: What about the farmers?

Mr. CAMPBELL: Farmers never did make a profit. I am going to say something about profits. There are different kinds of profits. There is one kind of profit where the business man has a mark-up on the cost of the goods

that he is handling or selling, or the mark-up on the cost of the goods the manufacturer or industrialist produces. If that mark-up is not out of line, I have no quarrel with it; but the kind of profit against which I protest, the kind of profit that has kept this country down, is what a great many people call unearned income. I want to see that sort of profit wiped out. I want to see exploitation halted; but after having given years of study to this old, so-called private enterprise system, I am quite certain that will not be done. When someone gets something for nothing—and that is what some people have been getting in this country—it means that someone is going to get nothing for something.

In common with other hon. members I feel a great responsibility because I represent here some of the people of Canada, those in my constituency. I feel honoured because I was chosen to represent them here; I also feel that these people did not support me so much for myself but sent me here to support the programme of the C.C.F., and while I am here I intend to try to represent them in the way they would like.

I was going to say something about my constituency, but I think I will omit that, because I do not want to take too much time in this debate. We have tremendous problems to face, and I do not expect they will be solved. The problems are there, however, and we should not spend too much time in talking about our constituencies. We have the two problems of rehabilitation and reconversion, which include finding jobs for about two million people. From what I have heard I believe pretty much the same condition existed all over Canada during the 1930's that existed in the part of the country from which I come. I know a large percentage of the boys in our district enlisted when war broke out and have been in the various branches of the armed forces ever since. Some of those boys are coming back now; some will not come back. I contend that it is up to this parliament to find the very best methods of seeing that these boys get a square deal when they do return.

I wish to give one or two illustrations. The first is the case of a young man who worked for me for about seven years. He was a good man, willing and with a liking for his work, a chap I was very happy to have around because my work was well done. Then my boys got big enough to help me on the farm, the depression came along and I was not able to keep this hired man any longer. This young man did what probably a great many other young men did during that period; he spent three months travelling from one end of Canada to the other, trying to get a job. After the three months he walked into my yard, and he was a pretty sorry looking specimen. He had always been neat and clean, but now he was dirty and his clothes were worn out. I asked him how he had made out, if he had found any work. He said, no; he had travelled all over Canada and it was the same thing everywhere he went. In fact he said, "In one town, I had run out of money and when I came to the outskirts of the place I had a loaf of bread and a little tea, so I started a fire and made myself a cup of tea. I was just going to eat my lunch when a policeman came along and said, 'What the hell are you doing here?'" That policeman came down, kicked over this boy's pot of tea, grabbed him by the back of the neck and put him in gaol. It seems to me that if we cannot use our boys any better than this something is wrong. A great many of these boys enlisted; they have done their duty to their country, and now they are coming back.

Let me give just one more illustration. Last winter and this summer I travelled a good deal on the trains. I make it a point to meet as many of the returned boys as possible, and try to get their stories from them. On this particular day I met one of the finest looking young men I have ever seen; in fact as I look around this chamber I do not see anyone who would compare with him. He would weigh about 220 pounds and was very handsome. I had a long talk with this boy. He told me he had been piloting Lancaster bombers for three and a half years. Then he said, "Now they are through with me. I am worn out, and have been discharged. I do not know what I have to face, because I do not know how to do anything but fly bombers. That is the only job I ever had. I never had a job in my life until I got in the air force. Worse than that, I married while in the old country, and as soon as I can find a place for my wife I want to bring her over here." I believe practically all the people of Canada wish to help these boys get jobs. I am also quite sure that most of those who employ labour are going to make earnest efforts to give jobs to those who left their employ to go to war. But many of these boys did not have jobs or training, and they will have a hard time. Some of them have been receiving pretty fair pay in the services. Some of them have bought homes; they have other commitments they will have to meet, and they do not know what is ahead. As far as these boys are concerned I can see very little hope for them in the future under the present economy.

I should like to say something about what was more or less a bombshell which was thrown into this house yesterday, when the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) told us that the floor price of wheat was to be set at not less than $1 a bushel. For twenty-five years the farmers of the west have been trying to get an agricultural policy. Now we have a policy of a kind, but I can say that a floor price of $1 a bushel for wheat is not satisfactory to the western wheat growers. I am not going to rehash all the arguments which were presented so well yesterday by one of our members, but I wish to say that I do not believe the farmers of this country should be called upon to make a sacrifice in this connection. I believe that in every possible way we should help the nations needing this wheat; but if any sacrifice must be made, then all the people of Canada should be asked to make it. In the past the farmers have been sacrificed all the way through to build up an industrial Canada. We who live in the west know that only too well, because we have had to pay hundreds of millions of dollars in higher costs for all the things we have had to buy. This has been the result of tariff protection given to industries in eastern Canada.

Not only that, but if we are to make loans to these countries to buy the wheat, the sacrifice should not be made only by the grain growers of western Canada. The government would have been well advised had it placed a floor price on wheat of at least $1.25 per bushel.

Mr. GARDINER: Under the legislation up to date, $1.25 is the only floor price that has been placed.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I should like now to say a few words about taxes. Certainly I am in favour of a reduction in taxation, and I am prepared to make a suggestion as to where we can get money to make it possible to reduce taxes. I find that in the report of the Bank of Canada, dated February 10, 1945, the net profit from our operations in the central bank for the year 1944, after providing for contingencies and reserves, amounted to $20,312,659.68. There is one instance where the government through the operations of the central bank made a profit of that much money.

Then, again, in the report of the Canadian National Railways security trust for the year ended December 31, 1944, the surplus earnings of the system are set out at page five as $23,026,924.35 less the abandonment of dock facilities at Seattle valued at $626,871. I do not think that figure should be taken into consideration.

[Mr. Campbell.]

Something was said a few days ago about the machinery of production. I believe people throughout the world realize to-day that the machine has displaced man-power. Millions of men have been replaced by machines, and this means that we are faced with the necessity of changing some of our ideas. I contend that the machinery of production should be owned by the people of Canada, for their benefit. Whoever controls that machinery also controls the economic life of the people. I contend that if the machine is to be started only when someone can make a profit, there will be many times in the coming years when it will be idle.

There is no reason why we cannot produce enormous amounts of wealth in Canada under a planned economy. If the people throughout the country do not plan the economy for this high production, it will not be attained. I understand that in 1932 Canada produced only a little over three billion dollars worth of wealth. But when during the war years we had a plan to win the war, to build ships, to build jeeps, tanks, trucks and the like, we went to work with a plan to win, with the result that our production jumped up to around nine billions of dollars.

To-day we hear a great deal about full employment and a high standard of living for our people If they are to have that standard of living we must produce great wealth. If it was possible for us to produce wealth to the value of nine billions of dollars in 1944, when 750,000 of our boys and girls were in the armed services, and when a large percentage of our people were engaged in war factories—and of course they were producing part of that wealth—I do not see why we should not set our sights for at least nine billions for the next year, and increase our production during coming years to the point where we can supply the needs of all our people. If we plan our economy with that in view we must see to it that those who produce the wealth will receive enough purchasing power to buy it back.

That cannot be done under a profit system, because under that system one group of people get too much purchasing power, and this means that there will be a large group who will not have sufficient purchasing power. If we are to have a condition where wages are knocked down—and it looks as if that is taking place to-day—and if we are to look to foreign markets to get rid of surpluses, I am afraid that Canada is in for a lot of trouble. Not only will this country be looking for foreign markets, but every country in the world producing surpluses will be looking for them. Those countries which to-day are

not producing surpluses will no doubt produce them in the near future. Under those circumstances what are we to do?

An hon. MEMBER: War.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Of course. The tremendous competition for world markets in the last forty years has to a great extent resulted in the last two wars. More than anything else, those wars have been wars to get markets. I do not see why we cannot get down to a policy of production for use. All people cannot make a profit. If that were possible I would favour the profit system. But, as I said before, if someone makes a profit, someone else must make a loss; that is an absolute fact. I believe that more than anything else the people of Canada are concerned first with security and, second, with a high standard of living. Can we give those two essentials to them under a private enterprise system?

An hon. MEMBER: Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL: If we can, why have we not done so?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: We have.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Few people in Canada have a high standard of living.

During this debate mention has been made of the grain exchange. Let me say that one can go to the city of Winnipeg and, if he will go to a certain district, where the members of the grain exchange live, he will find the finest houses in Canada. They have done well through the grain exchange, and have attained a very high standard of living. One can go to the city of Toronto and find in that city thousands of beautiful homes. They, too, have a high standard of living. One can go into other places where there are good homes and where people have high standards of living. But one can also go into sections of this city, or go on to many farms throughout the country and find people living in abject poverty, and they will have to continue to live under those conditions as long as we have the so-called private enterprise system.

I like enterprise and I like initiative. I like private enterprise as long as it is private enterprise, but the people of Canada will not be fooled much longer by being told that we have private enterprise. We have not private enterprise except in a few cases. There is one thing I have been watching for in this house but as yet I have not seen it. Before very long, possibly during this debate, I hope to hear something said about the abuses of capitalism and the abuses of the free enterprise system. No one in this house, outside this group and the little group to my left—I do not agree with them but they have ideas—has any idea as to what is to be done about the abuses of capitalism or the abuses of the private enterprise system. No one has any idea as to how private enterprise is to be made to work. I hope that before this debate is over or before I have finished serving my constituents in this parliament somebody will rise in his place and tell me and this group just how this can be done.

Are we to continue under this so-called private enterprise system? I call it "so-called" because it is not a private enterprise system. Our industries in Canada have largely reached the point where they are controlled by a small group of people. We have not private enterprise in Canada; what we have is monopoly enterprise. This small group of people who are directors in banks, insurance companies and industries of all kinds control the whole economic life of this country. When people think parliament is running this country they are just fooling themselves. I have no illusions as to that.

We in the C.C.F. talk about a planned economy. We say that we must plan our economy to produce such wealth as it is possible to produce and distribute that wealth to the people in the form of wages and costs of all kinds. We have had a planned economy in this country; the small group I have mentioned have planned our economy for their own benefit and the people of the country have suffered as a result. If we allow this small group of people to control this country we are condemning our youth as well as the present generation to the same kind of conditions that existed during the thirties.

I am going to vote against the subamendment and I am going to vote against the amendment. Why? Each of these amendments simply says that the government have failed here or failed there or somewhere else. Perhaps they have. I feel quite sure that they will fail, and they will fail because they will not do the things that must be done to make a success of the things that they want to do.

I wish to say something now in their favour. We have heard a good deal of criticism in connection with bringing home the boys from overseas. I do not claim to know enough about how to get these boys back and give them a fair deal to say whether the government have failed or not. I do not want to brag about my boys, but three of them are in the active forces—two in the air force and one in the army—and one came home from

overseas a few days ago. He told me that the treatment he got all the way back was wonderful and I want to thank the government for what they have done. I think they are entitled to that. The boys coming back are well satisfied with the treatment they are getting. They have been treated like kings on board the vessels and the trains have been met all along the way by the different service clubs. These boys were given a royal welcome. That may have nothing to do with the government, but the government had to see that there were ships and that the boys were looked after on the ships and I wish to give them credit for that.

On motion of Mr. Beaudry the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie the house adjourned at 5.40 p.m.

Monday, September 24, 1945.

The house met at three o'clock.

PROVINCIAL LEGISLATION

INQUIRY AS TO DISALLOWANCE OF CERTAIN ACTS OF SASKATCHEWAN LEGISLATURE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to ask the Minister of Justice if the government has under consideration the disallowance of any acts of the Saskatchewan legislature. If so, what acts are being so considered, upon whose petition, and what procedure is proposed to give to the Saskatchewan government and other interested parties an opportunity to make representations?

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Minister of Justice): I received notice of this question from the leader of the opposition just a few moments ago, and I can give him from memory the information desired. I may not have the exact titles of the acts, but I think I have them sufficiently so to identify them.

The government has under consideration petitions which pray for the disallowance of certain acts of the legislature of Saskatchewan. These are the farm security act; the mineral taxation act of 1944 and an amending act of 1945, and an act to amend the local government board (special powers) act.

The Dominion Loan and Mortgage Association petitioned for the disallowance of the farm security act and the act to amend the local government board (special powers) act, and in sending in its petition asked for an opportunity to add some oral representations, which I assume to be along the lines of the material set out in the petition. They were told that on October 11 I should be glad to hear such oral representations as they might wish to submit.

The Canadian Pacific Railway Company filed a petition asking for the disallowance of the mineral taxation act of 1944 and the amending act of 1945, and also asked for leave to make oral representations in support of the petition. October 15 has been fixed as the date on which they will be permitted to make such representations. The petitioners were immediately asked by the deputy minister of justice to supply the attorney general of Saskatchewan with a copy of their respective petitions, because there would have been delay had we taken time to copy them here and forward them, and we have been informed that they have supplied the attorney general with these copies. In addition he was at once advised of the dates we had indicated to the petitioners on which their oral representations might be heard. The Hudson's Bay Company have sent in a petition, which was received this morning, also dealing with the mineral taxation act of 1944, and they are also being asked to send a copy to the attorney general of Saskatchewan. They have not asked to be heard orally in support of their petition.

Mr. COLDWELL: If I may ask a supplementary question, when was the attorney general of Saskatchewan notified that these petitions had been received? The time between now and October 11 and 15 is very short for a government to prepare a brief in reply to something which probably has been carefully prepared by clever and competent lawyers.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I would not like to give exact dates, but notice was given as soon as we were notified.

Mr. COLDWELL: When was that?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: The first petition came in more than a week ago.

Mr. COLDWELL: The time is very short for the provincial government to prepare a statement in rebuttal.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Perhaps it is, but I understand that we have only the period from now until November 10 within which to decide whether to allow the provincial legislation to take its course or to recommend the disallowance thereof.

Mr. COLDWELL: The petitioners themselves allowed very little time for consideration by this government or the government of Saskatchewan.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: The legislation was already under consideration by the law officers of the department, after it had been officially received from the government of Saskatchewan; and I assume it is the privilege of a citizen to file a petition at any time. We had not waited for the reception of the petitions to give consideration to the legislation of Saskatchewan generally.

Mr. COLDWELL: That was done on the initiative of the department itself?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: It is always done. We always receive provincial legislation for examination and there are law officers of the department whose function it is to examine that legislation, and to prepare memoranda for the minister to submit to council.

CANADIAN ARMY

DISMISSAL OF EDITOR OF "MAPLE LEAF"—POLICY IN REPATRIATION OF N.R.M.A. SERVICE PERSONNEL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. C. GREEN (Vancouver South): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of National Defence. Will the minister make a statement on the dismissal of the editor of the Canadian overseas army paper *Maple Leaf* for criticizing the repatriation policy, as reported in to-day's press; and will he also state the policy of the government on repatriation of N.R.M.A. soldiers?

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of National Defence): My hon. friend was good enough to inform me of his intention to ask this question, and I am very happy to answer it.

May I preface what I have to say by stating that the action which General Simonds took in removing the editor of the *Maple Leaf*, and the statement which he issued giving reasons for that action, were entirely on his own initiative, and without any instruction or request from Ottawa to do so, but that both action and statement have my entire approval.

Perhaps it would be useful if I gave the house first a statement of what the policy of *Maple Leaf* is with respect to matters of this kind. When the various editions of the *Maple Leaf* were first established, Colonel R. S. Malone, assistant director of public relations, (army) discussed what the policy of the paper should be with the various interested parties, including General Crerar, commanding officer overseas, and the then Minister of National Defence.

As a result a signal was sent overseas which is referred to in one of the signals from General Simonds, which I shall read later, and which summarizes that policy. I shall give the house an extract from that signal, as follows:

1. No editorial directives, regulations or policies for the *Maple Leaf* have at any time been issued by either military authorities or from Canadian government sources. Decisions on editorial matters rest entirely with the *Maple Leaf* staff. On the founding of the various editions of the *Maple Leaf*, however, the A.D.P.R. Lt.-Col. Malone in each instance set forth a basic policy to be followed as long as the *Maple Leaf* functioned. This policy involves two principles only and was accordingly registered with Field Marshal Montgomery, General Crerar and the defence department in Canada. They in their turn agreed to a policy of non-interference. This policy which must be maintained at all times is as follows:

(a) There will be no holding back of actual news at any time either domestic, military or foreign events. All factual stories considered of interest to the troops will be published with a prominence according to reader interest. No such stories will be deliberately overplayed if such treatment could result in loss of morale or friction within the army or political controversy, i.e., troops within the army are entitled to their own political views whether Liberal, Labour, Conservative or C.C.F., etc. As there is only one newspaper available to the troops, there can be no special emphasis given to news of one particular political body, racial group or provincial division.

(b) Editorial comment and opinion appearing in the editorial column proper of necessity represents the official view of the *Maple Leaf*. The basic purpose of the *Maple Leaf* is for assisting troop morale and at the same time keeping our forces up to date with the news as well as providing some interest and entertainment.

2. For the above reasons the following subjects will not be dealt with editorially:

(a) Any comment or opinion on domestic, political issues in Canada which would cause friction within the army and between the troops overseas and people at home thus injuring army morale.

(b) Any internal military question which would tend to cause antagonism and set one group, formation or service within the army against another. This applies equally as regards other national interests within the Canadian army, i.e., subjects which would cause friction between Canucks, Limies, Poles, Yanks, etc. Rather the governing principle should be that the *Maple Leaf* should be a strong medium for binding our army together and maintaining a team spirit throughout. The strength of the *Maple Leaf* lies entirely in that direction.

Then follows another paragraph relating to letters to the editor, etc., which I need not take up the time of the house in reading.

When I saw the press report of the first editorial which appeared on the 19th, while it caused me some concern, because it did not disclose anything new, and expressed an opinion which seemed to me would cause some disturbance among the troops overseas awaiting repatriation, I did not feel that it called for action on my part.

The next day I saw a report of a second editorial in which reference was made to the matter of the repatriation policy, indicating that that policy was determined in Canada, and leaving the inference that it had been changed before and that it could be changed now. To me that editorial had definite political significance. I then asked the chief of general staff to obtain for me a report as to the publication of the two editorials.

My wishes in this respect had been anticipated, and a signal was sent to General Murchie, chief of general staff at headquarters overseas, asking for a report on the publication of these two editorials. On Friday, September 21, General Murchie cabled to General Foulkes, chief of staff in Ottawa; and I think I will read to the house the text of that cable. This is what General Murchie said:

Ref. DPR. 1762 Amsterdam edition of *Maple Leaf* followed up repat story and editorial of 19th September by a further editorial on 20th September entitled "To Continue" which further criticized the present system of repat. Both editorials written by Major J. D. MacFarlane, managing editor.

Have now received following from Simonds. Begins. Reference *Maple Leaf* editorials September 19 "On this repat question *Maple Leaf* reveals"—

That is the title of the first editorial.

—and 20th September, "To continue"—

The title of the second editorial.

—I pointed out to the editor, Major J. D. MacFarlane, that these contravened the policy of the *Maple Leaf* in particular reference COS. 660 of 101630B July 1945 para 2(B)—

That is the signal from which I read an extract a moment ago.

—and CGS. 365 of 181740 July 1945 para 2 and para 3 last sentence. I requested Major MacFarlane to publish editorially the other side of the controversial question raised in the editorials referred to above namely that in view of common obligations of service after reaching this theatre and DND policy as regards repatriation there was no differentiation between NRMA and volunteer soldiers of equal point scores. I further said to him that raising this issue was creating a schism between groups within the army detrimental to morale and to no useful purpose and that to present a one-sided case was bound to do much harm. He refused to accede to publication of the editorial which Col. Gilchrist and I considered necessary to give a just presentation of the case and in principle was not willing to accept as policy that a balanced view as opposed to his own personal view must be expressed in editorial columns of the *Maple Leaf*. I have therefore ordered the removal of Major MacFarlane from the editorship and am going to arrange repatriation as early as possible to which his point score entitles him. I regret that this action should be necessary but in view of his refusal to accept the basic policy as laid down for the *Maple Leaf* I consider no other course was possible. I am issuing a statement for publication in the *Maple Leaf* explaining the action I have taken the reasons for it and presenting the side of the case which I consider was not properly presented in the subject matter discussed in the *Maple Leaf* editorials. A copy of this I will forward as soon as complete. Col. Gilchrist was present throughout interviews with MacFarlane and agrees as to issues under discussion and action taken.

Then General Murchie added:

I consider that Simonds took the only action possible under the circumstances and I will forward the statement to which he refers as soon as received.

Information requested para 1 DPR. 1762 being obtained and will forward earliest.

That signal was given to me on Friday. On Saturday afternoon I received a copy of the signal containing a copy of the statement which General Simonds had caused to be published in the *Maple Leaf*, and which he had given to the Canadian press. That has already appeared in the newspapers.

I think for the purpose of the record I should like to have it on *Hansard;* but since it has already appeared in the press perhaps the house will consent to its being taken as read, and placed on *Hansard*.

Mr. GREEN: If that is to be done, I think it would be fair to place the editorials on *Hansard* also.

Mr. ABBOTT: I should be glad to do that, but they have not been cabled to me as yet. The *Maple Leaf* is not published here. I shall be glad to see that those are placed on *Hansard* as soon as we can get them. I shall ask that they be cabled at once. I have seen only the extracts which appeared in the Canadian papers.

Mr. GREEN: I suggest that they all be placed on *Hansard* together, General Simonds' statement and the editorials.

Mr. ABBOTT: All I am talking about now is General Simonds' statement and the statements which appeared in the *Maple Leaf* which have been referred to in this morning's papers. I want it on the record here. I am trying to give a full explanation of this matter. I thought it would save time, but

I am prepared to read it. This is the message which came on Saturday to General Foulkes from General Murchie:

Reference my GS. 2091 following is text of statement issued by Simonds to the *Maple Leaf* with copy to Canadian Press under heading "Statement by Lieutenant-General G. G. Simonds commanding Canadian forces in the Netherlands". Statement begins.

On September 21, 1945, I reluctantly ordered the removal of the editor of the *Maple Leaf*, Major J. D. Macfarlane, M.B.E. I give you below my reasons for so doing.

Freedom of the press is a vital principle which we are all concerned to uphold. But the position of the *Maple Leaf* differs from the ordinary newspaper in that it holds a monopoly. It is the only daily newspaper regularly presenting its views and news to the whole Canadian army overseas. Ordinarily in our country or community there are a number of newspapers presenting news and providing editorial comment on current problems. In this way important and controversial subjects are presented and discussed from many angles—if one paper or group of papers emphasizes one aspect and advocates certain action others will independently present other and contrary angles. A balance of views is available and each individual is enabled to form his own opinions based upon all the information and arguments available through the whole press.

Because of the monopoly position of the *Maple Leaf*—because it is the only newspaper regularly serving the whole Canadian army—it is inherent in its charter that its editorial columns must present all points of view and a balanced statement of the subjects with which it deals. Particularly is this important when it deals with the subjects in which all soldiers are acutely interested. It is quite wrong for the editor of the *Maple Leaf* to give a biased view or what is his own personal view in disregard of the views of others on internal military questions which would tend to cause antagonism and set one group formation of service within the army against another.

So long as the editor of the *Maple Leaf* adhered to his charter and presented unbiased and impartial argument in his editorial comment he was free and would always be free from any interference by myself or any other commander. But on September 19, 1945, there appeared an editorial entitled "On this repat question the *Maple Leaf* reveals" and on September 20, 1945, a further editorial entitled "To continue" both of which in my opinion made biased and most unfair comment upon an issue affecting every soldier awaiting repatriation. I met the editor and told him that though I had no quarrel with his statement of facts and no desire to suppress or hide them I thought his comment biased and unjust and far from doing any good could only cause unhappiness and dissension in the ranks of the army. I gave him what I considered "The other side of the picture", which I give in full below, and told him he was under an obligation to present those aspects as well as his own personal views in an editorial in the *Maple Leaf*. This he refused to do and he further stated that he refused to adhere to the principle that a balanced expression of opinion as opposed to his own personal opinion should govern the editorial policy of the *Maple Leaf*. Under these conditions I considered I had no alternative but to order his removal as editor.

It is with deep regret that I have had to take this step. I do not believe that anyone has a greater appreciation of all Major Macfarlane has done than I have myself but in a newspaper holding a practical monopoly I cannot concede the principle that the editor may use it as a medium of expression of his own views regardless of the views of others. I have no personal antagonism towards Major Macfarlane—on the contrary I offer him my personal gratitude and thanks for all he has done since the inception of the *Maple Leaf*. I would be the very last to suggest that the fact he holds strong personal views is any detriment to his personality or character. His point score entitles him to repatriation now and in arranging this I wish him good luck in his future undertakings.

"The other side of the picture."

I have said that I considered the editorials in the *Maple Leaf* of September 19 and 20 presented a biased point of view and were unjust. I am not challenging the facts as presented and have no desire to suppress them.

I consider the editorial of the nineteenth unfortunate, first of all because the very title of it and the whole tone implies that the *Maple Leaf* has unearthed something that the authorities are trying to conceal.

Every soldier in the Canadian army overseas ought to have known long ago that the plan approved by the Department of National Defence for repatriation of the Canadian army, the plan for the execution of which I have been made responsible, envisages units returning as such with personnel of point scores between 150 and 50. This was stated in the official publication "After victory in Europe" issued last May. It was repeated in General Crerar's circular letter of July 10, and I have personally so informed officers, N.C.O's and men when speaking to them on this problem. The fact that a concession has been made to high point scores by inserting further Canada drafts between the moves of successive divisions has not changed the policy that units when they move as such will take with them all personnel on their strength with point scores of between 150 and 50. There can be no "revelation" in that it has been known and published in the *Maple Leaf* and discussed for months.

The real issue by the *Maple Leaf* and the real reason why I condemn the editorials of September 19 and 20, is that they advocate that N.R.M.A. soldiers should be treated differently from volunteer soldiers for purposes of repatriation. It may be unfortunate that the individual cases referred to in the *Maple Leaf* editorial of September 19, 1945, were posted last June to a unit of the first Canadian infantry division but to remove them now I am convinced would be unjust for it would mean that for soldiers with equal points the volunteer and N.R.M.A. soldier must be treated differently. This would be wrong from both the practical and moral point of view.

Of soldiers who started their service in the N.R.M.A. some after being called up and while still serving in Canada volunteered to come overseas. Some who were sent to the United Kingdom as N.R.M.A. became "active" volunteers whilst in the United Kingdom, some sent to reinforcement units on the continent became "active" volunteers after reaching the continent. Some sent as reinforcements to the continent never became "active", they were posted forward

to infantry battalions and fought as N.R.M.A. men. Of this last group, i.e., those who never changed their N.R.M.A. status, sixty were killed in action, 192 were wounded.

When we were hard pressed last autumn and spring and the N.R.M.A. were sent over as reinforcements I believed the feeling of the whole army was that if they "did their stuff" they would be accepted as equal members of this army. They did "do their stuff" and it would be morally wrong at this time when the fighting is over to say that they should be treated differently from other soldiers.

If the criterion is taken as to whether or not a soldier served in an operational theatre, what about volunteers who never served in an operational theatre. A comparison of risks run is not valid at this stage for those of us who are awaiting repatriation, have in fact survived, we are here alive and well regardless of comparative risks to which individuals might have been exposed. There are both volunteers and N.R.M.A. men who have fought in battle. Some of both have been killed. Some of both have been wounded. Some of both have come through the battle unscathed. There are both volunteers and N.R.M.A. men who have never served outside Canada. There are both volunteers and N.R.M.A. men who have never served in an operational theatre. Length of service and length of service abroad are the only proper individual yardsticks at this time. Two points for a month's service in Canada, three points for a month's service abroad discriminates in favour of the man who has served abroad. But between men of equal points there cannot be further moral discrimination.

I have used the term moral discrimination because there must be some practical discrimination between individuals. There are many with high scores who must be prepared to wait because duty so requires.

I consider it my duty to see that those who have to wait the longest before returning home are at least as well served as regards health, education, sports, welfare, recreation and leave as those more fortunate ones who have returned to Canada in the earliest drafts. To do this I must retain, sufficient experienced staff and regimental officers, warrant officers, N.C.O's, clerical staffs, cooks, administrative specialists and tradesmen and units of the services to ensure that a proper standard of administration is upheld until the end. That is why it is impossible to let the point score be the only consideration in the order of return home. Some with very high scores, others with medium group scores must subordinate their own personal wishes to return home to their duty to the group as a whole.

Feeling as we do about this question of return home it is not difficult to find individual cases here and there which appealing to our emotions give rise to feelings of indignation and injustice that our particular turn has not come sooner. But the few individual cases do not really affect this problem which is still to be solved in terms of many thousands.

I assure you that it is my intention to work the repat plan with the greatest possible degree of fairness to the individual providing that this does not react to the serious detriment of the remaining groups.

My hon. friend asked me to give a statement on the repatriation policy. The broad details of that policy I think are pretty well known and are as indicated in General Simonds' message. They were outlined in the pamphlet which was issued after VE-day early in May.

Mr. GREEN: What I asked about was the policy of the government on repatriation of the N.R.M.A. soldiers.

Mr. ABBOTT: That is pretty well indicated too in General Simonds' statement. But may I point out to the house, as I indicated in the statement I gave to the press last night, that this repatriation policy is not a policy which was adopted here in Ottawa and imposed on the army overseas. That policy was evolved overseas, by the men over there, by General Crerar and his officers. It was, of course, approved in Ottawa, but neither my predecessor nor I, nor for that matter the staff here in Ottawa, initiated or designed that policy. It was worked out overseas. It was felt here that the policy would be more satisfactory if it were designed by the men on the spot who knew the problem. I want to make that perfectly clear, because this editorial indicated, as some others have since, that this was a policy imposed by somebody here in Canada. That is not the case.

The policy from the very outset with respect to these N.R.M.A. men has been this: Once they stepped on a ship there was no distinction made between the N.R.M.A. man and the volunteer soldier. They were all going over to fight. There has been a lot of talk in this country—not by me, let me say—of two armies, but so far as overseas service is concerned we have never had two armies. There has been no distinction made between the volunteer soldier and the man sent over under the National Resources Mobilization Act. Once the N.R.M.A. man got over there he took his place in the reinforcement pool, and when his turn came he went over to France as part of the reinforcements and was posted to a unit, just the same as any other soldier. General Foulkes told me only this morning that when people asked him over there how the N.R.M.A. men were doing, he replied, "I do not know, because I do not know who they are. So far as I am concerned they are soldiers just the same as any other soldier."

So there has been no distinction made, and so long as I am minister there will not be any distinction made, between the soldier who is over there compulsorily and the soldier who is over there voluntarily. And to old soldiers it is obvious why that must be so. There must be mutual trust and confidence in the man be-

side you when you are fighting, and to make a distinction between the men who have volunteered and the men who have been sent over under the N.R.M.A. would be indefensible.

Mr. GREEN: Is it not a fact that the complaint made in the editorial was about N.R.M.A. troops who were never in the fighting at all but went over to the continent after the fighting had ended and are now being sent home ahead of the men who did the fighting?

Mr. ABBOTT: As General Simonds indicated in his message, it was perhaps unfortunate that a few N.R.M.A. men should have been posted to the first division on or shortly after VE-day. That was the case, although I believe there were very few. But having been posted to the first division in the ordinary course, not by any process of special selection but just in the ordinary course, they were no longer N.R.M.A. men but just soldiers who had been sent over from England to reinforce a particular unit. As General Simonds has indicated, perhaps it was unfortunate that that step was taken, but it was taken, although not by the Minister of National Defence or the government here in Ottawa. That step was taken overseas. That may be a subject for criticism; I do not know. However, I am advised that relatively few in that category were posted to that division. Having been posted to that division, if the men had a point score in excess of 50, between 50 and 150, they would come back with their units. If they have not that point score, they will not.

I do not know that I should go into details to justify the present system. The reason, to anybody who understands the problems of repatriation, are obvious. If you did not follow that system you would soon, for instance, be without any cooks, senior officers or N.C.O.'s. It was felt after most careful consideration by General Crerar and his officers overseas, and this has been known to the troops overseas and to this country for the last four or five months, that there should be no distinction made—and this is the policy which is being followed—both as to the volunteer soldier and the so-called N.R.M.A. soldier, provided he has the required point score.

Mr. GREEN: Am I to understand that the minister will obtain copies of the editorials and—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, this is a question arising out of the minister's statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I think I have already been very generous to hon. members. I would call their attention to Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, third edition, page 125, also May, 245, on standing order 44:

> After a minister has answered a question asked by a member when the orders of the day are called, no discussion of any kind should take place. Mr. Speaker Lowther laid down the rule about this on the 5th July, 1915, in the British House of Commons, where the practice is practically the same as ours. He said: "All supplementary questions are irregular and are not provided for at all in any standing order. It is entirely a matter of grace. I may say generally that the object of supplementary questions is to elucidate any ambiguity in the reply of a minister or to seek for some further information if he can give it; but supplementary questions should not be put, and ought not to be put, to embarrass a minister or to lead him to give an answer in a hurry which at a subsequent time he might be sorry that he gave. I will give as much freedom as I possibly can, but at the same time there must be some limits."

Mr. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I was not intending to carry on the discussion. All I wanted to do was to ask the minister to make sure that he had given his undertaking that he would obtain copies of these editorials and place them on *Hansard*. That is all I ask.

Mr. ABBOTT: I have already given that undertaking, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GREEN: That is all I want.

Mr. BRACKEN: May I ask the minister, arising out of the statement he has just made, what body determines the official policy of *Maple Leaf*? The minister may have mentioned that in his statement.

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes, I did. The *Maple Leaf*, as the leader of the opposition knows, is purely an army newspaper set up by the department of public relations, headed overseas by Colonel Malone, and in discussion with public relations officers overseas Colonel Malone worked out the method of editing and publishing the *Maple Leaf*. Following those discussions the policy was laid down which I have outlined and which is contained in this signal from which I have quoted. It was approved by the other defence ministers, by General Crerar, and by General Murchie, chief of staff here. That is my information as to the manner in which the policy was determined.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE IN REPLY

The house resumed from Friday, September 21, consideration of the motion of Mr. W. M. Benidickson for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech

at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Bracken, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Hansell.

Mr. ROLAND BEAUDRY (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I rise with some diffidence to undergo what might be termed the "baptism of speech" of a member new to this house, since the constituency I represent has nothing at first sight to single it out. It is a constituency of Canadians who believe in Canada as an entity achieved almost eighty years ago, and who have lived, thought, acted, and at the last election voted, as free men aware of the fact that living in a free country is one of their most precious prerogatives, and desirous above all of retaining their prerogatives and of taking pride in their citizenship.

When I say that St. James has nothing to single it out I am perhaps a bit inaccurate. St. James is the constituency which gave this house one of its finest exponents of the graces of parliamentary eloquence, and one of its outstanding former cabinet members, the late Fernand Rinfret. It is the constituency which recognized the qualities of heart of his successor, my predecessor in this seat, Eugene Durocher. His span of life, all short as it was, allowed him to endear himself to a good many in this house and to everyone for whose hopes, interests and wishes he stood in this chamber.

In one respect, Mr. Speaker, St. James stands out in almost paradoxical relief. By its very lack of singularity it becomes singular. In point of population it is one of the largest constituencies, if not the largest, in this dominion. and it is probably the most clearly outlined cross-section of this country's component elements. Representing as I do one of the largest bodies of people who may send a representative to this house, I am fully conscious of the responsibilities entailed, and fully aware of the hopes, desires and needs of these Canadians of various origins who make up the entity which, since the beginning of our political history as a nation, has been, with Quebec East, the bell-wether of Canadian Quebec's opinion. This I say, Mr. Speaker, fully cognizant of the fact that each constituency claims equal importance, but also mindful of history and tradition.

Through my voice, sir, St. James speaks its hope, its desire, its determination that Canada shall become the country which it was meant to be by the French settlers, to whom self-sacrifice was the means to an end; by the English conqueror, upon whom through the taking over of this vast territory devolved the duty of meting out justice and of recognizing rights; the country which has been the promised land to so many new Canadians.

Of course—we on this side of the house, and I trust those on the other side, are aware of it—rights, prerogatives and their enjoyment entail duties—duties of understanding, duties of commission, duties, if I may so term them, of omission and remission, and duties stemming from divine law. Since the opening of this parliament there have been many statements on both sides of the house which hearten me in my belief that this country at large intends to discharge its duty of understanding —of understanding that in matters of language and of religious tolerance numbers do not necessarily imply right; that in matters of controversy arising from different viewpoints—viewpoints of necessity dissimilar because they spring from a dissimilarity of antecedents and precedents—both sides at times may be right; of understanding that abuse cast by either party at an ideological opposition will never bridge a flow of opposite thought; understanding that under the present circumstances the problems of government may often find a solution, not ideal perhaps to each individual but reasonably acceptable to all. This duty Mr. Speaker, the people of St. James, the French and English speaking, the Catholics and the non-Catholics, the old Canadians and the new Canadians of different origins, living together in harmony in the largest constituency in the largest city of our country, have lived up to and will continue to live up to. I am equally sure that they have noted the utterances of many in this house with a renewed assurance that we may yet achieve the unity of thought and purpose which this party has set as its goal, and for which the leader of this party stands out as a symbol.

The duty of omission and remission is perhaps not as easy to define, but certainly its performance can be far more of a daily occurrence and the opportunities for its discharge far more numerous. May I define what I term our duty of omission and remission as being: omitting to take offence at provocation, whether it be just or unjust in all spheres of thought, and, in such cases of provocation, as omitting to condemn before or without a full hearing; of refraining from verbal or factual behaviour such as may lead a fellow Canadian to believe that his rights to full citizenship are being disputed. May I suggest that we remember at all times that if we have reason to be spurred on to greater nationalism, or to become the nationalists which the new glory, the new opportunities,

the new horizons which open before Canada justify us to be, our nationalism may take different means of expression.

Let us not condemn our neighbour's form of expression because it does not fully coincide with our own. If both are sincere, if neither is inspired by selfish motives of local sublimation, both have their place in our spiritual economy and both should with time be merged into one common means of expression. Both should eventually have one sincere, one all-encompassing joint purpose, the happiness of all Canadians to whom religion, language and custom shall not prove an obstacle to a common interest, a common sense of citizenship, and a common flag.

The accomplishment of the duty which I have termed that of omission and remission has at times been difficult for the people of St. James; yet they took the opportunity offered by the last election to recall to the country at large that they saw their duty. Their overwhelming vote in favour of one who, in our minds, is the symbol of tolerant yet firm Canadianism, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), proves it. And, Mr. Speaker, many were there to influence them, in some cases to urge them that now was the time to mingle their voices with the cry for separation, with the cry for isolation of mind and of thought if not of corporeal presence, and that cry had not always found its accents from sheer selfishness. At times it may have been provoked by what seemed to some, and not the least enlightened, sound justification for their attitude.

The men and women of St. James proudly discharged their duty of omission, anxious to remain free citizens in a country of freedom. They were oblivious, if not forgetful, of the castigation of a few and of the blandishments of a fewer still, to whom Canada is not an end, not an achievement, but an instrument and a means. St. James, sir, did a magnificent job of discharging its duty of remission and omission, and it omitted all considerations other than the furtherance and aggrandizement of the destiny of our homeland.

I shall not dwell on the duties stemming from divine law, but all this country should be thankful for the family allowances act. The men and women of St. James are grateful for the family allowances act, and have accepted family allowances in the spirit in which they were proffered by this government: For the purpose of making the citizens of Canada who are in process of growth both physically and mentally, such as they may become wider in their horizon than the boundaries of St. James, than the boundaries of their province; that they may become citizens of a closely knit yet far-reaching Canada, masters of the two languages which are recognized as the twin tongues of this land, masters of both mentalities which spring from this duality of languages, and above all masters of themselves in their own land.

May I now, Mr. Speaker, submit my views on our approach to the performance of our duty of commission. Here I say that full understanding of the importance of the duties I have outlined previously is imperative if we are to agree on our various duties of commission, and I submit that it is imperative for our future that we do agree. There are many in this land who have advocated in word, and others in thought if not in word, that the greatest tangible evidence of the discharge of one's duty of commission to this country is military service for war purposes. I agree that military service for war purposes is not only commendable but necessary; and that it definitely represents a duty of commission. But they in turn surely will grant me that this performance, no matter how heroic it may be, no matter how great its repercussions, no matter what it entails in loss of that which is dearest to man, his very life, is not necessarily given to each generation. Let us hope that it shall never be given to the generations to follow. They will also grant me that the performance of many other duties of commission is no less important to national life and survival. When I say this, it is farthest from my mind to detract one whit from the greatness of the sacrifice, the hardships that accrue, the sorrows that follow, to lessen the glory, the merit or the gratitude which they deserve, of those who a quarter of a century ago, and more recently in the last six years, have shed their blood or have given their lives in the accomplishment of their duty. To those with heads bowed St. James pays its debt of gratitude for their part in saving Canada. And so that I may be understood by all of those who shared in the battles for the survival of Canada as an entity, and for the safeguarding of our way of life, I say: Nous vous sommes profondément reconnaissants.

I regret I cannot repeat what I feel in the language of origin of every Canadian who helped to save civilization, but to every one of these goes my deepest admiration and gratitude in the knowledge that for minorities as to language the obstacles and the sacrifice were, of necessity, greater.

In St. James as everywhere else in Canada we have cause to honour a great many of our

own who gave up years of blood and life; but in St. James as everywhere else in this country there are a great many more who will never reap glory except in their own hearts, whose everyday prosaic task is known to but a few, and who are yet daily deserving of their country and who daily carry out the acts of commission which they owe to their country. Of these too many are slighted in times of war, too many forgotten in times of peace. They are the workers, the labourers, the consumers, the taxpayers, the artisans of our daily bread, the fathers and mothers of the present and of the future generation, who perhaps do not always see their duty of commission as their neighbour sees it, but who are none the less sincere in its accomplishment.

When we shall all have in this country a similar interpretation of our duties of understanding, of omission and remission, of divine laws, we shall better understand, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, what the duty of commission means to ourselves and to our neighbour. To those and to others Canada also owes tangible recognition. For those and all others it is the duty of this parliament and the avowed intention of this party to enact such legislation as may ensure unity, peace and security.

I am gratified that old age pensions become part of our individual economy. I am not fully in accord with the limitation of time set upon their enjoyment, and would strongly advocate that within the bounds of our financial ability to meet our obligations, the men and women of Canada should receive old age pensions at the age of sixty in cases of dire need and at the age of sixty-five in all other cases. I believe and advocate that plans for our physical construction and reconstruction should be laid not in the light of a bounty but in direct consequence of the immediate needs of our people, and that the realization of these plans be unhampered by the dictates of what I hope may soon become the unnecessary evil of bureaucracy.

I appreciate that this is not all easy. Certainly the contradictory statements and suggestions on this score coming from the opposite side of the house will prove of no great help. Just here may I suggest to hon. members of the opposition that to them is given at once the opportunity of carrying out their duties of understanding and omission for the true benefit of this country. In connection with the demobilization and rehabilitation in civilian life of our forces, those non-combatants who owe a debt of gratitude are perhaps more desirous than anyone else of prompt and effective action. May I be allowed here to call attention to what seems to be an anomaly, this, that men who enlisted for general service, and who through no wish of their own but because of the necessities of military discipline and organization did not see service overseas, are not granted rehabilitation treatment equal to that of front-line men. I submit that all non-commissioned ranks, at least, who enlisted with an equal sense of duty and an equal willingness for self-sacrifice, should be treated with an equality of recognition. If it is true that circumstances may alter cases, I believe it equally true that in the main the ends of fairness to all may be best served in this way.

This house already has been too kind to me, and I should not like to wear out my welcome. I conclude with the hope and faith that the immediate future will see the development of Canada not only as a member of the community of nations but as a land of fruitful realization for all those whom the Almighty has placed within its confines; and for that purpose the additional duty devolves upon us of helping every Canadian in the task of fulfilling each of the duties I have outlined earlier. Let us keep constantly in our minds the thought that we as individuals hold our fate in our hands, and that the fate of each of our fellow Canadians is at all times inseparable from our own if we are to be true to our own interests and shall be worthy of Canada.

Mr. ANTHONY HLYNKA (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, during the course of the past twelve days we have had the privilege of listening to some very fine contributions to this debate, dealing with the problems mentioned in the speech from the throne. The most important and immediate problems, of course, are those which have arisen directly as a result of the war. Our domestic problems should be less difficult of solution, particularly in view of our fortunate geographic position, since Canadian soil has not been ravaged by war. But in war-torn Europe the problems of providing food, clothing, shelter and medical supplies, finding refuge for millions of displaced persons and their rehabilitation, are matters of great magnitude and extreme urgency. It is my firm conviction that on humanitarian grounds alone we have a moral responsibility to those unhappy people, particularly when we consider the tremendous sacrifices and limitless contributions they made to the winning of the war. It is true that the lion's share of this gigantic task is being discharged, and with some success, by such

official organizations as UNRRA, intergovernmental committees, the International Red Cross and its auxiliaries, and so on. However, I am more concerned with that phase of the problem which extends beyond the scope of officialdom but which is by no means less deserving of the most sympathetic and humanitarian consideration.

Before proceeding further I should like to say that I have nothing but the highest admiration for the organizations to which I have referred and for the work they are doing with the limited resources which have been placed at their disposal for such a colossal task. I believe, nevertheless, that we have fallen short in our humanitarian response to that other phase of this gigantic problem which, as I have said, extends beyond the jurisdiction of the organizations I have mentioned. I would refer to the situation which exists in regions where complications have arisen due to racial or political differences. In order to alleviate the situation with respect to food, clothing and other supplies in regions where complications do exist I should like to make the suggestion that societies, private individuals and relatives of displaced persons be permitted to make direct gifts to those needy people so that all such articles may be received by those for whom they are intended. Under the present arrangement all articles of food, clothing and so on are collected into a common pool and distributed in the various zones by local officials and agencies as they see fit. Should the suggestion of direct gifts be adopted I am certain that additional aid would be forthcoming, both from those who are interested in their own relatives and from many other public-spirited individuals and societies on this continent.

Speaking in this house on March 26, 1945, in a debate on the San Francisco conference, I suggested then that there was a great need for some mechanism to be devised whereby stateless peoples and persons would be provided with the means of voicing their own opinions on their own behalf, when and if they consider themselves not represented by the various de facto governments. To-day, in the light of what is taking place in the Soviet sphere, I am convinced more than ever that there has become a still greater need for the setting up of such mechanism. For it is quite obvious that any problem which involves millions of people cannot and must not be lightly dismissed or brushed aside. To substantiate my contention that the magnitude of this problem has reached serious proportions, may I quote from an editorial which appeared in the Ottawa *Evening Citizen* of September 15, 1945, under the heading "Estonian Odyssey." The editorial says:

A small Canadian press item from London tells of the setting out in a 37-foot sailing yacht of a group of sixteen Estonian refugees from the west coast of Scotland. The destination of these seven men, five women and four children is the United States. Three times already the small craft has set out, but it is in an earnest of the determination of the group not to return to their native land that a fourth attempt is now being made to reach the new world in the hope of a new life.

The desire to go far from their own land will surely raise problems on this side of the Atlantic if they complete their desperate voyage. It emphasizes the plight of many thousands of what are now known as displaced persons.

Such lands as Estonia and Latvia, and other territories in Europe where governments have changed, inevitably leave numbers of former residents unwilling to return to their former homes. In the case of the Estonian group they are unwilling to return to the land which is now incorporated under the Soviet union.

It will take a great deal of wisdom and understanding to deal with this class of refugee. The war has been fought in the great cause of freedom. It would be a negation of that struggle to be a party of the unwilling return of such refugees or other displaced persons—they include victims of nazi forced labour from Poland and even Russia—to former homelands. The united nations, particularly the big three, have a test of their ideals in stern realities to face.

I have other reports describing in the most pathetic and desperate terms the fate of these homeless millions. Here is another extract found in the Czech press service bulletin of June 28, 1945. This bulletin is published in London, England. The article is entitled "News From the Crucified Continent," and the subheading reads, "Be Communist or Perish." It states:

According to information received from Trieste, the western allies are forcing large numbers of people who escaped the wrath of Tito communists to return to the parts they ran away from. Thousands of Croats and Slovenes who sought refuge in the British-American zone in Karinthia, have been handed over to Tito. They were stripped naked and executed by the deadly fire of machine guns. The Bishop of Lubljanja, together with 161 Slovenian priests and clerics, made their way into the American zone beseeching protection. It has not yet been decided whether they will be given up to Tito or not.

There is silence over these horrors in the press of the Christian civilized countries in the west. It seems almost as if a decision has been taken that the peoples of the European continent must be communist, or else perish.

It will readily be seen, Mr. Speaker, that the two quotations which I have cited reveal the desperate situation which faces so many freedom-loving people of the world. I may say further that the fate of the continent of Europe is in the hands of the English-speaking nations—Canada included.

According to the figures of the international labor office there are no less than 40 million displaced persons as a result of the war. A good number of these persons will return to their former homes of their own free will, but in the case of what I call "stateless persons" the word repatriation has a different meaning. To them it means penal servitude, concentration camps, or, to use the favourite Soviet term, liquidation. This group of stateless people comprise several millions of Ukrainians, Jews, Czechs, Slovaks, Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Finns, Poles and others, and the most tragic and ironic thing of all is that this group is made up of persons who hold democratic views, and, as the quotation says, democracies are forcing them to become communist or perish.

I find brief reference to this subject of repatriation in the British *Hansard,* for August 20, 1945, wherein Hon. Ernest Bevin, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in the British government, asserts "that over 600,000 Russians," as he calls them, "have been transported from the British zone to the east," and, "that it was expected that by autumn only 645,000 will be left, of whom 500,000 will be 'Poles'."

During the past several weeks desperate letters, messages and pleas have been reaching many of our Canadian homes, and we have read press dispatches to the same effect, that the group of displaced persons who are found in American and British zones are being repatriated by force to their former homes. Many of these displaced persons commit suicide rather than return under the Soviets. Still others go so far as to resist the British and American military police in self-defence, and we learn from the latest reports that the situation is growing worse. In dealing with this question I should like to ask: Is repatriation by force a solution to the problem, and is it in conformity with the principles proclaimed in the Atlantic charter and later endorsed at Yalta, namely: "the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live," and also "afford the assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want?"

Representations have been made to me, Mr. Speaker, by many of our Canadian veterans of world war II, who have met many of these displaced persons and who have personal knowledge of the situation as it exists with respect to the question of repatriation; and being of Ukrainian origin themselves, they asked me to plead the cause of these unfortunate people, among whom there are many Ukrainians. In addition to this I have been receiving letters and telegrams almost daily from all parts of Canada, sent by Ukrainian church bodies and other Canadian-Ukrainian organizations, requesting that I bring this matter to the attention of the Canadian government and to the attention of this democratic tribunal.

I should like, therefore, on behalf of Ukrainian refugees who are involved in this repatriation, and on behalf of others, to submit a plea to the Canadian government to transmit through its high offices to the British and United States governments an appeal to cease forceful repatriation of displaced persons, and in addition to give sympathetic consideration to the following specific requests:

1. That permission be granted to representatives of Ukrainian relief committees to visit various camps and districts where Ukrainian refugees are found. These representatives to act on instructions of the British and United States commanders in their respective zones.

2. That where the number of Ukrainian refugees warrants it, they be organized or granted permission to organize themselves into Ukrainian refugee camps, and that they be permitted to organize their own welfare committees. If this were done, all material aid meant for Ukrainians would be more likely to reach them.

3. That radio news and information broadcasts—now being transmitted to Europe in many languages, but not in Ukrainian—be also given in the Ukrainian language. For at present all authoritative information is broadcast in languages which are not adequately understood by Ukrainian people.

4. That British and United States military governments alone issue and announce statements of policy in regard to problems respecting refugees, instead of permitting Russian and other representatives to confuse the Ukrainian refugees.

5. That permission be granted to Ukrainian refugees to edit, print and distribute a "news letter" in the Ukrainian language for the benefit of Ukrainian refugees, as is being done in Russian, Polish and a few other languages.

From the five specific requests which I have just placed before the government and this honourable house it will be quite evident that not only do Ukrainians share the unfortunate fate of a refugee life, but they also have been overlooked in respect to the privileges granted to Polish, Russian and other refugees. It is in the light of all these cruel and horrible conditions and because of the tragic fate of the Ukrainian refugees that I make this plea.

In conclusion, I should like to read an extract from Mr. Churchill's speech which he

delivered in the British House of Commons on August 16, 1945 and which is recorded in the British *Hansard* of that date. This extract describes a scene which appears in the tragic world drama of to-day and which I could not even hope to describe in my own inadequate words. Mr. Churchill said:

It is not impossible that tragedy on a prodigious scale is imposing itself behind the iron curtain which at present divides Europe in twain. . . .

I cannot conceive that the elements for a new conflict exist in the Balkans to-day . . . Nevertheless not many members of the new House of Commons will be content with the new situation prevailing in those mountainous, turbulent, ill-organized and war-like regions . . . for almost everywhere communist forces have obtained, or are in process of obtaining, dictatorial powers. . . . We must know where we stand, and we must make clear where we stand in these affairs of the Balkans and of eastern Europe, and indeed of any country which comes into this field.

Our idea is government of the people, by the people, for the people—the people being free without duress to express, by secret ballot without intimidation, their deep-seated wish as to the form and conditions under which they are to live. At present . . . a family is gathered around the fireside to enjoy the scanty fruits of their toil and to recruit their exhausted strength by the little food that they have been able to gather. . . . Suddenly there is a knock at the door and a heavily armed policeman appears. . . . It may be that the father or son, or a friend sitting in the cottage, is called out and taken off into the dark, and no one knows whether he will ever come back again, or what his fate has been. All they know is that they had better not inquire. There are millions of humble homes in Europe at the moment, in Poland, in Czechoslovakia, in Austria, in Hungary, in Yugoslavia, in Rumania, in Bulgaria—where this fear is the main preoccupation of the family life. . . . "Freedom from fear"—but this has been interpreted as if it were only freedom from fear of invasion from a foreign country . . . but that is not the fear of the ordinary family in Europe to-night. Their fear is the policeman's knock. . . . It is for the life and liberty of the individual, for the fundamental rights of man, now menaced and precarious in so many lands that peoples tremble.

. . . Democracy is now on trial as it never was before, and in those islands we must uphold it, as we upheld it in the dark days of 1940 and 1941, with all our hearts, with all our vigilance and with all our enduring and inexhaustible strength.

Yes, democracy is on trial. No atheistic philosophy of force, torture and extermination shall ever restore the God-given democratic right to humanity unless the surviving democracies write a new chapter of history founded on Christian principles.

Mr. H. R. JACKMAN (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, there are many of us in this house who feel that the sooner we can wind up the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne, the better, because we wish to get on with the important topics of reconversion and the rehabilitation of our armed forces. If at the moment I trespass on the time of the house I do so because I wish to speak on a subject which I think has a great deal to do with rehabilitation and reconversion, that is, the financial measures which the government will bring down. It is not that I have any fore-knowledge, but I do wish to give some ideas which are uppermost in my mind and which I believe are requirements in the budget which the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) will bring down, we hope in the very near future.

Although the elected Speaker is absent from the chamber at the moment I should like to offer my sincere congratulations upon his elevation to the high office he now holds.

Inasmuch as parliament was not called for some two weeks after the first appointed date because of the intervening of V-J day, one might have expected that the financial proposals of the government would be made known, at least as far as principle is concerned. However, we find that whatever the government did during that period it is not ready to make this announcement to parliament and to the people of Canada. One would have thought that with the ending of the Japanese war our expenses would be curtailed substantially and therefore the amount of revenue to be raised would also be curtailed substantially. One would have thought that when parliament was called the government would have made known something of its plans. The only reference to the budget in the speech from the throne was this short sentence:

My ministers' proposals with respect to taxation measures will be disclosed in the budget.

Those of us who have followed the workings of government in this and other British countries for many years realize that the position of the budget has changed considerably, particularly since 1939. There are two reasons in my opinion why the budget should be mentioned, in principle at least, in the speech from the throne. The first is the changed character of the budget proposals. There was a time when the budget had merely to do with the ways and means of raising for the government money to carry on the ordinary administration of the country. In pre-war days the budget seldom ran over $500,000,000; now

it runs to many times that amount, and represents a substantial proportion of our total national income. In other words, there was a day not so far distant when what a man earned in open competition with his fellow men, or what he could induce his employer to give him, was his take-home pay. But that no longer obtains. What a workman gets or what an industrialist may earn bears little relation to the amount which he may take home to spend. He must wait until after the budget is announced before he can know, and this year, here we are in September, still waiting to know what the budget for the year 1945-46 is going to be. So far as one can see, the Minister of Finance is taking his own good time before he brings down the budget and acquaints the people and the business men of this country, who must do the planning, with what the incentives and budget measures are likely to be for 1946.

Everyone I think realizes that budgets now are much more far-reaching than they ever were before. They go right down into the very life of the people. I can think of nothing of greater consequence, because the whole industrial and agricultural fabric of our nation is determined by budget measures. Everyone in this house knows that the power to tax is also the power to destroy, and it may very well be that if the budget measures are on the scale which we have seen during recent years, and are wrong in principle or in incidence, they may very well destroy the whole economic life of our country. I hesitate to think what the results may be if this government, because of ill-founded budget proposals, causes us to have great unemployment in Canada.

The second reason for speaking on what I would term budget principles at the present time is conveyed in a sentence that was uttered by that staunch supporter of the Liberal government, the hon. member for Prescott (Mr. Bertrand), who in the early days of this debate said:

> As we all know, when the budget is announced it immediately becomes law.

I am not against the old principle of the budget becoming law the day it is announced, because there were times, and there may again be times, when tariff or other changes could be taken advantage of by some if they knew of the measures before they actually became operative. But that is hardly so to-day, and inasmuch as the budget ramifies through our whole economic life and determines virtually our daily bread and butter, I believe it is the duty of the people's representatives to have some say and to interpret the will of the people in the framing of the measures which determine how the money shall be raised. The government which takes the responsibility for the budget is, of course, aided by certain economic experts, for whom generally speaking I have the highest respect. Nevertheless these so-called experts are not in touch with public opinion, nor do they know how business functions in the same way that members of parliament know, because the members have an intimate acquaintance with the daily life and the welfare of our people.

It is my recommendation, Mr. Speaker, that we should have a committee of this house to decide the ways and means by which the amount of money shall be raised which the government decides must be raised, instead of having brought before the house, as is the practice now, a series of proposals from which no deviation whatsoever is allowed; for only in the minutest detail is any deviation permitted, according to my experience in this house. Unless we resort to such a system, the government becomes in effect a dictatorship, and we have little better than a totalitarian state. The budget is now all too important to be decided by the government and its technical staff rather than by the representatives of the people.

I should like also to say that we are interested now in the budget proposals not simply as a matter of percentages, whether this tax shall be at a certain rate, but we should know the principles, we should know exactly what type of taxation we are to have, and whether taxes are to be increased or lowered in certain brackets, and how business is to fare; for without that knowledge the business men cannot do their planning.

I could also make a plea, and I think on sound grounds, for some relief from taxation. Certainly the people of Canada are expecting relief from taxation. Everywhere one goes he finds that the Canadian citizens believe, and I think the Minister of Finance will agree with them, that they have done a wonderful job in the raising of war revenue. There has been no quibbling and no lack of good will in connection with it. But I am not so much concerned with the relief of the taxpayers, necessary as that is—I believe the government will have to pay some heed now to public opinion because the government's narrow majority in the house will not permit them to railroad measures through, irrespective of what the people think. The second reason we should know now what budget principles the government has in mind is this. The budget has a great deal to do with jobs, and it

is to that aspect of the matter, rather than from any feeling in regard to relief from taxation, that I wish to address my remarks.

What is the history of our present high taxation? At the beginning of the war, taxes were raised substantially. They were raised higher in subsequent years, first of all for the purpose of raising revenue, and secondly for syphoning off spending power, so that there would not be too much pressure on inflation. The revenue was necessary, and so was the syphoning off. But the main reason for the high taxation was to stifle and check any increase in civilian production. The reason for that was that we had a war on our hands, that we must fight for liberty, and all our materials and all our man-power must be transferred to war account for the production of the needed munitions of war. In that regard we have done a grand job. The government proceeded to freeze the profits of industry and of business generally, so there was no incentive to produce more for civilian consumption. The average profit for the four preceding years was ascertained and under the Excess Profits Tax Act no one could earn more than that. Shortly after profits were frozen, wages in civilian industries were likewise frozen. But when it came to starting a new aviation plant or a gun plant or some other plant for war production, wages not having been paid before in such industry, there was no level at which to freeze them; consequently substantially higher wages were paid. This had the effect of inducing workers to leave civilian industry and go into war industry at higher rates of pay. That was the natural working of economic law. People who had never worked before went to work in war industries in order to turn out the goods for beating the enemy. So civilian production, as I have mentioned, was frozen in order to make available for war production all the resources of this country which we could possibly spare, apart from maintaining some standard of civilian welfare. But now, sir, we are happy enough to have won victory both in Europe and in Asia. We no longer need manufactured goods for war; we no longer have that insatiable demand, and we must manufacture for civilian use. One would think therefore that if the government during the war saw fit to adopt certain measures in order to get war production and stifle civilian production, they might now adopt the reverse procedure, undo those measures and reduce taxation in order once again to provide the stimulus for civilian production, which means jobs for our returning men and for our people coming out of war industries.

We should at the present time put every stimulus on production. The whole accent of our budget legislation and all other legislation should be on production, because it is out of production that we pay for our daily bread; it is out of production—not out of money—that we pay for our social services. Does the government lack courage to reduce taxation and bring about increased production through once again restoring incentive? I think we in this house should know whether or not the government expect that result irrespective of any lowering of taxation or restoring of incentive. Do they count on a small boom in order to make up for the pent-up demands which have grown during the war period, and then perhaps we may go into a slump? What is the government's idea?—so that business may do its planning and so that we may know what are the proper tax measures to be brought before this house?

Let us centre our fiscal thinking on job creation, not primarily on lessening taxation.

In my opinion, and I believe the house will agree with me, jobs are made up of two parts. First, there is the creator of the job; secondly, there is the seeker after work. Both must be considered in any reconversion or rehabilitation plan. Taxes must not be a wet blanket on incentive or on production.

So far as 1945 is concerned I do not think it necessary, however desirable it may be, that taxes, so far as they are to be paid in this year, be reduced. If they need to be reduced at all it is in the lowest brackets. Carpenters and other workmen will not work on Saturday mornings because the pay they earn is not worth their while; they would rather stay at home and do nothing than work for such a small rate of pay. Perhaps consideration should be given at once, considering the housing shortage, to the workman getting as good a return for himself in the forty-fourth hour of his work as he gets in the first hour. But for 1946 there must be a real promise of reward for effort and some return for risk-taking; otherwise we cannot expect business men and leaders of industry to do the planning necessary to bring about the full employment or even the high rate of employment which is essential and desired by all.

I could say much about the value of leaders and leadership in the economic field. Without them there is no direction. Jobs do not occur of themselves. Jobs arise because someone has an idea of manufacturing something or providing some service and is willing to put his savings in that enterprise. In the making or the providing of that service he creates jobs, but there must be some incentive to men in order that they may do the planning and take the risk. Without planning and leadership our standards of living in this

country and in America generally—standards which have risen higher than in any other country in the world—would fail to rise any further. It is not through government action that standards of living improve, but through the action of business leaders who cause more goods and more services to be produced.

Let us look at taxation at the present time. After the meagre exemptions which a married or single man may receive, the next $500 is taxed 37 per cent. Is it any wonder that carpenters and other artisans do not see it worth while to work additional time, or overtime? The same condition applies through the whole gamut of our economic structure. I believe the house knows as well as if not better than I do that human nature is pretty much the same whether you look at it in the lowest brackets or in the highest. Nearly all people are motivated by the same considerations. Then if you look in the higher income tax brackets you find that present taxation takes over 70 per cent of any income over $20,000. There is no incentive to venture. There is no incentive to the development of our resources. There is no incentive to production of much-needed goods through which we must pay for our social services and by which we earn our daily bread. The reason is perfectly obvious to us all: it is that there is virtually no net return for increased work. In many cases there is not even enough in the way of return to compensate for the risk factor. The present taxation is designed to lead and does lead to state socialism. Nothing could lead more directly or more quickly, if continued, to state socialism.

May I remind the minister that if his government did not receive a direct mandate on the issue, certainly it was to the fore in the minds of most of the electors—it was the crucial issue in the province of Ontario—that we should once again operate under a system of free enterprise and not under state socialism. I say that the government of this country has received a mandate to operate under the system of free enterprise, and if incentive is not restored, the motivating power for that system is lost. May I say to him to that not only can he count on the votes which his party, now forming the government, received, but he may also count on the votes which the Progressive Conservative party received, and I do not think I am mistaken when I say he may also count on the votes the Social Credit party received, as an endorsement of the free enterprise system.

So far as the corporation tax is concerned, the government puts up no money, but it shares in forty per cent of the profits, and takes no losses. Many of us would consider that a better deal than putting up all the money and taking all the risk. At the same time, if a business is prosperous there is the excess profits tax. As I pointed out when this tax was first introduced, the name is really a misnomer, because it is an excess tax on profits. For whereas prior to the war the corporation tax was fifteen to eighteen per cent, when the excess profits tax, so-called, came in, a business, even though it earned less than it earned in the pre-war years, was subjected to the forty per cent rate, which people have now come to consider the normal tax rate. May I remind this house that the corporate tax is a system of double taxation, because the earnings are first taxed in the corporation, and what is left of them is taxed again in the hands of the individual. That is different from the British system, where there is but the one tax in effect on the earnings.

I should like also to point out that the corporation tax is of the nature of what writers on taxation would call a retrogressive tax. Whether or not it is the widow's $5,000 that may be invested in the corporation, or the industrialist's large sum of money, it is taxed at the same rate, namely, forty per cent as a minimum, and what is left is taxed in the personal brackets of the shareholder, whether the shareholder be a widow or an industrialist.

I want to say a word or two about a matter which may be considered by some a little technical, but which on analysis will be found to be so vital to the mainspring of our business that it is worth the consideration of the house. I refer to the risk factor pertaining to investments. If a man has $1,000 to invest, he may lend it to the government at three per cent and make what may be termed a riskless investment. On the other hand he may, as a partner, hand over that $1,000 to some veteran who is starting up a small shop, taking a chance on getting a better return, say, seven per cent. The difference between the three per cent on the government bond and the seven per cent on the industrial or merchandising investment, as the case may be, is not income in any sense of the word. It is nothing more or less than a premium for having taken the risk.

Mr. IRVINE: A premium for the soldier having taken the risk, or you?

Mr. JACKMAN: If the hon. member wishes to speak at another time—

Mr. IRVINE: I am going to.

Mr. JACKMAN: —he may do so, but his remark is irrelevant to the point I am making. I say, the four per cent difference is nothing

more or less than a risk premium. If a man put his $1,000 in an enterprise of the kind I have described, he takes a chance on that business failing, so that the four per cent is additional to what he would get if he invested in a government bond, as a compensation for the risk he takes, because when we are dealing with these small industries, far more businesses of that kind fail than succeed. That four per cent, which has nothing to do with income, is a risk premium and is taxed by the government as if it were income, so that very little if any is left. Perhaps not as much as one per cent of that risk factor is left to a person in order to encourage him to put his money into risky enterprises or businesses. I am not suggesting to the minister that I have any way of levying the tax so that it shall fall only on the true income of three per cent. I am saying, however, that the effect of the present rates of taxation is to take nearly the whole of the amount of the risk factor. If you applied the same principle to life insurance, within a year or less the insurance companies would be bankrupt.

The result of all this is that the man who has money with which he might open up the north country, or start new industries, or back someone who has a new idea, says to himself, "It is no use trying to get seven per cent on my money, because if I do succeed the government will take practically all of it away, and if I lose, the loss is entirely my own. I am better off if I stick to government bonds." That policy may have been all right during the war years when the government provided all the employment necessary owing to the demands of war, and when they wanted all the money they could get in the form of subscriptions to government bonds; but now comes the time when the minister and the government will want to have businesses created as far as possible so that we may provide employment. Production is what counts. It is the sole objective which any modern budget should have in mind.

During the last five years we have had great increases in production in this country, and notwithstanding the stifling measures which the government sought to put into effect we have had an increased and a better distribution of the standard of living than we ever had before. And we have achieved that high standard of civilian living notwithstanding the fact that there were one million of our people engaged in war industry and 750,000 in the combatant services. So that we have at least one million workers, according to the white paper, available to increase the civilian standard of living if things are properly handled by this government. In other words, the machinery is there to provide a higher standard, and if we cannot provide that higher standard under the system of free enterprise, if it is spoiled for political considerations, we no longer deserve to operate that machine.

Let me say however that no machine will run without motive power. There must be a spark-plug somewhere; there must be a generator to impel activity. You have state-controlled totalitarianism plus the concentration camp as one form of motive power. People will do what they are told, unwillingly, half-heartedly, and ineffectively in that way; nevertheless you will have full employment with everyone working and a high measure of production. On the other hand you can have freedom of enterprise, opportunity and an adequate incentive as another motivating power, and that is the motivating power which this government has a mandate to put into operation immediately.

The country has chosen. Let the government implement that mandate. Let the government not fall, for want of courage, between two stools, one of control through taxation and the other of free enterprise, giving businessmen their head, so to speak, in order that they may get on with the job. The government may try to ride both horses and so fail in its objective. It must decide, and so must this house decide, which motivating power is to be behind the industrial and agricultural machine so that we may get on with the business of the country and achieve a high standard of living.

Business men now have confidence. In fact, they have a superabundance of confidence at the present time, and if they are given some idea of what they may expect to receive in the way of returns and compensation for the risk factor, that confidence will not wane. I can assure the minister however, and he knows this thoroughly, that business confidence is a plant of very tender growth. While governments may easily put on the brakes when it comes to economics, it is very difficult for the government to stimulate the economic process because you are up against the human factor, and if men are afraid, if they feel that it is not worth while, and that they are likely to lose whatever little capital they have available for risk, you will not attain your objective.

We have the refusal of workers, skilled craftsmen, to work on Saturday mornings because the higher tax brackets have destroyed all incentive. Why have the farmers reduced the hog population of the country by a third? I was interested in the remarks of the member for Selkirk (Mr. Bryce)—and I do like to hear occasionally from the C.C.F., because I

find that if you scratch a little under the skin you will discover that we are all brothers. The hon. member told a story of a dairy farmer who had some cows. He and his family looked after the cows before breakfast and after supper in the evening. But he did not file an income tax return. One of the inspectors called upon him and said the creamery had reported that he had sold them $400 worth of cream, and the farmer found he had to pay a tax on that amount. After a while he said he was going to get rid of his cows, because, to use the words of the hon. member quoting the farmer, "I will never milk cows for Ilsley." That goes not only for that farmer in Selkirk, but for men occupying much higher positions. It runs through the whole economic structure. People are not going to work for nothing, particularly now that the war is over. If I may quote from the minister himself, when he delivered his budget address in 1942 he said this, at page 3579 of *Hansard*:

> There is a danger that high progressive rates of income tax may interfere with the incentive for harder and better work for efficient production. We can and must rely upon other than economic motives to a large extent these days. Nevertheless, we cannot afford to dispense entirely with the incentive of improved earnings as a stimulus in the continual week-in week-out production work of a nation at a time when production is of vital importance.

I suggest to the minister that if we needed incentive in those days we need it all the more at the present time. The question might well be asked, why work beyond the bare minimum if there is no adequate reward for extra endeavour and sacrifice? In the dominion-provincial relations booklet of the government we find the same idea expressed, that something must be done; yet the government has not given to business men, who must do their planning for 1946 well in advance, any indication of the rules under which they must operate. In the proposals of the government of Canada to the dominion-provincial conference in August, 1945, we find this:

> The creation of conditions under which the initiative and skill of private enterprise will result in new investment on a scale far exceeding pre-war levels is one of the principal problems of reconstruction policy. The tax policies of all governments can be a fundamental factor in the removal of undesirable and unnecessary obstacles.

The government wrote this; I hope they will elucidate it themselves.

> The elimination or reduction of taxes on costs, the removal of tax penalties on enterprise, and the effect of taxes upon the taking of risks, are basic considerations in determining a satisfactory system of dominion-provincial financial relations.

[Mr. Jackman.]

Yet I find that the speech from the throne merely mentions taxation in the barest possible manner. It should be one of the principal items in that speech. We in this party, and I think all Canadians, are for as generous a measure of social security as may be possible but we can have social security only if we have production; we can have increased standards of living only if we have increased production, and any measure which prevents increased production is bad legislation.

In the speech from the throne we have only the barest reference to trade policies. What are we going to do to maintain the market in Great Britain for Canadian bacon after the wonderful job the farmers of this country have done? Foreign trade is essential. It is true that we have taken some measures to help in a small way, but the business men do not ask for such assistance as this. Business men ask that incentive be restored, and they will do the business without government interference and without any of these paternal measures. We must give our men in industry incentive to maintain and enlarge all our foreign markets. We have the capacity and the brains; the incentive must be restored. Trade makes jobs; jobs make high employment and give our people full prosperity. The road to depression is through a high tax on a small and diminishing volume of business. The road to prosperity is through a moderate tax on a large and increasing volume of business.

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday last the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), speaking in reference to meat rationing, asked if it would not be possible for me to place before the house a detailed statistical statement relating to meat in storage, shipping facilities needed and probable slaughterings. My purpose in participating briefly in this debate is not to prolong it, because I hope it will end to-morrow, nor is it to discuss generally the speech from the throne, but primarily at least to comply with the hon. gentleman's request. I have had some figures put in form for presentation to the house. The information is not new, in that it has been given on other occasions, but possibly not as part of a single statement.

Following the tri-partite food conference called by the late President Roosevelt in the spring of this year, Canada undertook that in addition to the amounts previously contracted for she would make an effort to provide an additional quantity of meat to bring her total shipments for 1945 to the United

Kingdom and liberated European countries up to at least the following amounts: Beef, 225 million pounds; pork, 450 million pounds; canned meat, 114 million pounds, a total of 789 million pounds. During 1944 Canada actually provided for the same purposes 129 million pounds of beef; 692 million pounds of pork; 39 million pounds of canned meat, a total of 860 million pounds. In addition Canada exported moderate quantities of meat sufficient to supply the essential requirements of Newfoundland and the British West Indies.

From January 1 to August 31, 1945, the Canadian meat board actually exported approximately 85 million pounds of beef, (carcass weight), 350 million pounds of bacon and ham; and 44 million pounds of canned meat, a total of 479 million pounds. That means that we would need to ship another 310 million pounds of meat in the last four months of the year in order to meet our 1945 objective.

While cattle slaughterings are running considerably in excess of 1944 there has been a sharp drop in hog slaughterings and total meat production in 1945 is less than in 1944. Total slaughterings of beef, veal, pork and mutton in inspected packing plants for the first eight months of 1945 are estimated at 1180 million pounds as compared to 1450 million pounds for the same period in 1944—a drop of 270 million pounds or a little more than 18 per cent. Details are given in the following table:

	Actual inspected slaughterings		Estimated cold dressed weight	
	Jan.-Aug. 1944	Jan.-Aug. 1945	Jan.-Aug. 1944	Jan.-Aug. 1945
			Pounds	Pounds
Cattle	782,688	985,508	393,921,000	476,820,000
Calves	476,016	570,407	50,612,000	60,445,000
Sheep and lambs	460,256	458,785	19,990,000	20,946,000
Hogs	6,120,701	3,942,207	986,000,000	622,547,000
Total			1,450,523,000	1,180,758,000

On the other hand our export requirements are only about 70 million pounds below our actual shipments last year

Meat in storage in Canada at September 1, 1945 was approximately 49 million pounds. The corresponding figure for September 1, 1944 was about 70 million pounds. When rationing was discontinued in February 1944 storage stocks were about 150 million pounds. Details are given in the following table:

	Meat in Storage		
Storage	Sept. 1, 1945	Sept. 1, 1944	March 1. 1944
	Pounds	Pounds	Pounds
Pork	23,692,000	40,722,000	98,793,000
Beef	17,497,000	21,429,000	40,043,000
Veal	5,390,000	6,491,000	2,982,000
Mutton and lambs	2,147,000	1,922,000	7,740,000
Total	48,726,000	70,564,000	149,558,000

These figures include some meat in process but intended for export. To that extent they overstate the amount available for domestic consumption. However, they do clearly indicate the trend of supplies.

Cold storage facilities fall into two categories, the sharp freezing facilities into which meat to be frozen must first be placed; and secondly the ordinary holding cold storage space in which frozen meats can be stored. Due to the heavy cattle runs of the past three weeks the sharp freezing facilities are being used close to maximum capacity and in some localities, there has been congestion, but it is fully expected that this will be cleared up this week. There are no serious problems in respect of ordinary holding cold storage space.

At the moment cattle runs are at an all time high. The inspected kill for the week ending Sept. 1, 1945, was 41,477 which set a new record. For the week ending September 15 the figure increased to 46,293. The figures for the week ending September 21 will not be available until to-morrow or next day.

As long as there is reasonably orderly marketing of cattle, it appears that the slaughtering facilities of the country are adequate to handle the expected slaughterings of cattle which for the last six months of 1945 are estimated at about 900,000 head.

Hog slaughterings, however, will continue to be considerably below the record figures of 1944, as the following table shows:

	Actual inspected Slaughterings July-Dec., 1944	Expected inspected Slaughterings July-Dec., 1945
Cattle	783,147	900,000
Hogs	3,627,468	2,500,000
Calves	306,672	350,000
Sheep and lambs	631,502	775,000

With respect to transportation facilities the United Kingdom Ministry of Food is prepared and able to provide ample shipping for all the meats we can export. The supply of refrigerator cars for movement to seaboard also presents no difficulties. There is therefore no reason to anticipate the kind of bottle-necks that occurred early in 1944.

For the current year, 1945, meat consumption per capita has been running at the rate of 145 pounds per annum. The scale of rationing is designed to reduce consumption to the annual rate of about 130 pounds per capita. This is a figure about twelve per cent below 1944 but about twelve per cent above pre-war.

It has occurred to me that, as I wish to make this brief statement presenting to the house the information requested, I might add a few words in which I might state in simple language, and without technicalities, the reasons why the government is rationing meat.

One must have some conception of the background of our relations with our allies during the war. From the beginning of the war this country tried to do its part in the struggle, and has been most conscientious, I believe, in doing so. We have been obliged and have found it advantageous and in the interests of all concerned to make what might be called partnership arrangements with other countries, particularly Great Britain and the United States.

The fundamental principle underlying these arrangements has been that each of these countries would bring forward and put into the common effort what it was able to bring forward. We have been dependent upon the United States, particularly, and to a smaller extent upon parts of the British commonwealth, for certain things we had to have which were vital to our very existence.

In that connection I might mention such non-food commodities as coal, gasoline and cotton, which we have obtained from the United States, and also sugar which we have obtained from American controlled sources of supply, and from various parts of the British empire. Our allies and partners have treated us with great fairness and have striven, as we have striven, so far as possible to base our contributions upon the principle of equality of sacrifice.

I believe I should read to the house, so that the picture may be somewhat clearer than I have been able to make it in these few words, an extract from a speech delivered over the radio the night before meat rationing was introduced. This was the speech of Mr. K. W. Taylor, foods administrator, who has been closely associated with the combined food board, and whose words carry weight in this connection. He said at that time:

Meat supplies are part and parcel of the whole international food problem. No country is completely self-sufficient in food. For example, we in Canada have surpluses of wheat, meat, dairy products and fish; but we depend upon other countries for all or most of our sugar, tea, coffee, cocoa, spices, rice, and practically all of our vegetable oils used in soap, shortening and salad dressings.

Most of these items are in short supply, and will be short for some little time yet to come. In order to see that the available world supplies are distributed as fairly as possible among the united nations three countries—Great Britain, the United States and Canada—set up a body in 1942 called the combined food board. Each year this board examines each of those food items which are in short supply, finds out what supplies are available, and then allocates these supplies fairly to all the countries that need them. Through this board each country is a receiver as well as a contributor. The success of the board—and it has been a notable success—depends upon each member country playing its part; that is, each country must make its maximum contribution to the common pool, in return for getting its fair share of things it needs but cannot produce.

If we want our fair share of sugar, tea, vegetable oils and many other imported foods, we must be prepared to contribute our fair share of meat, cheese, canned fish and other items which we have in abundance.

I can speak with some personal knowledge of the work of the combined food board, because I have been quite closely associated with it. For instance, earlier this year I had to spend several weeks in Washington assisting in the working out of the allocations for 1945. After a lot of very hard work, we reached a series of agreements, which set up our fair share both of the things we wanted and of things we should contribute to the pool.

In the case of meat, Canada undertook to do its very best to supply 225 million pounds of beef, 465 millions pounds of pork—

Which would include shipments to the British West Indies and Newfoundland.

—and 114 million pounds of canned meat. It has become clear in recent months that we will fall short of these obligations, unless more definite restrictions are placed on meat consumption in Canada.

It seems to me that the first reason why we should ration meat in Canada, and continue with the rationing we have introduced, is in the discharge of our obligations. These obligations are not clean-cut in the sense that contractual commitments are; but if we are to carry out the spirit, if not the letter—in this case it is both the letter and the spirit—of our understandings with our partners and allies, we must, I think, put forward reasonable endeavours to make available as much meat as we can, provided, of course, that we do not ask our people to accept any unreasonably low ration.

Apart altogether from that, if we had no commitments, if we had no such arrangements with our partners and allies as I have mentioned, I believe this country would want to do something along these lines for humanitarian reasons alone. As a country whose government must be internationally minded, as a country which is a great exporting country, as a country which has a good reputation and which must maintain that good reputation for breadth of view and humaneness in its attitude toward other countries, I think this country in its policy should have regard to humanitarian considerations. I have not the temperament or the language to make a powerful sympathetic appeal, but I think it is the sensible thing for this country to have regard to humanitarian considerations.

That brings us to the consideration of what the need is for meat in what we call the liberated countries. We have tried faithfully to get a picture of the situation and it seems to be something like this. In the United Kingdom the weekly meat ration is one shilling and two pence worth per person and three ounces of bacon. The bacon ration was reduced from four ounces to three ounces in May. I am told that the ration there is such that it makes possible only two or three decent meat meals a week. At any rate it is a small ration and it has been reduced. It will have to be reduced again if we do not come somewhere near fulfilling the undertakings I mentioned in the earlier part of my remarks.

In France the meat ration was reduced in May to 400 grams, which is fourteen ounces a month. The outlook is bleak and the shortage is the worst since the beginning of the war. In some areas the ration has been as low as the equivalent of one thin slice of ham each week, and sometimes even that is not available to the consumer. It will take about four years to build up the cattle herds to the pre-war level. Meat is not evenly rationed over the whole of France; it varies as between cities such as Paris, where our information is that the ration is about one-tenth pound a week, to other cities where it is about a quarter pound a week. In Saturday's papers there was a dispatch to the effect that the United Kingdom was flying some meat to Paris in an effort to relieve the great shortage of meat there. Those who are acquainted with conditions in France paint a very dark picture of the extent of anaemia, malnutrition and so on among the population. It is impossible to get statistics to bear that out; nevertheless that is the fact.

In Belgium the meat ration is thirty-five grams, which is just over one ounce a day. In Holland the ration at the present time, that is in September of this year, is reported to be one hundred grams or about one-fifth of a pound a week. In Greece and Yugoslavia meat is not rationed because no supplies are available. In Yugoslavia eighty per cent of the live stock has been destroyed by the enemy. In Czechoslovakia the ration is reported to be about ten ounces a week.

In a comparison of meat rations in the different European countries it is important to bear in mind that the official ration does not really indicate the amount of meat available to the individual consumer. Frequently no supplies are available to meet the ration, while at the same time many consumers supplement their rations by supplies obtained on the black market.

The representatives of a number of these European countries were interviewed just before meat rationing was instituted in Canada and the substance of those interviews was given to the press. It would take too long to read them all, but a summary was presented to the press in the form of a release by the wartime prices and trade board. This sets out the situation in Europe somewhat more graphically than do the figures I have just given. It reads:

> Tens of millions of people in the war-ravaged areas of Europe are starved for a taste of meat, a survey of conditions made through the embassies and legations concerned on the eve of meat rationing indicated last night.
>
> In countries like Greece and Yugoslavia there is no meat rationing, for there is no meat to ration. In Holland the ration is about one-fifth of a pound per person per week; in Belgium it is a little over an ounce per person per day; in Paris the people are entitled to one-tenth of a pound per person per week. But rationing, the representatives of these countries made clear, does not necessarily guarantee that the consumer will be able to buy the amount of the ration.
>
> The picture, except in degree, is the same in all the liberated areas to which Canadian meat will be going. Ambassador, minister, charge d'affaires representing the different countries told of the confiscation and annihilation of the live stock by the enemy so that herds were depleted. They told of malnutrition and disease resulting from famine; they told of the serious loss of strength and vitality on the part of the people. They pointed out that the live stock that remained were unfit for slaughter because they were lean and food for them was unavailable. They said it would take years to rebuild the herds and that the problem was complicated by fields sown with mines, lack of fertilizer and lack of farm implements.
>
> The most serious need in the liberated areas is meat, fats and dairy products, the representatives stated. Any meat that Canada can spare from her table to share with the starving millions, they emphsized, would help to repair the damaged bodies and restore the vitality necessary for the people to rebuild their countries.

In Belgium, which has been more fortunate than some of the other liberated countries, the Hon. Alexandre Paternotte de la Vaillée, ambassador to Canada, reported that the Germans had confiscated two-thirds or more of the cattle and that nine-tenths of the chickens had disappeared. Slaughterings, he said, were now forbidden because of the shortage of feed and in order to reconstitute the herds. He was deeply concerned over the health of the children; the number of tubercular children, for instance, had doubled.

J. J. Poelhekker, director of the Netherlands information service, related how people everywhere were being treated for hunger oedema. The Dutch, he said, had lost sixty per cent of their hogs, one-third of their dairy cattle, nearly all beef animals and eighty five per cent of their poultry.

In France, Michel Dumont, director of the French information service, said there were fifteen million people without enough food for normal requirements. Infant mortality is up fifty per cent over pre-war; anaemia affects fifty per cent of the children, tuberculosis is forty per cent higher. The situation in the cities is particularly bad. Sundays and legal holidays are the only days on which meat may be served in public eating places.

While conditions are appalling in many parts of France, Belgium and Holland, they are worse in the countries in southern Europe where Canadian meat is scheduled to go. In Greece, Yugoslavia, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Albania, to whom meat is being supplied through UNRRA, the health of the people has been so seriously undermined that very many deaths are still taking place due to starvation. In Greece, Philon Philon, charge d'affaires, reported that half the population was suffering from anaemia, recovery from which could be greatly aided through the vitamins and protein supplied by meat. One hundred per cent of the pigs have disappeared, ninety per cent of the dairy cows, sixty-five per cent of the oxen, sheep, goats and asses, and fifty per cent of the horses, mares, mules and buffaloes, he said. Pero Cabric, charge d'affaires, the Yugoslav legation, said, "We have nothing for ourselves, and we have nothing to help other countries which were dependent on us for much of their live stock. Eighty per cent of our stock was destroyed by the enemy."

Doctor Frantisek Pavlasek, minister from Czechoslovakia to Canada, stated that nearly everyone in his country was suffering from anaemia.

One after another of the representatives of the various countries expressed their gratitude to the Canadian people for sharing their meat supplies with the less fortunate peoples of Europe. Meat, they said, would help to restore both physical energy and national stability. As Doctor Pavlasek said: "When Canada rationed meat before, she did so in the interests of her own people. Now Canada is to have meat rationing to give help to the liberated countries of Europe. The moral uplift which this gives our people cannot be too strongly emphasized. This sacrifice has a great appeal to those who receive the help."

Therefore, on humanitarian grounds I believe we should continue with the rationing of meat. But there are other grounds as well.

[Mr. Ilsley.]

The economic recovery of the continent of Europe is in our interests, and political stability on the continent of Europe is also in our interests. We must not, if we can avoid it, let malnutrition and starvation arrive at such a stage that it generates revolutions and possible wars; nor must we allow the populations of these countries, if we can avoid it, to drift along in an aimless sort of way, not able to do the work they otherwise would do, and thereby postpone too long the economic recovery of these countries. I said before, and I say again, that this country is not a self-contained country at all. It is a world trader. It imports tremendously and exports tremendously, and must continue to import and export tremendously after the war. Therefore we have a selfish interest, if I may put it in that way, a prudential interest in the rapid economic recovery of the continent of Europe.

While the United States has not the same dependence upon foreign countries and is not as great a trading country per capita, I think the United States takes the same view. It has been said recently that it looks as if the United States would go off meat rationing. But the other day President Truman was reported as saying that the United States government would let nothing stand in the way of supplying the liberated countries with the supplies that they required to permit their recovery. I thought I had the press clipping but I do not seem to have it. Any official information that we have been able to get indicates that the United States intends to look at the matter in the same light in which we are looking at it and to continue to make available to the extent of its ability the food and other supplies required by the liberated areas.

I have not very much more to say to the house on this subject. We have a great many people in Canada who are impatient with this step that we are taking, and some of them even more than impatient with it. But that arises from a feeling that the war is over, so why continue these vexatious measures which might have been borne with toleration in time of war but which cannot be borne in time of peace? The war is over in one sense only. It is over in the sense that the shooting has stopped. But the consequences of the war in a very direct way are still with us.

This nation should not be a quitter. This nation should see the job through to the end. It cannot be said that we have seen the job through to the end when conditions such as I have described exist in so many of the liberated countries of Europe. I think our people, perhaps the majority of our people, are disposed to look at it in that way. If one were to get out his pencil and try to prove mathe-

matically that we would in the short run or in the long run gain materially by cutting our consumption of meat down from 145 pounds per person to 135 pounds, he might not be able to prove it. But when we act in character, when we keep our word, when we fulfil our obligations, when we act with humaneness and charity to other countries, when we help not only Canada but the world to some extent to get on its feet, I am sure that we are really adding to what I may call the national heritage. We are giving ourselves and our children and our children's children just cause to have pride in the fact that they are Canadians. We are making the name of Canada respected and honoured.

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Cariboo): Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that all hon. members will be in substantial agreement with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley), who has just completed his speech.

During this debate there has been, as is usual, a good deal of advice offered to the administration, and a good deal of criticism. It will be the duty of the government to pay due heed to the advice given, especially since it has all been given quite freely, and to attend to whatever good there may be in the criticism offered. I hope that the government will hear in the expressions of opinion from hon. members in all parts of this house the actual voice of the nation, and in hearing that voice I hope it will not hesitate to make alterations in its policy and introduce the legislation that may be required to meet the demands of the voice of the people of Canada.

I am naturally in entire agreement with the opinions expressed by my hon. leader and by other hon. members of the C.C.F. party, and of course I have found myself in agreement with many of the things that have been said by other hon. members.

The major themes of the speech from the throne, including such matters as reconversion, full production, an adequate income in the pockets of the consumers to buy that production which they are assured we are competent to produce—all these matters have been thoroughly covered by other hon. members, and I do not intend to repeat views which they have already expressed so adequately.

But I note that there is in the speech from the throne a significant sentence which seems to have escaped all other hon. members, at least those that I have heard speaking. I shall read it:

> . . . we seek to bring into being a new order founded upon world security and social justice.

I do not remember reading anything so imaginative, so daring as that, in any other speech from the throne. I remember as far back as 1921, when the great J. S. Woodsworth first came to this house, that was one of the reasons he came, to encourage and help the initiation of the new social order; and while that hon. gentleman in his day was highly respected by his contemporaries here because of his fine character, I can well remember how very often, when he made allusion to a new social order, he would be greeted with jeers and sarcasm. But now it is in the speech from the throne, written in by the Prime Minister, (Mr. Mackenzie King) and his cabinet: a new social order to be based on social justice and world peace. I have no knowledge of course to what extent the government propose to translate this rhetorical phrase into practical human life; but even though they should do little about this at this session I still welcome it as a harbinger of progress. I do not believe that this sentence would have been in the speech from the throne if the government had not been pretty well convinced that the people of Canada want a new social order. In putting that sentence in the speech from the throne the government has, I believe, correctly interpreted both the spirit and the temper of the Canadian people.

But I may suggest that the Canadian people will not long be satisfied with the new social order on paper, they will not be long satisfied with it in words. They will want that new social order to be translated into beautiful and comfortable homes for every family in the dominion; they will want it to be translated into higher living standards commensurate with our capacity to produce the wealth which is required for human life; they will demand that new social order in equality of opportunity in education, in equality of opportunity to obtain health services. They will require that new social order in new and better schools, in new and better hospitals, in more and better highways, in better bridges and railways and all the other things which go to make up an economy in which people live a fuller life.

The new social order promised is to be based on social justice. I believe that this phrase requires defining; I do not think I should take up the time of the house now in defining it, but I might say one thing which I believe most of us will agree that it is not. I do not believe any hon. member will regard it as being social justice that, for instance, this country's hydro electric power, its great mineral resources in coal and iron and copper and gold, its oil fields, its timber, its means of transportation,

its financial institutions, should be owned and controlled by private corporations for profit while great masses of the people are in want. That is the kind of social justice which we have witnessed in Canada heretofore. That is the kind of social justice spawned by free private enterprise. It was free private enterprise which we had in this country from confederation to the "hungry thirties"; and I hope that no member of this house will suggest that it is social justice to give the ownership and control of all the means of the life of this country, for an ulterior purpose, into the hands of private corporations. I hope we do not suppose that the profits of private corporations are of greater concern to the people of Canada in our coming new social order than the wages of the workers who work for such corporations.

Seeing, then, that it was free private enterprise which we suffered—not enjoyed—during the hungry thirties and prior to the war, there must be some change if we are to have the beginnings of that new social order which the government foreshadows in the speech from the throne. I welcome that pronouncement not only because I believe it is a true interpretation of the spirit and temper of the Canadian people, but because by implication it repudiates the pledges of the orthodox to adhere to free private enterprise; for as I have said, that was what we had before the war, that is what we have had throughout the war; and now we are to have something different. It cannot be free private enterprise, for in that case there would be no need of a new social order. So that there is to be a change.

Frankly, I am sceptical about the change. I do not see how any government that is pledged to retaining the very essence of the old order can be entrusted with the establishment and the building of a new. I am also a little bit sceptical about it because, if hon. members notice the phraseology, the government is going to "seek" a new social order, as if it were some elfish creature that was fond of hiding itself in dark corners for fear somebody might find it and in order that statesmen might spend their time in hunting it in a game of hide and seek. That is not the character of a new social order. A social order will have to be created if it is to be a new one. It will have to be created by us. It will have to be built by us. To the extent to which the government proposes to initiate that new social order which is adumbrated in the speech from the throne, to that extent, as my leader indicated, this group will be here to help them, and if they do not move in that direction we shall be here to push them to the best of our ability.

[Mr. Irvine.]

Speaking of this new social order reminds me of a humorous remark—it was humorous to me at least—made by an hon. gentleman who sits to my left. In his criticism of socialism he tried to argue that it should not be considered because it was so old. I have of course much respect for a great deal that has been said by hon. members to my left. I think they are to be congratulated on having brought to the attention of this house and of Canada a phase at least of our economic problems. But I would point out to my hon. friend that if he has no better argument against socialism than the one referred to he had better stop. Surely private enterprise, which he himself champions, is older even than socialism, which we have never had at all in this country. But I would say to him that if we are to have full production and ample income for every consumer in Canada it will take more than a monetary patch on the worn-out breeches of so-called private enterprise to bring it about.

As I wish to turn now to another subject, Mr. Speaker, would you mind calling it six o'clock?

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. IRVINE: When the house rose at six o'clock I was commenting on the statement in the speech from the throne that we might expect a new social order.

I turn now to deal with a matter of great urgency and great importance to the people of the riding of Cariboo. The matter on which I desire to speak now is not directly connected with any proposal in the speech from the throne, but it might appropriately be considered in connection with the rehabilitation programme of the government and the new social order we have been promised. The matter to which I refer is the outlet to the Pacific coast from the Peace River district. This is not by any means a new subject for this house. Mr. D. M. Kennedy, who represented the riding of Peace River from 1921 until 1935, made it his business to bring the subject before this house year after year, consistently. I believe he brought the question of the Peace River outlet before parliament thirteen times in thirteen years; and during eight of those years, from 1927 to 1935, he was ably assisted by Mr. John A. Fraser, who at that time represented the Cariboo riding. These two hon. gentlemen succeeded

in having a resolution passed favouring the building of that road. The motion, which was passed in 1933 and again in 1934 read:

That in the opinion of this house the Peace River country should be connected by a direct railway outlet to the Pacific coast when circumstances permit.

The words "when circumstances permit" were added as an amendment by the Minister of Railways of that day, as a sort of safeguard, which hon. members will appreciate. That resolution was passed during the hungry thirties, in the heydey of private enterprise, and a time when it might have been expected that works of this kind would have been undertaken. Speaking in this debate, the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore) had some pertinent things to say about the money complex. If he had been in the house at that time he would have seen a very fair illustration of what he was trying to bring to the attention of hon. members. I will quote the actual words of the Minister of Railways of that day, who said:

The total programme is still out of the question; I am quite frank about that. The people of Canada simply have not sufficient money at the present time to embark on a programme embracing anything like a complete Peace River project which would cost anywhere from thirteen to seventy-five million dollars.

That was the official view at that time in regard to the project, and according to the minister in charge, lack of money would appear to have been the only reason why the project was not carried out. But as the hon. member for Lethbridge pointed out, from 1939 up to the present time there has been no lack of money for much larger projects than this. Canada seemed to have no difficulty in finding and making the money when it had to.

As a matter of fact the reasons given for not building the railway at that time were the very reasons why it should have been built during the depression years. If that project, the St. Lawrence waterway project and a number of others had been undertaken, then we would not have had any depression in Canada; but that was not the official view of either party at that time. My predecessor, Mr. Gray Turgeon, as member for Cariboo I have no doubt was just as anxious to have this railway built as were any of the hon. gentlemen I have mentioned, but he had the misfortune to serve that constituency during six years of war, when of course it would have been inadvisable to enter upon a project of that kind, since there were so many more pressing problems facing the government. Now, however, we have come to a time when the excuses of the past have no meaning. No longer shall we be given the excuse of lack of money, I am sure, in regard to a project of this kind; and the war is no longer with us. The war is over, and we are entering upon what probably will be called the rehabilitation period, in which a project such as this should be welcomed and undertaken.

There is little of data or argument that needs to be added to the presentation made by hon. members for Peace River and Cariboo in years gone by, but I desire to summarize briefly the position as they set it forth, so that I may recall to the minds of hon. members who were in the house prior to the war the views and facts in regard to the Peace River outlet, and at the same time give newer members the situation as it now stands.

I shall begin by pointing out that all party leaders in this house and in previous parliaments at least since 1924 have, to my knowledge, gone on record as being in favour of this project. I am going to quote their pledges. They have been quoted before. If I recall aright, the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie) quoted the statements of leaders of that time dealing with this matter. I shall just quote them again in order to refresh the memories of those leaders who are still in the House of Commons, who pledged themselves to build this line. First I quote the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) who, speaking in Edmonton in 1924, said:

I pledge myself that as soon as it is humanly possible the great Peace River country will be given that measure of railway relief that will bring to the pioneers of that country the outlet they have been so long denied and will open up the country for prospective settlers.

An hon. MEMBER: Was that before an election?

Mr. IRVINE: Yes, getting pretty close to one. Then Right Hon. Arthur Meighen, speaking I think in Winnipeg in the same year, said:

I have always urged that the north country should have railway relief.

That is not much of a promise; it is like a fish winking at the bait. Then he went on to give a sort of clip on the ear to his opponent, when he said:

I cannot be accused of making futile promises such as the Honourable Mackenzie King promised in the speech from the throne at the opening of the last session of parliament, when he stated he was going to give railway relief to the north country but nothing has been done.

Then I come to the pledge given by Right Hon. R. B. Bennett, now Lord Bennett:

We pledge ourselves to the improvement of the whole scheme of Canadian transportation, northward by the completion of the Hudson bay route and the construction of such branches as may be necessary to render it most readily

available to every part of Canada; to the Pacific slope by a Peace River outlet and east and west by the development of the St. Lawrence waterway.

Then I come to the statement of the Minister of Veterans Affairs, which I believe he will stand by to-day:

I believe to-day, when we are going to consider entering upon gigantic projects of public works in the near future, there is, regardless altogether first of partisan considerations and second of the various reports that have been made by engineers, an obligation of honour resting upon this chamber to carry out the promises that were made as long ago I believe as 1924, ten years ago.

That is twenty-one years ago now.

There are other party leaders in the house. I cannot quote them, but I know they have gone on record as favouring this project. I know the hon. gentleman who leads the official opposition has gone on record as favouring the building of the Peace River outlet. My own leader has also definitely said that he was in favour of it. Then the hon. gentleman who sits to my left and who leads the Social Credit group is the member for the constituency of Peace River and, as all members will have noticed, he introduced the subject in his speech when addressing the house during this debate. He also made it clear that this would be one of the things he would strive to achieve while a member of the House of Commons.

So that this makes it unanimous, so far as party leaders are concerned. It is, Mr. Speaker, a matter of honour in this chamber; there is no question about that. But it is more than that; it is also a matter of urgent necessity for the people living in the territories concerned, and a matter of great importance to Canada as a whole. This is a local thing in one sense; but it is such a great "local thing" that it touches all Canada. I believe it has been the major issue in every election, provincial or federal in the Peace River district, at least since 1911, and undoubtedly the promises made have induced many settlers to come in there.

Those settlers have pioneered that great country under severe hardships, and while enduring almost unbearable difficulties. It is the duty of this parliament to see that the people living in the Peace River block, especially those in the Cariboo area, shall not suffer these difficulties any longer, and that they shall no longer have to nurse their disappointment.

Settlers from the dried-out areas of southern Alberta and Saskatchewan came into the area which the proposed railroad would serve. Those people had suffered extensively before they left their old homesteads. They have striven to build new homes in this new country, the Peace River block, and it is not reasonable to ask them to put up with any more misfortune.

As I say, this is not merely a local thing. Surely it is not presumptuous for me to suggest to the government that it is high time it adopted a definite national railways policy in respect of Canada, a policy which will see to it that every part of the community is reached and served, and it will not be a question then of whether this little branch or that little branch pays, but rather whether the whole system pays because of the service rendered to the nation.

It is a very extensive area which would be served by the Peace River outlet. According to a pamphlet issued by the Department of the Interior some years ago, there are 10 million economic acres in the Peace River area alone. Mr. Kennedy, when debating this matter in the house, said that this acreage would allow 6,000 economic acres for every mile of railway, whereas on the prairies only 5,000 economic acres are served by each mile of railway. In addition to that there are the territories which embrace the Prince George country; the Cariboo with its mining, and its extensive ranching, and the Lillooet country still farther south with its agriculture, fruit growing and mining.

The Peace River district therefore, is only a small part of the great territory to be served by a railway of this sort. The resources of the total area are vast and varied. As I have said, the hon. member for Peace River when introducing this subject, referred to the richness of the soil, the advantages of climatic conditions, the growing of all kinds of field crops, and the raising of live stock. The figures will verify his statements.

The 1943 agricultural census is not yet available, so that I cannot give the latest figures. But in 1934 Mr. Kennedy stated in the house that in that year twelve million bushels of wheat were raised in the Peace River country alone. In 1911 Sir Henry Thornton had promised that when the Peace River country produced ten million bushels of wheat for three years, or an equivalent tonnage, it would be economical to build the Peace River outlet. May I point out that the Peace River country alone has had that tonnage since 1925.

As to the quality of the grain raised in that area, one has only to refer to the fact that world championships have nearly all gone out that way. Eighteen world championships were won at Chicago in eight years following 1926, a fact which put Peace River in the forefront of the grain growing areas of the world.

British Columbia has published some facts about this area, and the adjacent country, which would be served by the railway. It speaks of one town, namely Dawson Creek, which has five huge grain elevators, and states that 2,000 head of cattle and 25,000 hogs are shipped out annually. The publication continues:

Hudson Hope area is noted for its mineral wealth, especially of the exceptionally fine Peace River coal and for its production of fur-bearing animals. It is rich in minerals with definite promise of oil production.

Then as a power site the possibilities of the canyon—

That is, the Peace River canyon, which would be tapped by this proposed railway.

—are outstanding. Engineers thoroughly familiar with projects of this nature, have expressed the view that the canyon is capable of developing power for a city of one million people.

Then, as to coal:

It is reliably estimated that in British Columbia Peace River district there is in the neighbourhood of three billion tons.

The coal is second to none and superior to most in any present producing or known field in North America.

It may be extracted at comparatively low cost and loaded in cars at a price permitting it to compete in any west coast port.

And as to timber:

British Columbia Peace River district is estimated to contain 48,000 acres of merchantable timber; 90,500 acres of immature timber of all species, about 160 million board feet in spruce and 32 million board feet in jack pine.

Then, summing up in respect to the resources of the British Columbia Peace River section, the government publication says:

While this folder devotes itself mainly to the agricultural aspects—the opportunities from the industrial standpoint are many and varied. The following suggest themselves as industrial enterprises for which the field is already ripe and waiting: Refrigeration plant, packing plant, dairy products, mill work, coal industry, oil industry and the pulp and paper industry.

Thus it will be seen that there is a vast area of very rich country to be tapped by the building of the Peace River outlet through the Peace River country to the coast.

In passing, might I mention the great productive possibilities of the Cariboo, with its mining and its ranching. That country has been served in a sort of way by a railway known as the P.G. and E. It is a railway which began in the middle, and goes nowhere at each end. I happened to attend a conference of cattle men in the town of Clinton last summer, and there was universal protest against the P.G. and E. for its failure to give proper service. Their greatest objection was the cruelty to the cattle in shipping and the shrinkage caused by the time taken.

I am going to propose to the government that this railroad be taken over as part of the Canadian National Railways; that it be built through along the coast to Vancouver or that it be built south to join with the Canadian National Railways; that it be extended in the north to join at Prince George and that a line be built from there into the Peace River. There would thus be provided an outlet for the Peace River people direct to the coast and a servicing of all that vast territory right through down the valley of the Cariboo.

That is a reasonable proposition. There have been many routes proposed for building this road, but to-night I am not particular about that. A route has been surveyed through the Aggie Obed pass, through the Monkman pass, through the Pine pass and through the Peace pass. At the moment I am not particular through which pass it goes so long as it goes through one of the passes. When the government decides to build the line I shall have something to say as to which pass it should go through, although I would be willing to leave that to the government engineers to settle.

There are rumours that the present government of British Columbia is proposing to offer part of the natural resources of the province as a bait to a private corporation to build this road. This may be just the ordinary pre-election stirring up that has occurred in British Columbia for many years. I have no doubt that some private company may grab this opportunity to get these natural resources, to some of which I have referred to-night. The people themselves want this railroad; they want it so badly that they may even be ready to have it built by a private corporation. However, I assure the house that if they had their way they would have it made part of the Canadian National Railways.

The people are entitled to this road as citizens engaged in economic pursuits essential to their own lives and essential to the whole national economy. They are entitled to it because of the large population which was settled in the area on the strength of promises made by every party leader in Canada for twenty-five years. They are entitled to it because of the volume of wealth that they are producing already, and they are entitled to it because of the possibility of greater wealth through new industries and untapped resources awaiting means of transportation. They are entitled to it, to use the words of the Minister of Veterans Affairs,

because it is a moral obligation. Promises to build this road have been made to the people who live in that section of Canada.

There is no question about the practicability of the proposal. There is no question about our ability to find the money. There is no question of the obligation. There is no excuse left to be used for not acting now to do this thing. Therefore I ask that the government include this project as part of its rehabilitation programme and that it proceed at the earliest possible moment to keep its promise to the people of the Peace River and Cariboo districts. It would be a splendid thing if in the crowning years of the Prime Minister's long period of service to the people of Canada he were privileged, not only to introduce a new social order to this country, but to fulfil his pledge to the people of the Peace River district and the people of the Cariboo district made in his election speech in Edmonton in 1924.

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with all those who have spoken in this debate in congratulating you upon having been chosen for the high honour which has been given to you by this house. I wish to associate myself with all those who have spoken in glowing terms of the speeches made by the mover (Mr. Benidickson) and the seconder (Mr. Langlois) of the address in reply. I wish particularly to associate myself with all the remarks of approval that have been made with regard to the speeches of many of the young men, particularly those who have been associated with the armed forces, who have come into this house for the first time. I think I can say without any fear of contradiction from any of the old-timers in the house that never in the experience of any of us has a more promising group of young men come into this house. I apply these remarks to members from all parts of the house who have spoken.

Having extended my congratulations to others, I think in extending a welcome to the fourteen new members from my own province I should congratulate myself upon being here at all. Since this debate began, a number of hon. members have suggested that I have reason to be thankful for the majority which was mine. I must admit that the road over which I travelled during the election was much more difficult than the one I travelled when I contested a constituency with the last speaker. On that occasion I entered this house for the first time as an elected member, and I wish to express to him my appreciation for the opportunity given to me to come here on that occasion.

[Mr. Irvine.]

The election through which I have just passed was made difficult for a number of reasons. One of these was the fact that I was one of I think seven candidates in Canada who had only one opponent. Under our system it is a little more difficult sometimes to get elected when you have only one opponent than it is when you have seven or eight. But when you are all through with such a campaign there is one thing that stands out: if you get here at all you must have had a majority. The fact is that I stand here as one of the minority in this house who reached the house through an absolute majority. With that majority small as it is I wish to address myself to the house on a number of questions which I think are of considerable importance, one of these being the question which was introduced into this debate for the first time by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) and which was spoken to this afternoon by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley).

Before proceeding to do so, I wish to put on the record one reason why my majority was not as great as it might have been. The hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Fleming), I think it was, called attention to something that he considered to be a fact—I do not know whether it was a fact or not—that some twelve members sitting on this side of the house owed their seats to the cooperation of the C.C.F. party. I can assure the house that I do not owe my seat to the cooperation of the C.C.F. party because, as they will all admit, I had the decided opposition of the C.C.F. Then, too, I had the opposition of my good old friends, the Conservatives. I think I got some of their votes, but that was through no fault of the party as this document which I have in my hand will demonstrate. I have here a circular letter which was sent to the whole mailing list of the Conservative party in my constituency. It opens with a news item in which this statement appears:

> The cabinet ministers being asked to speak in Neepawa include the Honourable J. G. Gardiner . . .

Then it continues:

> As you will note by this item that every effort is being made by the Liberals in the constituency of Neepawa to defeat Honourable John Bracken, so why not, "An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth?" . . .
>
> Why not, for once, defeat the Honourable J. G. Gardiner in the Melville constituency? It is not necessary to become a member of the C.C.F. party to vote Mr. Gardiner out of office on June 11, 1945.
>
> Sponsored by the Melville Progressive Conservative Association.

It is signed by the President: Philip Goll.

I put that on the record in order to assure the hon. member from Toronto that there is no doubt about how I was elected in the constituency of Melville. It was not with the cooperation of the C.C.F. party; It was not with the cooperation of the official Conservative party, although probably I had the votes of a number of Conservatives who did not agree with their own party.

Mr. COLDWELL: Who was the other member of that party besides the president in Melville?

Mr. GARDINER: There are not very many but there are some.

Having placed that on the record and cleared up any doubts as to whose support I had and whose opposition I had, may I proceed to a discussion of the address in reply to the speech from the throne; and in so doing I call attention to two or three statements made in that speech. On page 8 of *Hansard* of September 6 of this session, I find this statement in the speech from the throne:

> To the promotion of national well-being, cooperation and good will between the dominion and provincial governments are as essential as these attitudes, between nations, are to the maintenance of world peace and international prosperity.

That statement is made after the speech has reviewed the accomplishments of our armed forces and of our people during six years of war, and I am sure that those references in the speech are concurred in by everyone in the house.

The speech goes on to refer to the relationships which exist between the national government and the governments of the provinces, which by inference call attention to the relationships which exist between the peoples of the Dominion of Canada as such and the peoples of the different provinces. Coming as I do from Saskatchewan, I want to pay a particular tribute to one group of the population of that province which I shall not refer to as a class in that province but as a part of the citizenship of Saskatchewan and a part of the citizenship of the Dominion of Canada, and I wish to connect up my reference to them with this other statement which is made in the speech from the throne:

> The government also considers that it is advisable to revise and clarify the definition of Canadian citizenship, and to bring the legislation respecting national status, naturalization and immigration into conformity with the definition of citizenship. You will be asked to approve the required measures.

I know of nothing which I have heard more criticized during my association with the people of Saskatchewan throughout the more than thirty years in which I have represented a constituency in that province than the fact that it is very difficult for us to convince a court or any official organization in the Dominion of Canada that we have a right to call ourselves Canadians. Therefore I hope that when this legislation is brought down it will make it perfectly plain to everyone in this house and outside it that we as a people in Canada have at least the right to designate ourselves as Canadians wherever we may appear. In associating myself with that point of view, I wish to say something with regard to the service of our people in this war.

Our population in Saskatchewan is composed to about forty-six per cent of people who came there from the continent of Europe or whose fathers and mothers came from the continent of Europe. I have in my constituency people who have come from every nation that has been fighting in this war on one side or the other, and they all want to be called Canadians. I want to say to this house now what I could not have said during the war—and I emphasize it now because we could not speak as openly during the war as we can now—that I want to associate myself with everyone in Saskatchewan and everyone outside it who have throughout this war resented the position that was taken in relation to the first great war and in relation to this, that men who have been naturalized as Canadian citizens were called upon to report to the mounted police throughout the last war and in the early period of this war. That is one of the reasons why we in Saskatchewan want to be designated as Canadians and feel that we ought to be treated as Canadians.

In addition, I wish to associate myself with those who during this war found themselves called up to serve in the N.R.M.A. forces or any other place when they had to submit to the indignity of having their parents told that they were aliens and could not receive naturalization in this country because they could not read or write either the English or the French language. Any parents in Canada who are willing to be citizens of this country and who are prepared to raise sons who enter the armed forces of this country ought to be considered capable of becoming Canadian citizens, whether they can read or write or not.

In order to impress upon the house my point of view in relation to these matters at this time, when we are congratulating ourselves upon the service which has been given by our people throughout the length and breadth of the land, may I say that when I look for the record of the heroes of this war

I do not look among the civilian population, many of whom are to be congratulated upon their very great and effective service in helping to prosecute the war. When I look for the heroes in this war I do not look in the headquarters staff or in the groups of men extending from the city of Ottawa to the city of London, filling important official positions, which are necessary in connection with the administration of affairs having to do with the war. Nor do I look in the N.R.M.A. forces or in the forces of those who have volunteered but who for one reason or another have not found it possible to get to the front lines. All glory and all honour to them for having attempted to do so in their own way. I look for the real heroes of this or any other war in the front lines, in the air, on the land and on the sea, and when one puts that test to the people of Saskatchewan I do not care whether the man says, "Me no speak English". While a little over forty per cent of the population of our province bears the names of nationalities that had their origin on the continent of Europe, a little under forty per cent of the men who gave their lives for this country from Saskatchewan bear those same names. That to me, Mr. Speaker, is the reason why I glory with these people in the fact that they can come to me and you and say: I have lost my son, too. We are all on common ground; we are all on a common level; we all have given a common service, and out of that common service have come all the honours that are due to all men who have served overseas, whatever their nationality or however they got to the front line.

Having said these things with regard to the war itself and our association with it from the province of Saskatchewan, may I call to your attention the fact that there is another matter here which has been referred to indirectly on a number of occasions. A bill to merge the Department of Munitions and Supply and the Department of Reconstruction into a single Department of Reconstruction and Supply will be introduced. If I understand that bill correctly, it is a bill which sets up a department to be presided over by the minister who down to the present has been the Minister of Munitions and Supply, a department which is to be provided with funds in very much the same way as the defence departments were provided with funds during the war, and other departments of government which are associated with reconstruction will have to convince those connected with that department of the necessity for doing certain works in which they are interested in order to have an expenditure of money made upon them.

In so far as my own department is concerned, one of the outstanding ventures upon which we have been urging that money should be spent, and for the expenditure of which we have had the support of quite a number of hon. members from western Canada who have spoken up to the present time, is the expenditure of money upon water conservation and irrigation. In my reference to this I include hon. members of every party, because the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act was introduced first in 1935 by my predecessor the Minister of Agriculture in the Bennett government, and one hon. member sitting opposite was a member of the first committee appointed and remained a member of that committee until he became a member of this house after I took over the Department of Agriculture. We have had it constantly urged by those from western Canada who belong to other parties that the rehabilitation work under this act is most important. Therefore I would say that while, since I took over the department, we have spent $20 million upon irrigation work and the re-grassing of lands and the fencing of sub-marginal lands, we look upon that as only the beginning of a very important development in the western part of Canada. I can assure the house that the support which has been given to these operations up to now has been greatly appreciated by those associated with me in this work.

I said in the beginning that one of the reasons why I wished to speak to-night was to deal with a question which has been before this house in one form or another during the greater part of this session. It has to do with meat. In order to have meat at all you must have it produced, and our association in the Department of Agriculture with meat is that we are responsible for direction in connection with policies having to do with its production.

In order that I may place the facts with regard to meat production before the house, I consider it advisable that I should recall one or two of the criticisms which have been made of policies followed down to the present time. The first of these I find in the speech of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken), when he stated, as reported in *Hansard,* at page 31:

> If there is need for rationing, the government is, to a great extent, responsible for it.

In leading up to that statement the leader of the opposition dealt with the matter of price for hogs in relation to prices of grain, and called attention to the fact that we have a

reduction in hog production in Canada in 1945 as compared with 1944. I wish to deal for a few moments with the position taken.

The leader of the opposition raised three questions: the need for rationing, government Policy on production, and the relation of price to production.

With regard to the first, the need for rationing, I think it is unnecessary that I should say very much to-night. This afternoon the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) gave the house the statistics with regard to our position, and in giving them placed before hon. members the real reasons for the establishment of rationing in Canada. But I want to put the matter in the manner in which I heard it put yesterday by the minister of one of our leading churches in presenting the same problem to his congregation; and in putting it in the manner he did, he said he was only repeating the statement of a leading minister from New York who spoke the other day in Toronto. What he finally said was this, that after we have produced all the food we can produce in Canada and in the United States; after there has been produced in the other countries of the world which are favourable to such action, all the food that they can produce, and after we have rationed ourselves to the limit, according to our present information over 300,000 children will die in Europe this winter for want of food. Statements of that kind may not have as much of reasoning behind them as some of the facts which we present in this house, but they appeal to the hearts of the people of Canada as they do to the hearts of the people of the United States. I know that the flying men who flew over Europe thought more of the children whose lives they might save in the end than they did of anyone else. I know that the fighting men and those who sailed the seas had the same feeling; all one had to do was to look at the many pictures brought back from the front and placed upon the screen, in order to see that anyone who desired to work upon the feelings of our people had only to place before us a little child; and if over 300,000 children in Europe are threatened with death this year, the question of whether there should or should not be rationing should not worry us very much if we feel that rationing and production will provide them with more food.

As a matter of fact the question which arises in this regard is whether rationing interferes with production. Some people argue that it does; some argue that it does not. But the government has decided that, whether it does or not, there will be a greater amount of food supplied to the needy nations under rationing because of the reductions in consumption than would be kept from the people of Europe because of any reductions in production owing to the fact that we have rationing; therefore, on balance, more food will be available under rationing.

That is the first point I wish to make in connection with this discussion, namely that rationing would have been necessary to meet the shortage in Europe, no matter what the production.

I have before me this evening the figures of production. I have the facts with regard to the accomplishment of farmers in Canada in meat production during the war. In answering the question as to what are the facts, I shall confine myself to two main classes, namely, beef and pork. There have been similar results in the others. The table which I am going to ask the privilege of placing upon *Hansard* is one that indicates production, exports and estimated consumption from 1938 to 1945. If I have the permission of the house I will put it on *Hansard*, as follows:

Production and Distribution of Meat

	Beef			
Year	Total production [1]	Exports [2]	Used for canning and by non-civilians	Total for civilian consumption [3]
	000 lb.	000 lb.	000 lb.	000 lb.
1938	700,478	67,096	1,274	638,184
1939	714,002	102,897	1,972	599,151
1940	717,467	77,921	32,639	614,931
1941	812,073	99,327	49,344	654,550
1942	822,530	94,735	60,123	671,592
1943	892,969	43,343	69,411	774,157
1944	960,991	165,323	78,727	695,228
1945 [4]	1,008,146	162,678	158,896	686,572

[1] Source.—Official figures of Dominion Bureau of Statistics on Meat Production. Estimated dressed carcass weight of animals slaughtered in Canada plus estimated dressed weight of animals exported alive.

[2] Exports of carcass beef plus exports of live cattle converted to a carcass basis.

[3] "Civilian consumption" does not take into account what was used by non-civilians or the amount used for canning.

[4] Estimate.

Production and Distribution of Meat—*Conc.*

Year	Pork			
	Total production [1]	Exports [2]	Used for canning and by non-civilians	Total for civilian consumption [3]
	000 lb.	000 lb.	000 lb.	000 lb.
1938	587,927	178,885	4,074	420,459
1939	625,689	195,432	6,304	432,776
1940	865,404	353,884	27,769	504,900
1941	1,060,761	486,755	48,012	520,563
1942	1,189,098	538,234	71,157	596,556
1943	1,395,705	588,780	97,852	681,557
1944	1,504,586	719,043	131,386	691,608
1945 [4]	1,149,969	451,117	55,875	627,917

[1] Same as note [1] above.
[2] Exports of pork (fresh, cured and dry salted) dressed carcass basis plus exports of live hogs converted to dressed carcass basis.
[3] Same as note [3] above.
[4] Estimate.
Note.—Apparent discrepancies in these figures are accounted for by year end carryovers of meat.

These statistics show that our production of beef went up from 700,080,000 pounds to over one billion pounds between 1938 and 1945. They show that production of hogs went up from over 587,000,000 pounds to over 1,504,000,000 pounds in 1944 and dropped back to 1,149,000,000 pounds in 1945. They show that exports of beef to the United States and the United Kingdom went up from 62,000,000 pounds in 1938 to over 158,000,000 pounds in 1945, while our exports of pork went from 178,885,000 pounds in 1938 to 719,000,000 pounds in 1944 and dropped back to 451,000,000 pounds in 1945. Of course, that last figure is an estimate. These figures show that our domestic consumption of beef and pork rose from 1,058,643,000 pounds in 1938 to 1,386,836,000 pounds in 1944 when not under control, and we estimate will fall to 1,314,489,000 pounds under controls in 1945.

In other words, while our production was doubling, our consumption, with all the purchasing power and freedom of purchase this country can ever hope for, increased by about 33 per cent. This would tend to show that the home market does not and will not for many years consume our possible production.

These figures show that production of meat in 1943 was approximately the same as is estimated for 1945 and that exports will be greater in 1945 and home consumption less. If one were to take the 1942 figures and compare them with 1945, the results would be even more favourable. The figures for the year 1942, the complete year 1943, and the complete year 1945 . . .

An hon. MEMBER: 1944.

Mr. GARDINER: . . . 1945, established the peak production of meat which is possible under normal conditions upon our farms. The year 1944 was an abnormal one in hog production and cannot be considered as anything else in establishing a sound agricultural policy for this country; and in order to show why that is so it will be necessary for me to place other statistics on *Hansard* with regard to grain production. The figures are as follows:

Production of grain crops in Canada 1938-44
(Millions of bushels)

	Wheat	Oats	Barley
1938	360·0	371·3	102·2
1939	520·6	384·4	103·1
1940	540·1	380·5	104·2
1941	314·8	305·5	110·5
1942	556·6	651·9	259·1
1943	284·4	482·0	215·5
1944	435·5	499·6	194·7
*1945	321·4	388·2	161·1

* First estimate Sept. 5/45.

Live stock production and finishing of live stock in Canada depends upon grain production in Canada. Eastern farmers never do produce and cannot produce the feed grains necessary to feed all the live stock they have facilities and other feeds for. Live stock production is therefore limited by the production of feed grains in western Canada. The general production figures for the same years are contained in the table which I have just placed on *Hansard* and which is much shorter than the previous one.

It will be noted that the production of oats and barley in 1942 was more than double that of any previous year. It will also be noted that wheat production was only slightly lower in two previous years if hon. members will refer to the table I have placed before the house.

Those who claim that wheat production has been encouraged at the expense of live stock production should also note that the reduction in wheat production for the years following 1942, as compared with those before,

is much greater than the reduction in feed grains. In other words, these statements made with regard to the trends in the production of meats and other live stock products as compared with wheat are largely picked out of the air and based upon nothing.

Prior to 1942, when we were producing from 305,000,000 to 384,000,000 bushels of oats annually and from 102,000,000 to 110,000,000 bushels of barley, we completed the period right down to July 31, 1942, with only one month's carryover of feed for the live stock we had in this country. Therefore everyone who wanted greater live stock production in order to assist in the war was delighted when in 1942 we came to the end of that season with twice as much feed grain as we had ever produced in this country in any one year previously. It is that feed grain which we produced in 1942 which has not only carried this country to the greatest heights of production in live stock products which it has ever experienced but helped to carry the United States to the same heights of production in order that we might be able to place at the disposal of Britain and her allies the supplies of meat necessary to feed her armies and her civilian population. But in doing that, hon. members will note by the figures which have been placed before the house, the production of coarse grains has gone down year by year since 1942. Some people say, "Yes; that is because you have encouraged the production of wheat."

But the production of wheat has gone down even more than that of coarse grains. I have heard men in this house, since this debate began, calling attention to the fact, or stating that it was a fact, that because hog production is down the income of farmers in Canada is down. The income of farmers from live stock in 1945 as compared with 1944 is down by $14,000,000, but the income of farmers on grain production is down by $44,000,000. In other words, our grain production has been going down year by year since 1942, with the result that we enter the year 1945-46 with only two months' supply of feed grains in the bins of the country, sufficient to feed the live stock we have for two months. On top of that we have the most limited production of grain we have had in the dominion for some years and particularly since 1942.

That brings me to this statement, that when we are considering a policy for agriculture in a country like Canada, with 700,000 farmers, the best policy for us to follow is one of placing the facts before the farmers from one end of the country to the other well in advance of the new season, and we have been doing that in December of the previous year, ever since the war started, and then telling them our desires and asking them to try to meet those desires.

I am sure the leader of the opposition will agree with me when I say that no man knows more about how to run a farm than the man who milks the cows. I am quite sure he will agree with that. The man who milks the cows and feeds the pigs, if he has all the information, knows more about how to run a farm than anyone else. When 700,000 farmers see their bins filled to capacity they increase their production. When 700,000 farmers look into their bins and see their supplies going down day by day, week by week and month by month, the only sensible thing for them to do is to try to feed fewer live stock. So we have tried to place the earnings from live stock on approximately the same basis as the earnings from grain. Then we have said to the farmers, take stock of your conditions. When you have taken stock remember that until now you could sell every pound of any live stock product you produced, but until now you have found it difficult to market your wheat in the volume you have been producing it. Therefore we have said the tendency ought to be to get down on wheat and up on feed grain and live stock production. In 1943-44 hog production increased because the bins were overflowing.

But no farmer can produce more live stock without grain; and I can say to the house now, without fear of contradiction from any farmer in Canada, that unless we have a more bountiful crop in the summer of 1946 than we have had in the summer of 1945 it will be absolutely impossible for our farmers to increase their live stock production before the end of 1946.

With these facts before us we came to the conclusion that while it was all very well to use the argument last spring in February, March and April that rationing might reduce production we are now looking at the present crop; and we know that meat production cannot be immediately increased. We know that the statement made in the question asked me the other day was absolutely correct. In western Canada this year we have the poorest crop we have had since 1937. For an area taking in almost half the Saskatchewan grain growing area and a little more than half the Alberta grain growing area the crop this year is poorer than during any of the 1930's with the exception of 1937. With that fact before us we know there is not the grain in this country to produce more live stock, even

if we had all the other facilities necessary for such production. So that our policy for 1945-46 must be governed by those facts.

Then I said that one other question had been raised, having to do with price as related to production, and I wish to take a few moments to deal with that point. At page 28 of *Hansard* the leader of the opposition is reported to have said:

> Some two years ago the government announced an export equalization bonus of fifteen cents per bushel for barley and ten cents for oats. Immediately farmers started to cut down hog production.

Then a little further down the same page he said:

> This is chiefly due to the government's policy of keeping hog prices so far out of line with feed prices as to discourage hog production.

I have already attempted to show the house that the real reason for the decrease in hog production is associated with the fact that grain supplies have been going down steadily. I personally went to the United States twice in 1943, when the Americans were pleading for more feed with which to feed their live stock, and announced to them that we had 900,000,000 bushels of grain stored in our elevators and on our farms in Canada. As a result of those two trips we did make an arrangement under which, in the fall of 1943, our grain went to the United States in great volume to assist in the finishing of their cattle as well as our own. In making that arrangement we provided for these bonuses upon feed grain. One only needs to quote the figures, which are published weekly and are available to all farmers and agricultural experts throughout the country, to indicate that the policy followed does not keep hog prices out of line with feed prices. The last issue put out by the meat board on September 20, 1945, gives these figures:

Hog-feed ratios	Hog-barley Winnipeg	Hog-feed Toronto
Long-time average..	17·4	6·7
Last week.....	22·9 (19·5)	7·7 (8·3)
Previous week	22·9 (19·5)	7·7 (8·3)
August, 1945	22·5 (20·6)	8·0 (9·1)

Note: Figures in brackets indicate ratio when 15 cents added to barley price at Winnipeg and dominion premium on hogs added to price at Winnipeg and Toronto.

I am sure every authority in this house will agree when I say that before the war, when that ratio was above 17·4, which was the long-time average, it was always considered that it paid a man to feed the barley to the hogs rather than to sell it. Since the beginning of the war, however, because of the higher cost of labour, we have been inclined to say that the figure where farmers would question hovered somewhere around 20, which is about the position of those in western Canada who have had grain to sell, if you add the 15 and 10 cents to the ceiling prices. The ratio was 19·5 last week and the week before and 20·6 for the month of August. In other words, the relationship as between barley and hogs in western Canada is almost exactly what it ought to be to permit of farmers deciding, to feed or sell barley, and that is where we have been trying to keep it.

This simply means that a farmer in the west must make a decision, and must have an argument with himself as to whether it pays best to feed barley or to sell it, and that is exactly the position in which we wanted him. The reason is that the farmers of eastern Canada, from lake Huron to the Atlantic, cannot grow sufficient grain with which to feed their live stock. They must get it from western Canada. If we should create conditions in the west under which all the grain was to be kept there, these live stock men in the east would have to go without their barley, and the extent to which they would get out of hog production would reduce production in this country very much more than would be the case if a number of farmers on the western plains decided to sell a certain quantity of barley rather than to feed it. So that we say our policy has benefited feed grain prices as compared with live stock prices to the extent necessary to make it possible for us, over the whole period of the war, to set an all-time record for the production of live stock and live stock products throughout the dominion.

Now, for a moment I wish to call attention to the contracts with Britain, because, after all, those contracts have established the floors right from the beginning of the war down to the present time. We have made six contracts so far, and I want to give the figures for the first five, because they bear upon the statement made by the leader of the opposition, who said we gave a sort of belated support to the hog producers by making possible a $3 premium on grade A hogs in the spring of 1944. Well, we did more than that, as the figures will show. The British contracts have set the floor prices of hogs since the beginning of the war. The first was on the basis of $17.70 per one hundred pounds of bacon and ham. The second opened at $17 and closed at $19.60. The third was on the basis of $19.90; the fourth was at $21.95 and the fifth at $22.70. That will indicate that there was an increase of seventy-five cents in the 1944 con-

tract, as compared with 1943. In addition to that, the government paid a premium of $3 and $2, which made the increase to the farmer as great as the average increase in any previous contract. And that was the contract signed eventually to cover the period down to December 31, 1946. So to-day we are committed to send to Great Britain not less than 450 million pounds of bacon and ham, based upon that particular price. The table I have already placed upon *Hansard* will show that we estimate at this time that with rationing we shall probably be able to send to Great Britain about 451 million pounds. This is very much less than the 717 million pounds we sent in 1944; but the 717 million pounds we sent in 1944 amounted to just about 75 million pounds more than anybody ever expected we would be able to send. It was our abnormal year.

If we in the Dominion of Canada can produce 450 million pounds of bacon a year over and above what we require in this country, for the years that are ahead of us we shall just about be able to supply that part of the British market which we hope to retain after this war is over. Therefore we are asking every farmer in this country who has been accustomed to produce hogs, who likes to produce hogs, who has the facilities for producing hogs, and who can produce hogs on the present return—and more particularly if he can produce them at a lower return, and still make a profit—to stay in the business and help us to retain that market which we have done so much to build up during this period of war.

May I say in conclusion that we have made exactly the same kind of arrangement with regard to cattle. That contract extends down to December 31, 1946. There is no one in Canada who needs to have any fear that the price will be cut in the marketing of these live stock products between now and the end of 1946, below the minimum which the contract establishes, if the stock is marketed orderly and the plants operate at capacity.

After that we have the floor price measure to help us. After that we have family allowances. After that we have all the social services that have been organized by this government for the Dominion of Canada.

We are asked: How are we going to finance it?

Not by policies that have been presented to this House of Commons by the socialists; not by policies that have been presented to this house by the Social Crediters; not by policies that have been presented to this house by the official opposition.

We intend to meet that problem by the good old policy of Liberalism. It is based, it is true, upon Manchestrian free trade, as our C.C.F. friends claim. But, Mr. Speaker, it is on the revised edition of it—brought out first in 1906 by Lloyd George, applied to Great Britain in the form of unearned increment taxes—about which my honourable friend from The Battlefords (Mr. Campbell) spoke the other day; applied through income taxes upon earnings; applied through unearned increment taxes of all kinds.

Mr. ROWE: The highest protection we have ever had!

Mr. GARDINER: We in the Dominion of Canada have followed the same plan from the time the present leader of the Liberal party became its leader down to the present time. During the war we have developed it to a point to which it has never been developed by any other country in the world.

Mr. ROWE: Because nobody understands it.

Mr. GARDINER: Well, my hon. friend does not understand it.

Mr. ROWE: Neither do you.

Mr. GARDINER: His thoughts are governed by old-time Tory doctrines. He never looks at it with the mind of one who could understand Liberalism.

Mr. ROWE: The highest protection we have ever had!

Mr. GARDINER: The people of the world understand it; other nations of the world understand it.

Mr. ROWE: But you do not.

Mr. GARDINER: And they have eulogized this government and this country upon the great assistance we have given in the prosecution of the war. How has it been done?

Mr. ROWE: By noise.

Mr. GARDINER: The people of the world understand it; other nations of the world understand it, and they have eulogized this government and this country upon the great assistance we have given in the prosecution of the war. How has it been done? While my friends opposite have been talking about doing something, this government has gone into the treasuries of big business and small business and taken out all unusual profits in the form of excess profits taxes, in the form of corporation income taxes, and in the form of individual income taxes. In the total they have taken out $1,600 million. We have spent a great part of it to perform those services which every one in this house who has spoken

has eulogized, in prosecuting the war in the manner in which it has been prosecuted. They have spent another part of it in providing funds to establish social services; and the final effort of the government in that direction has been the placing of floor prices under farm products, to the extent of $200 million, and the placing of opportunity in the hands of the people of Canada to attain purchasing power, by distributing $250 million in family allowances.

So that Liberals, as usual, have been acting while others have been talking. I submit that the expenditures we have arranged for will not take all the $1,600 million, and that therefore it is still possible to lower taxation and perform the services.

Mr. COLDWELL: Just to have one point clear, I should like to ask the minister a question. He has mentioned figures concerning exports of meat. Did those figures include exports to our armed forces, or do they appear elsewhere?

Mr. GARDINER: Well, I think all the meat which went overseas was included in the agreement we made with Great Britain.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is, Great Britain supplies our troops overseas.

Mr. GARDINER: That is my understanding of it, that under the agreement all bacon and beef that go overseas go over under this agreement.

Mr. COLDWELL: And go to our army afterwards.

Mr. GARDINER: They are included in those figures.

Mr. C. E. STEPHENSON (Durham): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak for the first time in the House of Commons I wish to say I consider it an honour to be one of its new members, and trust that I shall be capable of contributing in some small measure to the task of governing this great country of ours, Canada.

First, permit me, sir, to congratulate you upon being elected to the high office you now hold. Upon assuming the office of Speaker of the House of Commons on the opening day of the session perhaps you felt slightly nervous, as I do at the present time.

To the two new supporters of the government who moved and seconded the address in reply, and who so recently served in His Majesty's forces, may I also add my congratulations.

With the kind indulgence of hon. members I shall endeavour briefly to express my views on a few matters which I consider are of paramount importance at the present time.

Many hon. members who have spoken during this debate have referred to their constituencies—their locations, their industrial production and their human and economic problems. In this way we in the central provinces of Canada have learned something of the eastern and western provinces and the conditions that there exist. We have thus all been enabled to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the over-all problems we shall be called upon to deal with in the near future. Therefore I should like to say a few words about the district, and particularly the county I have the honour to represent.

Durham county, one of the fine counties in Canada, is situated in Ontario about 225 miles west of this city. It fronts on the north shore of lake Ontario. Durham is predominantly an agricultural county and it contains many fine farms where the raising of pure bred stock is carried on. There are also many fine orchards in the county which grow some of the finest apples in Canada. About five years ago it was discovered that there was a fairly large acreage suitable for the growing of tobacco and to-day tobacco growing has developed into a large industry.

Scattered throughout the county are several prosperous towns and villages. News is supplied to Durham county by weekly and daily newspapers, one being the finest weekly in Canada, the Bowmanville *Statesman*. There is one daily paper, the Port Hope *Guide*, which has been published continuously since 1831. In the large centres are situated several factories, one being a large rubber industry which produces great quantities of synthetic tires. Other factories produce plumbers' supplies, conveyers, fertilizers and other commodities. Located in Durham county is the only file factory in the British empire.

Here also is located a great radium refinery that contributed much to the making of the atomic bomb which brought the fanatical Japanese nation so speedily to its knees and won a victorious conclusion of the war for the allied nations. Hon. members may be interested in hearing something of the part the radium refinery in Durham county played in the making of the atomic bomb. Some years ago while prospecting in the Northwest Territories Mr. Gilbert Labine landed his plane near Great Bear lake and by following around the east coast of the lake discovered a vein of pitchblende ore from which radium is refined. The discovery was of great interest not only to Canada but to the whole world, because it was well known that only a few countries in the world possessed deposits of pitchblende ore.

Shortly after the discovery was made a refinery was built in Durham county. The concentrated pitchblende ore was flown out by plane to the head of the great lakes and shipped from there to the refinery. Monsieur Marcel Pochon, who I understand is the only living pupil of Madame Curie, the great scientist, came to Canada to take charge of the new refinery which in a few years was supplying the rare metallic element known as radium to the world. Also produced from pitchblende ore is the heaviest element known, uranium. This was produced in quantity at the refinery and was first used for the glazing of earnthenware, but we are now given to understand that it is from this element that the atomic bomb was created.

It may be asked why the refinery was located in Durham county when the pitchblende ore deposits were hundreds of miles away up at Great Bear lake. As explained to me, the reason is that it requires about seven times the amount of chemicals in weight for the refining process as the weight of the concentrated ore itself, and it is therefore more economical to fly the ore out from Great Bear lake than to transport the necessary chemicals to the location of the pitchblende deposits. We have all read of the might and destruction of this new discovery, which is almost incomprehensible. While we are fervently thankful it was the scientists of the united nations who first learned how in some measure to control this energy, let us hope that it will be controlled so that in the future it may be used, not for destruction but for the good of all mankind. I trust that what I have had to say of Durham county has been of interest to hon. members.

With regard to the conditions and problems that face the people of Canada, I believe at the present time the housing situation is of first importance. The need for houses is desperate, and especially is this so in the county I represent. With your permission, sir, I should like to read from an article which appeared in the Bowmanville *Statesman* of September 6. This reads:

> Too little and too late has been the charge most frequently laid against the Ottawa government. Its recent emergency orders covering the housing situation have come too late for at least one returned soldier of this town. Here is the story. Born in Bowmanville this lad enlisted the week war broke out. Married in England, he fought in Italy, was captured, suffered from malaria in a German prison camp, was repatriated, got a job at home. His wife and small child rejoined him here, have since lived in temporary, emergency quarters. With winter coming on they have sought to find a suitable home.

But none were available. The article continues:

> His reaction was as characteristic as the impulse which led him to enlist. He resigned his job and has booked passage with wife and child to return to England. There, among friends still suffering war's privations they will seek both a job and a home. These are the simple facts in the case, just one case by the way, that points to the indifference of a government and a people whose boast was that we should make this land fit for heroes to live in.

The rehabilitation committees and building contractors are doing their best to alleviate these conditions, but they find they are running into difficulty because no priorities for building materials have been granted to build veterans' homes. This being the case, why does the government not come out and make a plain statement to the public as to the actual conditions that exist? No doubt thousands of letters are being written every day to the various departments of government and to members of this house making futile efforts to find out the real answer to this housing problem.

There also seems to be no understanding in the smaller municipalities as to just how the various housing schemes work. I have had several individuals and small contractors write me to inquire, "Where do we go from here?" It is true there has been different housing legislation enacted and published, but what could John Jones, say, learn from reading subsection 27 of section 2 of the National Housing Act, which reads:

> (27) "Minister" means the Minister of Finance and includes, in paragraph 6 of this section, paragraphs (b), (c), (g), (i), (j) and (k) of subsection 2 of section 4, paragraphs (a), (f), (g), (h), (i), and (j) of subsection 2 of section 8, subsection 2, paragraphs (a), (b), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), (j), and (k) of subsection 3 and paragraphs (a), (c), (e) and (g) of subsection 4 of section 9, paragraphs (a), (c) and (d) of subsection 2 and paragraph (a) of subsection 3 of section 11, paragraphs (a) and (b) of subsection 2 of section 12, paragraph (a) of subsection 1 of section 14 and subsection 1 of section 15 of this act, a person designated by the minister to act on his behalf.

This may be good practice in learning the alphabet, for it seems that only a few letters are left out, but I imagine John Jones will be asking the $64 question, "Who is what?"

It must be remembered that the men interested in building houses are business men, not Philadelphia lawyers, and I suggest that simple and concise instructions be published to guide them, with regard not only to housing but all other government rules and regulations with which the ordinary business man must deal and to which he is subjected. I

venture to suggest that if free enterprise were given a free hand we would soon have the houses built which are so urgently needed.

I should also like to deal for a short time with the subject of controls. It is but reasonable that in war time any government is justified in setting up certain central controls. Such controls were set up by the present government, and it might be said that on the whole the people of Canada complied with the regulations admirably, in spite of all with which they had to contend. The government has informed us that these controls are being removed as speedily as possible, but that some will have to be retained and perhaps other emergency controls added. We trust that this is not just a way to retain these bureaucratic offices. No doubt many hon. members have been amazed at the attitude of some of those who were appointed as inspectors and officers in charge of the wartime prices and trade board offices throughout the country. These appointees were no doubt put in their offices to assist the public and to serve the people, but many have assumed the role of dictator. To bear out my statement, I will cite an incident which happened in my constituency.

The roof blew off a building in which were stored perishable goods. The owner went to the wartime prices and trade board office with the request that he be granted enough roofing to replace the damage. After considerable humming and hawing the answer was: "Why do you guys have to bother me on a hot day like this? I will think about it."

Another instance. I appealed to the board on behalf of a man in my constituency for a tire for his car. This man lives eight miles from town and drives in each morning, bringing with him two sons to attend school. This man is a diabetic case, but in spite of his handicap was working in the flour mills all day. At night he picked up his boys and returned home. I think hon. members will agree with me that this man was doing a real job working under such conditions and trying to educate two sons, but I was informed that he would not be granted a tire, and that if I encouraged such requests I would only be adding to their work. If we are still to be harnessed with controls, surely the government can issue instructions to the employees in these offices to be reasonable, and at least civil to the public.

In connection with youth training, I should like to speak for a few moments of a situation that has arisen in my constituency. We have located there the Bowmanville boys' training school, with an average of 500 or 600 boys to be looked after annually. This boys' training school was conceived as a foster home for underprivileged children generally lacking proper home environment, and it has achieved a magnificent record. Pupils are cared for between the ages of seven and sixteen, and records show that after graduation literally hundreds have joined the armed forces and served with distinction and, coming home, have voiced their appreciation of the gifts given them by teachers and supervisors. Others have gone on to college for professional careers, while hundreds more have entered honourable occupations in various spheres as first-class citizens.

It will be seen, therefore, that the school deals in human values of the highest character. This school has been the means of doing some very useful work from its inception, but in 1941 the dominion government took it over and converted it for use as a camp for German officer prisoners, and it was so used until April, 1945, when these prisoners were removed to other accommodation. Since then the main buildings and grounds have been empty and neglected and now present a scene of utter desolation. Doors and windows swing open to the elements; birds nest among the fixtures; lawns and gardens are deep with weeds.

I understand that the dominion government, under a signed agreement with the government of Ontario, undertook to restore the property to its original use immediately the German prison camp was done away with, and restore it to the same condition in which it was prior to 1941. I trust that the dominion government will take immediate steps to fufil that agreement in order that the splendid work of the Bowmanville boys' training school may be carried on under suitable conditions.

There is a matter of importance, Mr. Speaker, which I think should be discussed by the dominion-provincial conference when it resumes this fall. It is that of conservation and reforestation. Considerable study has been given to this matter, and action should be taken as soon as possible to remedy the serious degree of soil erosion that is taking place in certain districts throughout Canada. I realize that during the war it was impossible for the government to give this matter attention, but I hope that as a post-war measure the dominion government will give every assistance possible to the provinces and municipalities in reforestation and flood-control measures in order to check the ever-increasing depletion of the best of our soil, on which we depend for our very existence.

In Durham county a survey of the Ganaraska watershed has recently been completed, and I have had the honour to be a member of the advisory board. This watershed covers the greater part of the county. The turbulent Ganaraska river drains the watershed, and it has been revealed that in one year 32,000 cubic yards of top soil has been dredged from the Port Hope harbour into which the river empties. It has also been revealed that there are over 20,000 acres of land in the county resembling a miniature desert, which must be reforested as soon as possible to prevent the blow sand from covering up adjoining valuable acres. The property damage caused by one flood has been estimated at $100,000, and to remind hon. gentlemen how serious soil depletion can become, I need only remind them that history informs us that the Sahara desert was once the granary of the Roman empire, and it is still to-day encroaching on the fertile lands surrounding it. We are anxious in Durham county that speedy action be taken by the dominion and provincial governments to remedy the conditions of which I have just spoken.

There is another matter of importance which I think should be discussed at the coming dominion-provincial conference. It is my opinion that there should be a national minimum wage act covering the whole of Canada, and the wage set should be sufficient to enable every one in this country, no matter what his or her occupation, to live decently and enjoy those things in life to which he or she is justly entitled.

Another matter which I feel should be given consideration at this conference is the extending of our research efforts in Canada, and lending every assistance possible to the universities engaged in this work. We have in Canada great natural resources, but it would appear that we have been content in the past to barter and sell them in their natural state rather than to process them in this country. I believe that through research many new uses may be found for those natural resources with which Canada has so generously been endowed. We could then encourage factories to locate here, and in this way we would supply labour as well as be adding to the national income.

In closing, I just wish to say a word about a distinctive national flag for Canada, about which we have heard so much. It reminds me of questions which are asked in this house on the order of the day and with regard to which you say: "There is no urgency about the matter." I feel that there is no urgency about the selection of a new national flag in Canada. I think the people of Canada as a whole should be given an opportunity to say whether they want a distinctive flag or not. I am not unmindful that in 1940 all that stood between us and possible destruction was the union jack of old England.

I should also like to pay tribute to all those members of the house who served in the last war or in this war, and finally as a member of parliament I wish to pay my tribute also to all those who have served in any of the armed forces of Canada. I am sure that hon. members will join with me in remembering those who have paid the supreme sacrifice and in expressing our deepest sympathy with those who sorrow for their loss.

Mr. E. G. McCULLOUGH (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I rise with great humility to speak for the first time in this house, recognizing the great responsibility and the honour which have been placed upon me. I arrived in this city on September 2 and came immediately to this building. The beauty and majesty of it thrilled me, and I rededicated myself, sir, to carrying out with the best I have within me the new responsibilities which have been entrusted to me.

The speech from the throne indicates that it is the intention of the government to beautify Ottawa and district. This project is to be highly commended, for things of beauty are in harmony with man's highest ideals and deepest longings. But I am also reminded of little fishing villages where fishermen and their families eke out a living; of the slums in our great cities; of farms which have become derelict and of farmers and their families who, through a vicious, outworn and outmoded system, have had to leave their homes. I remember these conditions which I have seen. I submit to all hon. members that, when we are thinking of a memorial to those who have suffered and sacrificed in this war, and when we realize that the heartaches and sufferings are not only for the duration of the war but will continue for years to come, all of us should dedicate ourselves to building a memorial in the form of a new Canada based upon a system which will give opportunity and security to all our people.

During the debate many hon. members have spoken about their own constituencies, but I should like first to focus the attention of hon. members upon our national and our international problems. I believe I voice the unanimous opinion of the party to which I have the honour to belong when I say that the winning of the war and the winning of the peace are two aspects of the same problem.

Winning the peace—a part of this problem—lies before us, and as Dwight D. Eisenhower is reported to have said when he arrived in the United States a few weeks ago, it is the bigger job which still lies before us. To-day, when the sacrifices of this war have given us another chance to win the peace, in my opinion it is the real emergency facing us.

Referring to the speech from the throne, I am a little disturbed at the vagueness of its allusions to what may or may not be put before us in the way of legislation. To begin with I would point out that in the building of a new Canada we must recognize that we are not French Canadians and English Canadians, but Canadians, and that we are not only citizens of Canada but also citizens of the world. We must recognize that in formulating a domestic policy for Canada we have a responsibility to the world.

The problems of housing and employment which face us to-day are tremendous and pressing; but at this time I desire to deal with some other questions. First, there is the idea of an emergency. As I understood some hon. members, in discussing the present emergency their idea seemed to be that if we could muddle through in some way for the next year or two, if we could deal with reconversion and the housing shortage, somehow or another we would get out on the broad plane of economic stability. In my opinion we could make no greater mistake, because while we have these immediate problems to-day, the biggest problems will arise after the pent-up purchasing power which exists to-day is exhausted. After the accumulated domestic and foreign demands for consumer goods have been dealt with, then what? Therefore, I say that to-day we should be planning for making fundamental changes; we should be establishing the four freedoms, recognizing the implications of the united nations food conference at Hot Springs, Virginia, where a minimum standard of living was set up for all the peoples of the world. We should so establish the Canadian economy as to be able to fit in with any plans for world order or world peace which may evolve out of the San Francisco conference.

During the war our government has failed on many counts. I would point out something which has not been mentioned here this session, namely the government's responsibility for moral leadership. It is a disgraceful thing that during a period of national dislocation the government has allowed the liquor industry of this country, controlled by private enterprise, to undermine the morale of our people. We are threatened with a serious condition of moral decay, for which in future we may have to pay in a wave of crime and a weakening of citizenship and leadership. The time has come to do away with corruption in high places. Parliament through this government should take responsibility for moral leadership.

One thing which disturbs me is that many hon. members want to remove all controls and get back to good old pre-war capitalism. Well, pre-war capitalism is as dead as the dodo. We are now in a new stage of capitalism. To-day we find the government underwriting the risks of the so-called free enterprise system. This is a crucial stage in Canadian history. To-day the government is underwriting these risks of capitalism; for instance, we have the national housing plan, the industrial bank, family allowances, unemployment insurance.

May I first deal briefly with family allowances. It is a good thing as far as the wage-earner in the low income bracket with a large family is concerned, but it does not take the place of decent jobs and adequate wages. In this regard it appears to me as though the government intends to allow private industry to go into lucrative forms of enterprise and exploit them, and then step in with the taxpayer's money to look after papa's children.

With regard to national housing, there again we find not very much of free enterprise; again we find the government underwriting any risk that is involved. The question is, where are we going to stop? When we speak of planning, the fact remains that to-day we are to have planning whether we like it or not; but the point is, who is to do the planning? Here we have a capitalist-government planned by big business, whereas we in the C.C.F., who also have a plan, propose a democratically planned idea for Canada, instead of allowing industry to take all the lucrative enterprises with the government stepping in and assuming the responsibility for capitalism's failures. To-day this is what happens. Private enterprise assumes no responsibility for unemployment; it has no responsibility for the real needs of the people, but the government steps in when unemployment becomes acute. That is the system under which we are operating at the present time.

The C.C.F. plan is that if the government is supposed to use the taxpayers' money to carry on vast social services it is only good sense that the government should also participate in the remunerative and revenue producing industries and thus be enabled to give the people a high standard of living. In

that way, through co-related planning, we would do away with duplication and the wasteful system of capitalism.

It would seem to me that this government is concerned in preserving the special privilege of private enterprise. I am more concerned in preserving the industry of our period.

I should like to give some idea of my conduct in future in this house; and while I recognize that hon. members on the opposite side of the house will have the whole say in any legislation which is passed, nevertheless, on occasion, when measures are brought in I shall vote for those that provide some alleviation to the distress and to the worry and trouble of our people resulting from the vagaries of this system which the government seems to wish to uphold.

I wish to deal for a few minutes with agriculture, and first of all let me say that there is no group in Canada more willing to make the sacrifices that are necessary to build a lasting peace than our agricultural community. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) presented order in council 6122, paragraph 4 of which deals with stabilization of the economic and political life in war-torn countries.

In the sixth paragraph it is stated that as a further means of stabilizing wheat prices during the post-war period it is the intention that steps shall be taken to ensure that producers will not at any time up to July 31, 1950, receive less than $1 a bushel, basis Fort William, Port Arthur or Vancouver.

The point I wish to bring to the attention of the house is this. Here we have an appeal from the government, from the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), asking for cooperation. I can assure the house that western farmers will be ready to cooperate in the fullest measure to attain stability and lasting peace, but here by this order in council we have $1 a bushel being assured to the farmers, basis Fort William and Port Arthur. This would mean, with twenty cents freight rate, that the farmers would receive as low as eighty cents a bushel. Again may I say that we may be scraping our bins, and from the speech of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) to-night it would seem that, with a short crop next year, 1946 may bring that condition.

I do not agree with the minister when he states that it is impossible to increase production or that we can bring any form of stability to agriculture by means of the plan which is being submitted to this house by the government. I wish to put before the house a plan which in my opinion would bring some stability to agriculture, and that is a plan whereby we would establish the principle of the ever-normal granary by storing in our bins one thousand million bushels in years of plenty, whereby we would have a granary on which to draw in years of scarcity which we might face in the future. It is clear to this house that if the war had gone on for one more year we would have been in a crucial situation in Canada. Therefore I say that it is a good sound plan to have the principle of the ever-normal granary. In years of plenty we would store for years of scarcity. I would ask the government to advance the farmers money to buy cement and building materials to build proper storage facilities, and I suggest that the Canadian wheat board be continued and that it take deliveries, or advance storage on the same basis as is paid to the elevators at the present time. In this way the farmer in a few years would own these storage facilities, and if we had scarce years our live stock production would not be jeopardized. In this way we could establish a stable agricultural policy for the country. But if we adhere to the old policy of trying to dump surplus wheat as soon as we have a few hundred million bushels we shall always remain on an unstable agricultural economy.

I wish for a few moments to direct my remarks to the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie), and at this time I would refer to those veterans who served in the last great war as well as in this one. I would ask very respectfully that a pension of $50 a month be granted to those veterans. Second, I would ask that they receive complete health insurance and, third, that the means test of securing a pension be done away with.

I make this appeal on the ground that these men, who number over 2,000, have given up civilian employment and gone out to give service to their country. Moreover, it would mean that well over 2,000 of these veterans would be relieved of the necessity of seeking employment and would have some measure of security. I would point out further that there is an injustice to be remedied so far as these people, who are living in a state of insecurity, are concerned. Let me state a case so that the members of the house will be in a position to sympathize with my suggestion. I have looked into the case of a veteran who served in the imperial army and who again served in the last war. As a matter of fact, in the last war he was a prisoner in Germany and he entered this war as A-1 but was let out as an E category man. For the last three years he has been trying to get a pension, and although he is suffering from an injured knee, from hernia and rupture, he has not been able to get a pension up to date.

While I might be able to make this appeal on grounds of service rendered by these veterans, I would say that they should be given the pension out of simple justice.

Still directing my remarks to the Minister of Veterans Affairs, I should like for a moment to deal with the matter of veterans wishing to settle on the land. I believe we should recognize that the best advice we can give our returning young men and women is to go on farms, away from the congested areas; but under the land settlement act as it is set up to-day this is not happening. A recent survey, which shows that very few of these young people wish to go back to the farm, would indicate that something must be done. As far as I have been able to find out, those coming under the Veterans' Land Act may receive a maximum of $6,000, of which $4,800 is for land and $1,200 for equipment. I am a farmer, and I think I can speak from practical experience. In the first place $4,800 is too small an amount for land, and $1,200 is totally inadequate for equipment. Here is what a lad going on the land must pay for his equipment. He will have to pay $1,700 for a modern small combine, $1,500 for a small tractor and $1,200 for a modern small truck, or $4,400 for these three major pieces of machinery. Therefore it is clear that this total of $6,000 is quite inadequate. I have tried to find out if there is any other way in which a veteran may get further assistance, but I find that the veteran, having hypothecated his land under the Veterans' Land Act, cannot get any help under the farm improvement act of 1944.

In this connection I should like to make some proposals to this house. My first suggestion is that $10,000 be the minimum amount given to veterans wishing to settle on farms. I further suggest that those showing good faith by remaining on the land for three years should be given a five per cent discount on the original loan; those staying five years should be given an additional ten per cent, and those remaining for ten years another fifteeen per cent, or a total discount of thirty per cent over a period of ten years. Then I submit that this amount should be amortized over twenty-five or thirty years. If any hon. member thinks this is an unreasonable amount I would remind him of what we were able to do during the war. We found $25,000 to train each pilot, and we found $50,000 to $100,000 for a plane in which to put him. Therefore I respectfully submit that these recommendations should receive consideration.

I should now like to direct my remarks to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell). To-day we find a great deal of unrest in the ranks of labour, which seems to have very little faith in what the future may hold. I quote from page 223 of *Hansard,* where the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) said:

> I see nothing disturbing in the present situation as far as employment is concerned. . . .

Then he went on to say that there were 132,520 jobs and 73,150 applications. I wish to point out that many of these jobs are of a temporary nature. For example, I should like to mention a veteran who went into the employment office at Regina to look for a job. The official told him there were many farmers who wanted combine operators and asked the veteran if he could drive a combine. He replied that he could not, that he had been in the transport division of the army. The official replied, "Well, if you can drive a truck you can drive a tractor, and if you can drive a tractor you can drive a combine." Then the veteran said that he had a wife and two children and that he was concerned about getting something permanent because winter would be coming on in a couple of months. The official said that this work was permanent for the next few weeks, and that he had better take it. I do not want to give the rest of the conversation, because it would not look good in *Hansard,* but hon. members will understand that this statement by the minister does not in any way reflect the real situation. I have in my hand a little pamphlet which was put out by the Department of National Defence, which says that no man wants to be a square peg in a round hole. We will all agree with that; but now that peace is here, at least we should be able to do for our people what the government has done for our boys in the services, and that is what I am asking.

Further in regard to labour I should like to mention the need for a national labour code and the extension of the already existing though perhaps temporary order in council P.C. 1003. In my constituency I have great coal fields. A year ago the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis) was there, and was reported to have said that Bienfait was the coming Pittsburgh of western Canada. I visited those mines about two years ago, and I know something of the conditions which exist, and something of the need for labour legislation of a permanent nature. For the benefit of those who have never been in a coal mine or who have never come in contact with the needs of labour I should like to repeat some of the things brought to my attention at that time. We have both dominion and provincial laws giving certain rights to workers in the mines, but I found that some of this legislation has not been carried out. Prior to 1939, when there were large numbers of unem-

ployed, if any person working in the mine tried to impress upon the management the need of doing something and carrying out this legislation, he immediately received his discharge notice. This shows the need for collective bargaining, so that workers may gain recognition and have something to say about their hours of work, rates of pay and the conditions under which they are employed. I submit that this would only be establishing two of the four freedoms, freedom from fear and freedom from want, for labour.

I should now like to refer to the War Assets Corporation. This was a highly contentious question in my constituency during the election campaign; and since it involves over $800,000,000 of plant and equipment belonging to the people, for which we have paid, and around $3,000,000,000 worth of surplus war material, I say that what is to be done with it should be the concern of everyone in this house, for this is the property of the people. We believe a lot of it is being destroyed. A week ago I had a telephone conversation with one of the high officials of War Assets Corporation. Without any solicitation on my part he admitted that some of this equipment had been destroyed.

I do not wish to spend too much time on this subject, but I should like to submit a plan to the government for the disposition of surplus war assets. I would point out that many of them could be used for civilian uses. When I was speaking to that official I suggested to him—and I now suggest to the house—that in addition to the plan which, I have been told, is in operation, under which aeroplane parts may be assembled in a field—parts such as fuselages and wings—and sold at a nominal fee, wings and frameworks may well be used on farms as cabs for tractors and the like. Hydraulic jacks could be used to make small hydraulic presses.

I would ask that consideration be given to my suggestion, and that when surplus war assets are being sold the government should advertise widely so that the public would be informed.

In this my first speech in the house I have tried to submit some of the plans offered by the C.C.F. But I believe that if we will seek to build a new order based upon the needs of the people and the inherent right of every person to a job and to security, we shall be able to say in the words of Tennyson:

> Ring out the thousand wars of old;
> Ring in the thousand years of peace.

Mr. JEAN LESAGE (Montmagny-L'Islet): (Translation) Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will allow me to express publicly the congratulations which I have already had the honour of tendering you on your elevation to the very high post of Speaker of this house. We are all assured—and you have given evidence of that fact during these last three weeks—that your dignity and impartiality betoken the preservation of parliamentary freedom in this country.

I also wish to join in the chorus of praise which was occasioned by the speeches of the mover and the seconder of the Address in reply to the speech from the throne. They gained the admiration of each and every member of this house.

It is my privilege to be the representative of the constituency of Montmagny-L'Islet. That electoral district is composed of two provincial counties. One of them, L'Islet, is represented in the provincial legislature by the Hon. Adélard Godbout, leader of the Liberal party in the province of Quebec, and the other, Montmagny, by Mr. Fernand Choquette, K.C., president of the Quebec City Bar Association.

I scarcely need to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the task of representing such a constituency weighs heavily on my young shoulders. From the bottom of my heart, I thank my electors for having given me such a mark of confidence, and my sole desire is to remain ever worthy of it.

My constituency has flourishing industries, large and small; farming is prosperous and progressive and land settlement is gradually developing. All classes of the population are enjoying, thanks to the present government's policy, a standard of living which had never been known heretofore. That is due to the government's policy, it is true, but also to our faith in the future, a faith which enables us to contribute, in a truly Canadian spirit, to the development of a truly united Canadian nation. My constituents are primarily and above all Canadians, and it was because I expounded Canadianism and advocated the political and economic independence of a united Canada, that I was elected as a member of this house.

The greatest evidence of patriotism on the part of my constituents is to be found in the number of those among them who volunteered for active service, went overseas and fought for our democratic freedom. All honour to the heroes from Montmagny-L'Islet who sacrificed their lives in order to save their fellow-citizens and who lie in foreign soil, in the glory of their eternal sleep!

(Text): Mr. Speaker, new members have come to this House of Commons in a very critical time. We are just out of a global war, in which all our economic standards have been upset. The people of Canada do not want to go through years such as we had between 1930 and 1939. Something must be done, and we have a strict obligation to prevent the reappearance at our doors of the monster of depression.

I respectfully submit that it is possible to achieve economic stability through what we call full employment. As a matter of fact, in the last few years we have gone beyond what we usually thought of in peace time as full employment. That was due in great part to the fact that our export trade had reached a peak we could not have attained in the past. But the majority of these exports belong—and I quote the words of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon)—to the category of temporary, abnormal wartime trade. A considerable percentage has been financed by mutual aid appropriations, and thus has been paid by the government itself. If upon the one hand it is impossible to maintain our export trade at such a cost, we must not forget upon the other hand that under present conditions those countries which have suffered directly from the devastation of war are not in a position to pay us in cash, or by imports which would be needed for the help of our internal economy.

However, we must have a greater volume of exports than we had before the war. It is the only way to full employment, or anything near it. The present index of employment and the index of the immediate future is not a normal one. Our reconverted industry will employ thousands of people to produce goods of which the population has been deprived during the period of war. For that reason the index of employment should remain very high and, consequently, the national income should also remain at a high level. But the demand for those goods the population wants so badly now will lessen, and employment will go down to a low level, if we are not in a position to export.

It is important to know that the goods required by the people of Canada at the present time are not the goods we may expect to export over a long period of years. Let us not forget that the nations devastated by war will do their utmost to reorganize their industries and become self-sufficient, and even exporters in the industrial field. If we ignore foreign prospects until domestic demand has been satisfied we shall wake up in two, three or four years without foreign customers. We must direct our industrial power toward the constant needs of the exterior which will serve at the same time the import needs of our Canadian market.

In my humble opinion we should do our utmost to seize every opportunity of selling outside Canada the products of our natural resources, which are mostly agricultural and animal products, lumber, paper and minerals, including non-monetary gold. The net profit these products bring to the nation is the highest. I respectfully submit that it is the duty of the government to assure full production and the opening of new markets for these products.

In order to expand our foreign trade the government should, first, guide Canadian production and economy; second, cooperate with the other nations of the world in a programme of free multilateral trade and monetary stabilization and, third, open credits to other nations.

First, the government should guide Canadian production and economy. The common good of the nation does not reside in the addition of the good of each and all of the citizens, but in coordinating the good of each citizen with the good of all others. The advantages and sacrifices of each and all toward the common goal must be coordinated. By themselves men are seldom ready to make the sacrifices necessary to the common good. Every man naturally seeks his personal advantages. If private enterprise is free of all controls, if we give free rein to competition as requested by so many members of the Tory opposition, we shall find, as experience has taught us, that we are heading straight to economic dictatorship.

The state must regulate the economic life of the nation, but it cannot provide equality for all. It is fair to distribute production according to the needs of each individual, but it must also be according to his merit. The Social Credit theory that every citizen should not have to work for more than four hours a day is not applicable. None of the hon. members of that group will ever prevent an individual from earning more by his talents or his capacity to work. As I have said already, the individual naturally seeks his personal advantage. We cannot change the natural law or the law of God that some forget in their arguments. When I heard the hon. member for Jasper-Edson (Mr. Kuhl) say last week that instead of looking for full employment we should look for full enjoyment I said to myself, "That is an old gag, thousands of years old." The hon. member for Jasper-Edson must be a great reader of the classics, because it reminded me of the

cry of the decadent pagan Romans as they yelled in the circus, "Panem et circences." We are not a decadent state and, if the government controls the economic life of the nation to prevent economic dictatorship and assures a fair distribution, it must leave to the individual sufficient liberty to allow him to be interested in helping the state by his talent.

In conclusion, national economy and production should be controlled in order to ensure for every citizen a decent standard of living, but room must be left for competition which is generative of great achievements.

I said that the government must cooperate with the nations of the world in a programme of free multilateral trade and monetary stabilization. Canada more than, or at least as much as, any other nation is dependent on her foreign trade to ensure her economic life. Therefore, Canada is most interested in the expansion of free total world trade. Our Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) is the most far-sighted Canadian of all because, since the beginning of his long and fertile stage at the head of the nation he has always looked for friendly political and economic relations among nations and the disappearance of all obstacles to a peaceful and important world trade.

The Prime Minister has always understood that we stand to gain more from multilateral world trading than from bilateral trade treaties. Multilateral world trading will be a precious advantage to Canadians especially if exchange rates are stabilized. The articles of agreement of the conference of Bretton Woods announcing the establishment of an international monetary fund and an international bank of reconstruction and development are of special interest to us Canadians who have so often had to pay for our surplus imports from the United States with the depreciated money paid to us by others for our surplus exports. That point in our monetary relations in international trading is so often forgotten by our teachers of Social Credit in their evolutions in the clouds of theory.

Mr. LOW: Did you ever read Social Credit?

Mr. LESAGE: I had an opponent who was a Social Crediter and he lost his deposit.

Mr. LOW: Did you ever hear him speak?

Mr. LESAGE: I heard him speak, but he could not convince me because he was in the clouds.

Third and last, I said that we must open credits and that for many reasons. As Christians we have no right to let our brothers of other nations starve, even at the cost of depriving ourselves of some of the things we would like to consume. What is rationing when misery is the best ground for the seeds of revolution and totalitarianism in all its forms? Our faith in democracy commands us to avoid the formation of a bloc of nations, even by one of our allies, to stand against a bloc of democratic nations. These reasons are apart from the fact that we must create good will for our foreign trade and take the place that we have so dearly earned in the world markets. Experience has shown us, paradoxically enough that even gifts to other nations ensure us a high national income. We must pay for them, it is true, and that is where our financial and monetary difficulties begin.

The government should take the money from a high national income in order to open credit to other nations. There are two ways of obtaining that money, loans and taxes. We cannot expect to go on for very long with loans of the importance of victory loans. Too much of the money—I am sure this will please hon. members of the Social Credit group—comes from the chartered banks and financial institutions, as was said by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley).

Mr. LOW: Where did you learn that?

Mr. LESAGE: I certainly did not learn it from my hon. friend. This is what the Minister of Finance said:

> These are sobering facts because to the degree that the government has had to borrow from the banks rather than directly from personal savings, to the degree that the spending power of the government has been increased and the spending power of the public has not been reduced by an equal amount, we have contributed to the pressure on prices and on supplies of necessary products.

That was said in 1943.

We must limit government loans to the saving public; otherwise we go directly to inflation and then depression. It is exactly the same as if we tried to put into practice the Social Credit theory of inconsiderate issues of currency.

The government must face its responsibilities and convince the people that we cannot have a high national income and social security without a level of taxes somewhat higher than before the war. Canadians will be ready to make sacrifices and to pay taxes if they love their country as their only motherland. It is by nurturing a true Canadian patriotism that the people of Canada will best discharge their responsibilities toward the country. The people of Canada are now more Canadian-minded than ever. In this connection I shall not minimize, as some Tory newspapers have done, the importance of

having a Canadian flag and a Canadian citizenship, and also, I pray, our own national anthem.

I am not of those extremists who proclaim that we should be a republic or one of those who say that we should be governed by Downing street.

I do not approve the partisans of La Laurentie, but I do not approve either those who will not recognize the fact that we are a bilingual state.

One of my electors, who is a manufacturer of saws, sent a statement of account to a customer in another province which I shall not name. It had four words in French on it. It said "facture" instead of "invoice," and "manufacturier de scies" for "manufacturer of saws." Clearly it was not a cheque which anybody would accept in whatever language it was written. It was a statement of account, and the answer sent back was: "Make out your account in the official language of Canada. I do not recognize French."

As long as we have men like that, of either French or English language, who will not recognize what I will call the "Canadian fact" or, if you like, Canadian unity in diversity, we shall not be a nation. The government should do its utmost to spread the idea of a bilingual state. For instance, should not the family allowance cheques be bilingual all over Canada? Why should cheques be written in French for Quebec and in English for the other provinces? All the provinces are part of the same country, which is bilingual. No province must be regarded as a reserve. I live in the province of Quebec, but I am at home everywhere in Canada. My ancestors came here three hundred years ago, and I am here to stay with my faith, my language and my traditions. I am tolerant, but I want tolerance. The unity of Canada is a *sine qua non* condition of its future.

The other condition is its high ranking among the nations of the world. Canada will reach its place only through political and economic independence. Canada has everything to lose by being tied up to any other country or group of countries; it has everything to gain if it is free to join as a free nation in the deliberations of international conferences of all the nations of the world. There is our future. There lies the prosperity and the greatness of our beloved country.

In conclusion, may I say that I believe the present government will achieve the common good of the nation. I have faith in the Prime Minister. His glorious past, in the most difficult days our country has seen, is a guarantee that he will steer the ship of state to a safe port. May God keep him long for Canada, to which he has devoted all his life.

Mr. D. J. McCUAIG (Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, as a new member of this parliament, I realize that I have been given a stewardship and a responsibility.

I am not a manipulator of words or a maker of phrases; I work with my hands. I represent the federal constituency of Maple Creek in Saskatchewan, in the southwest corner of the province. Eastend is my home town. I have farmed there continuously for thirty-three years.

Being now a full-fledged commoner, I take it to be my bounden duty to work for and to serve all the people of Canada, regardless of race, colour, creed or political faith.

First, I should like to acquaint the government with certain conditions in the part of the country which I represent, conditions brought about by drought. We are experiencing the second worst drought in the thirty-three years that I have been in that country. Wheat will not average over two bushels to the sown acre. That means that on thousands of acres there will not be one bushel at all. The year 1937 was our worst year. In that year the grass never got green and the soil blew and drifted all summer. There was not one dollar of return for all the seed planted, the wearing out of equipment, the year's living expenses and labour, and there was no seed for the spring of 1938. We are hearing now about the 1938 seed grain.

The year 1936 was just about like this. Conditions were disastrous for stock-men. Trainloads of stock were shipped out at one and two cents a pound, and someone made a harvest on the stockmen's misfortune. Feed was the problem then. Feed and water constitute the problem now.

The stock-man is trusting the government to give him a stabilized price. He can see no reason for wide price fluctuations—more times down than up—when the demand is steady and meat is urgently needed. In my opinion, government control is the only thing which will attain the desired end. Company or monopoly control would do just the opposite in this kind of situation for their motive is: In business to make money.

The way the set-up is at present, shipping and slaughtering facilities cannot handle the offerings. The pastures are brown and bare. The water situation is bad, and the people are clamouring to ship their stock. Before I left Eastend to come here the shippers told me that shipping was restricted. The longer they

keep this stock, the poorer the quality will be. This is a waste when meat is so badly needed in Europe, where people are starving. We fought to save humanity; now they need food to live. I hope the government will move with all their war-time efficiency, speed and energy to take care of this situation.

After seeing the accomplishments of Mulberry, after reading about radar and atomic power, it seems to me that by comparison the achievement of many of these things would be very easy. If these men who are endowed with such wonderful gifts and training, the knowledge of science, of engineering and planning, almost likened unto the infinite, were given the job of making the world a fit place for all peoples of the earth to live in, what a world it would be! "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth" would surely come to pass. This basic fundamental was ignored by Mussolini, Hitler and Tojo and their followers. Six years ago they were the biggest men in the world. To-day they are no more. What an ignoble end was theirs! They did not recognize this basic fundamental of life, and if we in Canada do not recognize it, can any man in this parliament say where we shall be six years from to-day?

I have not been able to find in the speech from the throne any basic solution which will take care of the problems of the great masses of the people, the producer, the men who must work for a living from the age of sixteen to seventy. Family allowances and old age pensions, desirable and indeed necessary under our present economy, are only props to hold up an unworkable system. We must get down to the basic fundamentals of life. The army could not get very far without basic training. The farmer would not go far without knowledge of basic agriculture. On the plains of Saskatchewan the record of thousands of years is found in the top foot of soil. That record tells a man whether he should break up land and how much he may expect to receive from that ground over a period of years. If he ignores that record it is just too bad for him; in other words he requires basic knowledge. In my humble opinion we must deal with basic principles if we are to have a prosperous, happy national economy. It is not only cooperation with our fellowmen; it is cooperation with God, carrying out the purpose of creation. I say these things in plain, farmer's working-man's language, because that is the only language I know. As I see things, there are four institutions in Canada, four main arteries through which the very lifeblood of Canada flows. They have to do with the welfare of every one of us. They are natural resources, industry, transportation and finance. The men who, by company or monopoly control, sit in the seats of the mighty and pull the levers, hold the economic destiny of every man, woman and child in Canada in the hollow of their hands. They exercise power and control that defy governments. They are the invisible government of Canada.

To support this contention, I will use *Hansard*. In June, 1939—before the war—there was brought down provision for a defence purchasing board under the War Measures Act. The profit was to be five per cent on capital, which apparently was not accepted. From page 179 of *Hansard* of September 12, 1939—after war was declared—I quote the words of the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe):

> I can say to my hon. friend that from that day to this the defence purchasing board has done its very best to place contracts on that basis and has used every pressure that could be brought to bear in the form of patriotism and so on, but to date it has not succeeded in placing a single contract on that basis.

Who was the power in Canada? Big business staged the first sitdown strike. We were at war. Our men needed the tools to do the job. It is evident that big business got their own price. Would you expect men who would not accept five per cent profit to bid against one another for a less amount? I do not know what they got: But here we have an exhibition of monopoly enterprise.

Lord Tweedsmuir had something to say about this in his book, "A Prince of the Captivity," at page 308. I quote:

> There is a great and potent world which the government do not control. That is the world of finance, the men who guide the ebb and flow of money. With them rests the decision whether they will make that river a beneficent flood to quicken life, or a dead glacier which freezes wherever it moves, or a torrent of burning lava to submerge and destroy. The men who control that river have the ultimate word.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), too, speaking prior to the 1935 election, as reported in the *Western Producer*, said:

> Canada is faced with a great battle between the money power and the people, a battle which will be waged in the new parliament. I plead for a sweeping Liberal victory to carry out my policies of public control of currency and credit. Until the control of currency and credit is restored to the government, all talk of sovereignty of parliament and democracy is idle and futile.

On October 9, 1942, in speaking to the convention of the American Federation of Labour at Toronto, the Prime Minister is reported also to have said:

> The war has shown us that the way of monopoly, of unrestricted power, is a way that leads to destruction, desolation and death.

I am at a loss to know who is the supreme authority in Canada. I, as a citizen of Canada, have always been of opinion that the people's democratically elected representatives were the supreme power and authority; that it was their democratic duty to lay down policies, and that the government was the executive of parliament to carry out those policies.

Yet, in the last few days, I behold a minister laying down a policy, making a definite regulation that affects the most vital industry in Canada, the raising of food. He does this without any consultation, so far as I am aware, with the people in this industry, nor has he received any mandate that I know of from this parliament. The democratically elected members of this house have had nothing to say about it.

Is this the kind of thing that is to take place in all our departments of government? If it is, we might as well go home. No excuse, not being able to consult the people; the people's representatives are right here now. Is that the kind of thing our boys fought and died for? No.

Whence comes this minister's authority or motive power? Could it, by any chance, come from the "invisible government", the powers that ride on the backs of the poor?

A fitting citation from the prophet Amos, in 720 B.C., goes:

> Forasmuch, therefore, as ye trample upon the poor, and take exactions from him of wheat; ye have built houses of cut stone, but ye shall not live in them.

Wheat and other farm products are the farmers' money. It is not the price of a bushel of wheat, but what a bushel of wheat will buy, that concerns me. I have in my hand two notes given to Bussie Brothers of Gull Lake, Saskatchewan, dated March 9, 1914—one for an 8-foot McCormick binder, price $165; one for a 20-run double disc drill, price $125—for the two implements $290, f.o.b. Gull Lake. Wheat was then sixty-five cents a bushel. It took 446 bushels of wheat to pay for those two implements. The binder now costs $400, on rubber, and the drill, power lift, $317.50 or a total of $717.50, f.o.b. Eastend, and it takes 850 bushels of wheat at eighty-four cents to pay for those two implements at $1 floor price, as announced by the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Farms were mortgaged in 1914 to carry on under much more favourable conditions than now. What will happen this time?

We have in Canada to-day, a mechanized industry which has eliminated fifty per cent of man-power, as compared with twenty years ago. The machine is doing the work. How are we to take care of the remaining fifty per cent? We carried on the biggest production Canada ever had from 1940 to 1945 without any help from our young men in uniform, who numbered 800,000 by the end of the war. This God-given gift to man was to take the toil, back-break and slavery out of his life and put it on the machine. But under our economy it starves him.

Mr. HANSELL: You should be sitting over here.

Mr. McCUAIG: If the hon. gentleman will be quiet—

Mr. HANSELL: It is a good speech you are making.

Mr. McCUAIG: I am not used to this kind of thing. The last reason why the people back home sent Duncan McCuaig to Ottawa was my ability to make a speech, but they had confidence in the C.C.F. and they were certain that I would carry out their philosophy.

The Tories did not recognize the basic fundamental, and they were absolutely floored in 1935 and nearly had their very name wiped off the map of Canada.

The Liberals did not recognize it from 1935 to 1940. In that very short time Canada was on the way out. In the thirties the national income dropped to a low of $2,723,000,000 as against $9,186,000,000 in 1944. Thousands of our boys were riding the rods, and as late as January, 1940, more than 3,000 older men were being fed in a soup kitchen on Princess street, Winnipeg. That is what the man at the desk there told me. I was in the place and personally talked with those men on several occasions. Another thing. In the ten years from 1930 to 1939, of Canada's children 166,972 died under one year of age, in a land of great potential wealth, food and other materials. A terrible indictment against our civilization!

Along came the war and snapped us out of it. War is the only thing that has ever saved the capitalist system. It gave us money and prosperity. It was blood money.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. It is eleven o'clock.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I would ask the unanimous consent of the house that the hon. gentleman be allowed to finish his address.

Mr. McCUAIG: I thank the house for its courtesy.

To-day, Mr. Speaker, nearly every invention that science and industrial development have given us is owned or controlled by companies and monopolies, who use them with one end in view, one motive, namely, to make money, not for the use and needs of men; because, if

the money is not forthcoming, man can darn well go without, and he did go without, between 1930 and 1940. This is the kind of thing this government was elected to solve. It is the biggest job any government in Canada ever undertook, and in my opinion they will have to implement social ownership of the means of production whereby the people will produce first for the needs of the people, as a first principle, or compel the present owners of the machine to do that very thing. The people of our country produced almost unlimited supplies for war and could continue to do so, and would continue, if the war went on. By the same token, if the government so wished we could keep every man at overtime work, for there is no end to what the people of Canada need and could do with. Listen to this from the book of Proverbs, chapter 29, verse 18:

Where there is no vision, the people perish.

We need half a million new and improved homes, with everything that goes with them. Good homes, good churches, well equipped schools—these are the very foundation of the nation. We need parks; not only the beautification of Ottawa but the beautification of Canada. Thousands of miles of good roads are needed. We require irrigation. We are only spending crumbs where a billion could be well spent in the restoration of lands and forests and the irrigation of thousands of acres in the west. We should harness the great Saskatchewan river; the water that flows from the mountains in the divine plan should be used, but we have not had enough sense to use it. We should have vocational training; recreational centres; the arts, crafts, drama, music and forums. All these would be real wealth and real value, and the very best kind of security for the Bank of Canada to have. Once again I hear a pleading voice coming from the dismal past and saying:

I plead for a sweeping Liberal victory, to carry out my policy of public control of currency and credit.

It is my very soul's desire, Mr. Speaker, that this parliament should do this very thing; and should the Prime Minister make to this house the appeal that he made to the people of the country, I believe this parliament would support him and this Canada of ours would go places.

On motion of Mr. Blackmore the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie the house adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

Tuesday, September 25, 1945.

The house met at three o'clock.

PROVINCIAL LEGISLATION

PETITIONS FOR DISALLOWANCE OF CERTAIN ACTS OF SASKATCHEWAN LEGISLATURE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): I should like to ask the Minister of Justice if he has received a telegram from Saskatchewan inquiring about the dates of the filing of the petitions for the disallowance of Saskatchewan acts, and indicating that Saskatchewan's first notice was received on September 20?

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Minister of Justice): No; no such telegram has yet been brought to my attention.

Mr. COLDWELL: I will send the minister a copy of it; I received one.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

SECURITY TO CERTIFIED UNIONS UNDER FEDERAL CODE—QUESTION OF JURISDICTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Labour. Has he asked the provincial governments to agree that the present federal labour code make provision for full union security to certified unions upon request, pending disposition of jurisdiction on the subject at the forthcoming dominion-provincial conference?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): I should like to thank my hon. friend for giving me notice of the question. No such representation has been made to the provincial governments in the matter referred to by my hon. friend, but representations have been received from the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, the Canadian Congress of Labour, and other labour and employers' organizations, with regard to amendments to the code generally. All those representations have been sent to the provincial governments. The representations received from the employers have been sent to the trade unions, and those received from the trade unions have been sent to the employers for their information.

PARLIAMENTARY ASSISTANTS

ANNOUNCEMENT WITH RESPECT TO APPOINTMENTS

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I should like to table orders in council passed to-day appointing certain parliamentary assistants.

Mr. R. W. Mayhew, the hon. member for Victoria, has been appointed parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley).

Mr. W. C. Macdonald, the hon. member for Halifax, and Mr. Hugues Lapointe, the hon. member for Lotbinière, have been appointed parliamentary assistants to the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Abbott). As the house is aware, the Minister of National Defence has responsibility for naval services as well as for the army. Mr. Macdonald will be concerned particularly with naval services, and Mr. Lapointe with the army.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE IN REPLY

The house resumed from Monday, September 24, consideration of the motion of Mr. W. M. Benidickson for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Bracken, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Hansell.

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, either this parliament will discover and apply a solution to the dismaying problems confronting the Anglo-Saxon world, or it will fail to discover and apply that solution. Either this parliament will redeem democracy and parliamentary governments generally from the slough of despond and contempt into which they are rapidly descending all over the world, or it will drag still deeper into the mire the reputation of parliament. The matter rests in the hands of members of this parliament.

There is in this parliament I am sure a knowledge of how to obtain a solution of the problems of the world. If the government would call together the representatives of the various parties in a round table conference in a non-political manner and discuss earnestly for whatsoever time was necessary this matter of a solution, I am confident that a solution could be found.

We shall never be able to find a solution by sneering at each other's ideas as did the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Maybank) the other night when he referred to Social Credit as funny money. We shall never do it by indulging in outbursts of fantastic misrepresentations as did the hon. member for Montmagny-L'Islet (Mr. Lesage) last night, or in bursting forth into ecstatic pæans of glorification of the present obviously hopeless orthodox system of finance, as did the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) last night in his otherwise excellent speech. We may be able to find a solution by approaching the situation with humility and a disposition to be open-minded, to consider and weigh and assess the value of the various arguments as did the hon. member for Grey North (Mr. Case) on September 21. At that time the hon. member said as recorded on page 369 of *Hansard*:

—I do not think Canada, of all countries in the world, is in a position to give leadership in monetary reform. We produce a tremendous volume of goods in this country, and we must find a market for them in the markets of the world.

Mr. Kuhl: How about the home market?

Mr. Case: The home market could never consume the amount of goods we produce, because we produce enough for 50,000,000 people. The productive capacity of this nation during the war absolutely staggers human imagination. If those with whom we seek to trade were to discover that we were using a monetary base which resulted in subsidizing our goods to the detriment of their standard of living, I am sure they would soon find means of applying dumping duties or an embargo to prevent us from finding our way to their market. The whole matter is greatly involved. I am glad that there are those who have the courage to come forward with these ideas. I like to think of myself as being a student of monetary reform —sometimes I think our system should be reformed—but I have yet to be convinced that Social Credit policies will fit in with our plan of world affairs.

The hon. member's words indicate a somewhat sincere desire to know something about social credit, why it is called social credit and the basis of facts upon which it founds its philosophy. What is its philosophy? What is the basis of fact upon which it founds its technique? What is the technique which social credit proposes? How shall social credit deal with the great problems which confront us at the present time, the great phenomena such as the surpluses in Canada and in other nations—wheat for example—and the deficiencies in other nations, such as are found in a country like Jamaica; inflation or boom, deflation or depression; monopolies and cartels; foreign investments in Canada which upset our trade balances or balances of payment; Canadian investments abroad; international debt and adverse trade balances; international commercial rivalry or trade wars? How would

social credit enable Canada to sell her goods on the world markets? How would Canada protect her economy against foreign goods seeking to enter her market in competition with Canadian goods? Would she use the tariff under social credit, or exchange control, or quotas, or embargoes, or just how would she proceed under social credit? How would Canada attain monetary stabilization, first of all in Canada and then internationally?

What is social credit's attitude toward international trade? What is social credit's attitude toward the Atlantic charter? What is social credit's attitude toward war, its causes and the remedy for those causes and provision against war? What is the social credit attitude toward the British commonwealth and the empire? What is the social credit attitude toward world organizations such as were attempted in San Francisco? What is the social credit attitude toward the world as it is to-day? How do they interpret the world? Why is it we have people pitted against each other in great organizations ready to fly at each other's throats? Is Canada of all countries in the world in a position to give leadership into social credit? These seem to be some of the major questions in the mind of the hon. member for Grey North.

These questions are all fair and reasonable, and they require to be answered. Any sound economic system ought to be able to answer them. The proposals necessary to answer them should be definite, consistent, realistic and logical. Can social credit answer these thirteen questions definitely, consistently, realistically and logically? If it can, and to the extent to which it can, then social credit has a valid claim to careful consideration as the possible technique to be used in establishing a new world order of freedom from want and fear, together with freedom of speech, worship and choice.

Can social credit answer these questions with definiteness, consistency, realism and logic? Let us see. Consider, first, the meaning of social credit, the first question the hon. member wanted to get clear in his mind. The credit of a nation is like the credit of an individual. It is of three kinds. There is the credit of honour, whether or not a man's word is any good, and this applies also to nations. There is the credit which means the ability to produce and deliver goods as, when and where required. This is called the real credit of the individual and it is the real credit of a people. Finally there is the financial credit, which means the ability of the individual or the ability of a nation to produce as, when and where required, money, which is a quite different thing.

Social Crediters maintain that the financial credit of a nation should reflect the real credit of the nation and correspond to it. They believe that when there are more goods and services on a nation's markets than the consumers of that nation are financially able to buy, then the people's representatives in parliament should lay down a financial policy under which a national finance commission or authority would create and distribute scientifically to the people money tokens or dollars enough to enable those so-called surplus goods and services to be bought and consumed by the people of the country in so far as the people can use them, or perhaps by the peoples of other countries in so far as the people of this country cannot use them. Under such a policy the national money authority would render available to all the people of our nation their real credit, the goods and services they produce. The social credit movement favours rendering the people's real credit social through the creation and use of financial credit to represent or correspond to that real credit, that is, the creation of enough tokens or dollars to make it possible to distribute to all consumers in Canada that portion of our goods and services which otherwise would be wasted.

One of the great faults we have to find with the members in this house who undertake to criticize or sneer at social credit is this simple fact—they never do take the trouble to find out what social credit claims to be, and consequently they have not the slightest idea what they are criticizing. So they make the most idiotic statements and say the most stupid things, simply because they do not know what it is. I have made that completely clear. I have given the facts concerning the social credit concept.

What is the basis of fact upon which social credit philosophy is founded? First, we as a people and as a world have solved the problem of production. That is, we have now got to a position in this world where mankind can produce more goods than mankind is at present able to buy. Consequently there are more goods than mankind is at present able to sell, and this is one of the major causes of depressions and war.

Second, machines have displaced men so that production has increased and jobs have decreased, and consequently wages have decreased, the result being that there is ever present a deficiency of purchasing power in the hands of the people which renders it quite impossible for them to buy the goods which they are able to produce in normal

times. Of course in times of war it is different because then so many goods are taken away and destroyed. These are the facts, which are incontestable. They are the facts upon which the social credit philosophy is based.

What is the social credit philosophy? It is that the government must so manage things that purchasing power will be put into the hands of the people sufficiently to enable them to purchase the goods which at the present time they are unable to purchase because of lack of purchasing power in their hands. By doing that the government will, first of all, raise the standard of living of the people, who will be able to buy the goods, and secondly it will increase their capacity to buy, which will increase the market so that producers will be able to sell and be able to employ people, and the unemployment problem, again, will be cleared up in a natural way.

What are the basic facts upon which social credit founds its technique? First, money—and social credit deals entirely with money, the monetary science of money. Money is merely a claim to goods. Do you agree with that? Money is a claim to goods. We might call it, instead of a claim to goods, a medium of exchange, and certainly we must call it a creation of man. Nature does not produce money; Providence does not produce money. Man produces money. Money is manufactured just as much as picks and shovels are manufactured. These are important truths.

Second, the value of money depends not upon gold nor upon any other kind of backing, metallic or otherwise. The value of money depends entirely upon the goods and services which are available for purchase in the country. Money is a claim to goods, and if the goods are there, the money is good; if the goods are not there, the money is not good.

Third, money need not be a debt. It can be debt-free. No one has ever looked upon a five-dollar gold piece as being a debt, any more than a five-dollar nugget of gold is looked upon as debt. It is accepted freely in exchange, but it certainly is not debt. There is a fallacy all over the country to the effect that money must be debt; as long as we keep that idea regarding money we are indulging in fallacy and we are bound to come to false conclusions and to a false policy. Money need not be a debt. A five-cent piece is not a debt. During the last war the Conservative administration in this country printed, through the Department of Finance, $26,000,000 of money—bills—under the Finance Act of 1914. That money was not debt. That money was used to pay the expenses as they came along, just exactly as though it had been raised by a loan or by taxation. That money was debt-free. It never was redeemed. We have never paid a cent of interest on it. It never was registered against this country as a debt. Why, I wonder, have Conservative members in this house all during this war never even whispered about that? There was involved there a principle which was extremely important, namely the principle of debt-free money. There will be those who say it causes inflation. Well, the money in circulation during this war would have caused inflation, without any $26,000,000 of printed money, if it had not been for the controls. So to use that as an argument against the creation of debt-free money, I would say is very short-sighted indeed.

The fourth principle upon which we base our technique is that money is created by banks to lend as a debt. It could be created by the government or by an agency acting for the government to be used debt-free.

Fifth, the amount of money that could be so created and issued without causing inflation would depend only on the unclaimed goods, because money is a claim to goods. It would depend only on the unclaimed goods or on the unused productive capacity of the country, whether that be resources, factories, man-power or whatever else enters into production.

Then what is the technique that social credit proposes, based on these five truths or facts? Social credit says that, first, in the nation there should be formed a national credit account which should give in detail the amount of goods which are available on the shelves throughout the country and in the store-houses, and probably give an estimate of the amount of goods which can come into existence within a given period, say one month or six months or twelve months, depending on the kind of goods you are dealing with.

Second, the national monetary authority should create the money debt-free to correspond to or claim the goods in the national credit account which are not being claimed by the purchasing power already going into the hands of people through wages, salaries, dividends and so forth.

Third, this new money when thus created should be used first of all to produce a just price structure. It should be used in subsidizing the prices of primary products to raise them to a standard which is the best standard obtainable under the nation's

economy. It should be used also to discount the prices of manufactured goods to bring them into line with the price structure of primary products. In this way a balanced economy will be produced as regards prices. This is the first important matter in connection with using the money or disbursing it.

Finally there should be a distribution of purchasing power directly to the people in such things as wage bonuses, pensions and allowances and in other ways to enable all the people of the country to gain access to the purchasing power stream in the country and thereby gain access to the goods in the country. This will raise the standard of living of the people and provide markets and distribute goods. So much for the social credit technique.

What is the social credit approach to various perplexing phenomena of our day?—and we have plenty of them. We find our friends of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation much concerned about them. They are not the only ones concerned about them, although perhaps they talk more about them than most of the rest of us do. Let us see what social credit will do with these perplexities.

Take surpluses, such as wheat. The first important thing is that we should enable all the people of Canada to use all the wheat and wheat products they can. Then we will draw off as much of our wheat for the purchase of goods from abroad as may be necessary to reach the point where our people have all of those goods that they can purchase. We shall still have a surplus of wheat, which according to the principles of orthodox finance it is utterly impossible to dispose of. What shall we do with that?

In the new order which is coming, in which we guarantee all men freedom from want and freedom from fear, we shall make our surplus wheat available in a great international pool from which the needy peoples of the world will be able to draw according to their needs. That is the only sane and sensible attitude to take. If you do not take that attitude you limit your production, which means that you will keep your vast resources as a dog in the manger, hiding them away from the people who need the products those resources could yield.

This is the social credit approach to surpluses. It says: Let the government encourage the people to produce just as much as they are able to produce. Bring about conditions under which they will produce buoyantly and confidently, knowing that they have guaranteed markets and guaranteed prices which will be remunerative. Then with money created by your national Money Authority buy your surplus and place it in an international pool, under a system of mutual aid on a wide scale, from which people will be able to draw in a manner never even dreamed of by UNRRA.

What is the Social Credit approach to deficiencies in other countries, we will say like Jamaica or Porto Rico? Porto Rico, I understand, is a country in which there are two million people but which has resources to support only one million. What is to be done for the Porto Ricans? With all due respect to them, we do not want them in Canada. They will be much happier in their own land. How are we going to help them to stay there? Only by a system of mutual aid whereby the strong and richly endowed nations will contribute to the support of nations less fortunately situated. So a mutual aid scheme financed with the national credit, debt-free, such as I indicated under number one deals with the deficiencies of other countries, and if this were applied all over the world it would make each nation able to support itself adequately and able to introduce a social credit system to distribute the goods on hand, just as though it were able to produce those goods itself.

I will give you, sir, an illustration to show what we are running into in Canada. During the war we have learned how to manufacture rubber. Before the war, I am told, about 100,000 Malayans were engaged in manufacturing rubber for us and gained their living through that activity. We now propose to produce the rubber we need in Canada—which, considering the dangerous international situation, is a wise policy; but we shall thereby deprive 100,000 Malayans of their source of livelihood, I understand. How are we going to make up this loss to the Malayans and to the millions if not hundreds of millions of other people whose livelihood will be taken away from them because we choose in our own interests to produce our own sugar and rubber and other goods which in this marvellous scientific age we can produce? Only through a system of mutual aid. We can help these people; we need have no anxiety on that score.

What are we to do about inflation? What is inflation? Inflation is a rise in price. A good many people think that an increase of money is inflation. That is not so. Surely Donald Gordon and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) have told us enough about that over the radio during this war, so everybody must know what inflation is. It is a rise in price resulting from a scarcity of goods. If you can manage to keep your goods plentiful

so that there is no scarcity of goods of any kind, you cannot have a rise in price, consequently you cannot have inflation, no matter how much money you bring into circulation; for the people will be able to buy all the goods they want, and will certainly call for no more. This is one of the great truths which must be learned by this parliament and by this generation if it is to solve the problems which confront it. Inflation is a rise in price which results from scarcity of goods. It has nothing to do with money in this modern age.

How do you overcome inflation? The first thing is to see that you have an abundance of production of all kinds so that, no matter how much people want to buy of coal and milk and cream and cheese and sugar and a thousand other things, there will be always more than they require, and prices will not rise. Such a condition can certainly be brought about in a land of abundance like ours.

Next, look after your prices. Social credit has a technique which we call the compensated discount. It means this, that the financial authority, the monetary authority, pays part of the price of goods. For example, if a pair of shoes is being sold for $5 and it is deemed advisable in the interests of Canada that these shoes shall sell at $4 a pair, the financial authority will pay one of the dollars, enabling the consumer to buy at $4. This device brings the price down, and it can be used in the national economy all over the country. The only limit beyond which it cannot go is the amount of goods and services you have in the country: those are what make you rich and strong. This compensated discount, if applied throughout the economy of the country, will completely prevent inflation. Furthermore, credit can be and should be regulated, and would be, under a social credit regime. Finally, if necessary, if some difficulty should arise, such as a great crop failure, say of apples or something of that sort, we would have to ration that particular commodity.

What would social credit do about deflation? First of all, what is deflation? Deflation is a fall in price. Why a fall in price? Because there are more goods on the market than there is money coming into the markets to buy goods with; consequently there is a glut of goods and the prices of goods go down. Under the law of supply and demand that will always tend to happen. The present government has already introduced a system of floors under prices, which indicates that they are already beginning to see the light. Social credit will introduce floors under prices, and the money required will be paid from the national credit without new taxation or debt.

So floors under prices and floors under wages will be maintained, and credit will be regulated. If the banks fear to lend and begin to draw in loans, the government comes in with an agency through which it begins to lend until the banks are encouraged to go forward. Thus deflation would be checked.

Fifth, monopolies. Social credit first of all believes it can control any monopoly for the simple reason that it has control of price. All it needs to do is to tell monopoly it will not give it the advantage of price, and I think that any monopoly with any sense will come into line. If monopoly chooses to be disobedient—"uncooperative" is the word we like to use—it becomes very easy for the government monetary authority to advance money to private companies to establish businesses,—say, to produce aluminium, or whatever it happens to be; and with government bonuses and assistances that little company could cut into the markets of that big monopoly and utterly destroy it, and it would be impossible for that monopoly to avoid it. There is no need for the government to take over the monopoly and thus have a government monopoly.

Now as to the matter of cartels. There is only one really safe solution to the problem of cartels, and that is to make the country as nearly as possible self-sufficient. In this day of remarkable scientific advancement, of the development of plastics and the like, together with the vast resources which we possess, we can become very nearly self sufficient. If there were difficulties with a few cartels we would probably have to resort to some sort of international agreement, but the general attack would be as I have described it.

With respect to foreign investments in Canada, these cause a great deal of difficulty. There is altogether too much foreign capital investment in Canada. Social credit would make it the government's business to see that these great interests which have investments in Canada were encouraged to sell. The government could lend money to private interests to buy these people out and send them home with their money. That can be done, and it is going to be done; it will have to be done. Mexico had to resort to that device in 1938 with respect to United States interests in her oil industry. It will be found as the days go by that it will be necessary for that device to be applied generally throughout the world, otherwise how can a nation govern itself, when it cannot be master in its own house?

With respect to Canadian investments abroad, such investments would not be encouraged by social credit, for the simple reason that Canadian investments abroad

would be unwelcome, just as foreign investments in Canada would be unwelcome. Some people will say—and I can almost see my Conservative friends thinking it—"We had to have foreign capital come in to develop this country." Yes; that was done when you still thought that you had to have money come in from outside. But we have learned that we can create our own money; we have no further need at all of foreign capital coming in.

What would we do with international debt? First, it must be agreed that any debt should be payed in goods and services, which is the only way such debts can be paid. The sooner all nations come to realize this, the better. Today the United States is rapidly coming to a realization of this truth in her arrangements with Great Britain. All nations will have to realize that international debt must be paid with goods and services. Then we would stimulate our own production, and we would lower our own prices in Canada by the method of the compensated discount, which would encourage people to buy Canadian instead of buying foreign; that would enable us to have a favourable trade balance. It should not be difficult at all in a country like Canada. In fact it would not be difficult if we were using a social credit system.

What shall we do about international commercial rivalry? This is one of the problems in the mind of the member for Grey North, who asked that question with great sincerity. He is much troubled about how Canada would get her goods into foreign countries. Well, Mr. Speaker, the day has to come when we must realize that we must not force our goods into a foreign market in competition with other people's goods or in competition with the goods of that country in its own market. If we persist in so forcing our goods we shall disrupt the economy of the country concerned and begin to sow the seeds of war.

All wars are the result of hot commercial rivalries—successful commercial rivalries. That principle was definitely enunciated by Woodrow Wilson, who was one of the men who in their time knew these things. Social Credit would trade not on a competitive basis but on a mutual aid basis. If we are financing mutual aid to various nations, why should those nations not finance mutual aid to us? If we can provide them with the things that they are unable to produce, why should they not provide us with the things that we ourselves are unable to produce? Surely they should not hesitate to do that, and I am certain that they would not. Imagine Britain refusing to send us goods which we cannot produce in return for goods that we have sent to her which she could not produce! It is not conceivable; neither would it be conceivable in the case of Australia, New Zealand or any other country under intelligent government.

And so we would trade not on a competitive basis but on a mutual aid basis. We would trade the goods we have, such as aluminum, copper, wood pulp, lumber, the products of wheat, salt fish, sugar, rubber, machinery and all sorts of things which we are able to produce. We would trade all these commodities for such products as bananas, oranges and other things we need from abroad.

There would be no attempt to "blast our way" into the world's markets in any shape or form. We could reduce our price—as the member for Grey North conceived we would—by means of a subsidy, to enable other nations to buy our goods, but we would not force those goods on those nations. We saw an illustration of this concept in operation in the statement on wheat which the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) gave to the house recently. He pointed out definitely that we must keep the price of wheat down so that the British people could buy it. Under social credit that could be done with any commodity. If a nation wanted to buy our goods we could bring down the price of the goods by a subsidy to producers so that other nations could buy those goods without reducing the price received by farmers and other producers. That could be done on a world-wide scale, especially by a nation as fortunately endowed as Canada is.

The tremendous difference between bringing down your price—may I impress this upon the hon. member for Grey North—so as to enable other nations to buy, and bringing down your price in order to force your goods upon other nations, is a difference that must be apparent to all. The first is a blessing; the second is a curse which must result in war.

How would social credit protect Canada's economy against foreign goods—by using tariff, exchange control, quotas and embargoes? Each of these could be used, but the social credit technique is that of price discounting. If goods were coming from a foreign country underselling ours by fifteen or twenty cents per unit, all we would have to do would be to subsidize our own producers to bring down our own price to enable that article to be sold under the goods coming in. That can be done and has been done; I could point to plenty of instances in which it has been done. We need have no use of a tariff. If we could not get along without one we might

have to have one, and we would use it only under those circumstances; but there is no need of one, so far as I can see.

How would social credit attain monetary stabilization? First, in Canada, it would lower the price structure by subsidies to producers or compensated discount to consumers. The lower the price structure in a country, the higher the value of that country's dollar, which means that by means of the compensated price you can raise the value of your dollar in the world to any desired standard. That is the technique we would use, in that way stabilizing our own dollar, so that we would know exactly what it would be worth, and everyone else would also know. In a similar way the other nations could do the same thing. We would have to agree on prices. Social credit is absolutely opposed to having any fund, such as the Bretton Woods agreement envisages, set up with the power to dictate to a nation how its money shall be managed. What a nation shall do with its money is that nation's business and nobody else's. If they do not choose to trade with us, that is their lookout; we will get along anyhow.

The next question is, what is social credit's attitude to international trade. I have already stated that social credit is prepared to trade with any nation on a mutually advantageous basis. It will trade what others need for the things which Canada needs.

What is our attitude to the Atlantic charter? Social credit is the only known system on the face of the earth under which the Atlantic charter can be established so that there can actually be freedom from want and fear among the nations of the earth and all the earth's peoples. I defy any economist anywhere in the world to show any other system whereby that can be done. The only system under which it is possible is social credit.

What is our attitude to war? We hold that the cause of war is economic; it is fear and want. The system of mutual aid which I have indicated would entirely remove fear and want and thus remove in a large measure the cause of war. We would trade through a mutual aid arrangement instead of having competition, and thus go far towards removing the cause of war. And if after that there were still people who wanted to fight—well, there is only one thing to do and that is to see that our walls are strong. Social credit would see that that was the case, and it has taken that attitude ever since coming into public life. We would see that we had a strong economy, strong armaments, strong and healthy people, well educated, strong through exercise and strong in morale.

What is our attitude to the British commonwealth and the empire? We believe that the British commonwealth is the greatest and most dependable guarantee of freedom of every kind thus far developed in the world. The greatest demonstration of democratic strength, through decentralization, is found in the commonwealth. We favour full understanding and wise cooperation with the British peoples. We insist that local sovereignty be completely and unchallengeably guaranteed. We insist that Canada, while being daughter in her mother's house, shall be mistress in her own, with all that term implies. We believe that, with respect to the British peoples, united we stand, divided we fall.

The British have a great responsibility to discharge in the world, and the British commonwealth, on a social credit basis, could withstand any enemy on earth or any combination of enemies. No combination could then destroy it politically or economically.

We favour putting the British empire and British commonwealth on a social credit basis, and then, under God, going forth facing the future without wavering. The British commonwealth can be economically self-sufficient.

What is the social credit attitude to world organization? We are ready to cooperate. We are ready to discharge our full responsibility. But we are not willing to surrender our sovereignty to any international or other external force on earth.

What is the social credit interpretation of the world situation? It accepts God, it accepts Jesus Christ, it believes that there is a struggle between the powers of righteousness and the powers of evil waging in the world to-day. Evil is forever seeking to enslave men, to centralize power and destroy men's freedom, politically, economically and financially. Good is with equal determination struggling to free men and to guarantee their freedom, politically, economically and financially.

The powers of evil are headed up by certain international bodies or powers. Among those powers we consider international finance to be one of the foremost.

Is Canada fitted to take the lead in the social credit movement in the world? The member for Grey North asked that question, and it was a good one. Let us see: Canada is rich in resources. She has very varied resources, almost inexhaustible resources, and she could be almost completely self-sufficient. She has industrial equipment of a very high order, and industrial skills coming out of this

war of first-rate quality. She has administrative skill of the first order. She has scientists of high quality, as witness the great developments in plastics on a commercial scale. She has hundreds of thousands of people already enlightened in social credit, and hundreds of thousands more much interested in it, as the hon. member for Grey North indicated the other day. Her people believe in individual enterprise; her people are a freedom-loving people, very brave and dreaded in war. She is a part of the British commonwealth of nations and is therefore protected through that association. She is a part of the North American continent and derives protection from that relation.

She is eager to find a solution to the economic difficulties which confront her; she is eager to find a solution to the problem of war; she is fearful of failure. Where could you possibly find a nation more admirably fitted, apparently more designed and destined by Almighty God, to take the lead in the world in the solution of the world's economic problems? I commend the whole system of social credit to the most earnest consideration of all hon. members in the house and of all the people in the country as the only means whereby we can emerge from the old order of doubt, insecurity, irregularity, injustice and war, into the new order where there shall be actually guaranteed freedom from want and fear, and where people will be able to enjoy freedom of religion, of speech and of choice.

Mr. D. S. HARKNESS (Calgary East): Mr. Speaker, I should like at the outset of this, my first speech in the house, to add my congratulations to the many which you have already received on your election to your high office. I also wish to congratulate the mover (Mr. Benidickson) and the seconder (Mr. Langlois) of the Address in reply to the speech from the throne, first on the excellent addresses they gave, and second because they are representatives of the air force and the navy respectively. I think it was fitting that those services should have been honoured in this way.

At this point I should like to pay a tribute to the men of the particular arm of the services with whom I served, namely, the Royal Canadian Artillery. I believe few will dispute the statement that, with the exception of the infantry, the gunners were more responsible for winning all our battles than any other arm of the ground forces. I am proud to have served with such a fine body of men, and I was anxious to have this tribute to them put on the record.

I should like to make a plea here for the foot soldier. Throughout the war he was the lowest paid of any service man, and during the earlier years of it was the least regarded, because it was commonly believed that technological advances had outmoded him, and that the gun, the tank, the signals, the repair services, and so forth, were much more important. Yet on the actual field of battle it was found that the infantryman was still the most important and necessary man there. He had the worst conditions under which to live, suffered the most privations, took the greatest risks, and incurred the highest casualties; yet his pay remained lower than that of the motor mechanic working in comparative safety some thirty miles behind the battlefield. I maintain that this was all wrong, and I hope to see this parliament authorize a complete change in the scale of pay of the services, so that it will bear a much closer relationship to the risks run, and to the conditions endured, than has been the case in the past. I feel very strongly on this matter because of my personal experience. As a result of the man-power policy of the present government the artillery regiment which I commanded spent three and a half months of last winter acting as infantry. During that time many men came to me and remarked that they had never before appreciated the difficulties and hardships of the infantry, and reckoned that they should be paid two or three times as much in that role as they were paid as gunners.

In the short time I have been in this house I have observed that it is customary for a new member to say something of the glories of his own constituency. In the constituency of Calgary East, which I have the honour to represent, we have a post office and a polling division called Bragg Creek. Do not be alarmed that the name is indicative of what is to come. In fact there is no need to advertise Calgary East, because, I believe, it is known to practically every person throughout Canada, because of two things. First, it is the site of the Calgary stampede, and second it contains Turner valley, the only large producing oil field in the dominion. At this point I will do a little advertising. I earnestly recommend to all hon. members that they make use of their travelling facilities to come out and see either or both of these attractions. For my own part I propose to do the same thing in eastern Canada. I am sorry to say that I have not seen anything of Quebec and the maritime provinces. I believe it is my duty to do so, and I intend to do so as early as possible.

What is not so well known as the Calgary stampede and Turner valley, is the fact that

Calgary East is a representative cross-section of Canadian life. It takes in most of the central or business district of Calgary, and embraces residential areas representing all levels of income, and people of nearly every racial origin and religion to be found in Canada. These people are engaged in most of the occupations followed in this country with the exception of those connected with the sea. The rural part of the constituency runs from twenty-five miles south of the city, west to the British Columbia boundary. In it there are found dairy farms, mixed farms, wheat farms, cattle ranches and the odd small saw mill, and on the outskirts of the city a large number of small holdings, where people are engaged in vegetable growing, fur farming and other rural enterprises of a small kind.

As a result of fairly close contact with a large number of these people, of all conditions of life, I assure you, Mr. Speaker, and hon. members of this house, that the three things uppermost in their minds are those with which the amendment proposed by the leader of this party deals. They want their men now in the services back home and into civilian life as rapidly as possible; they want houses for these men and for themselves to live in, and above all, they want jobs and the assurance that these jobs will continue.

These subjects of demobilization, housing and jobs have been dealt with by many other speakers in this debate; therefore I do not propose to say anything further on them except that I believe any hon. member of this house who has these matters sincerely at heart cannot conscientiously do otherwise than vote for the amendment proposed by the leader of this party.

I should like now to touch briefly on certain other matters. Because of the nature of my constituency, and because the prosperity of Calgary and of Alberta is very closely connected with the prosperity of the beef producers, I am very deeply interested in that industry. Some ten days ago the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Smith) and I, had several long talks with Mr. George Ross, chairman of the Council of Western Beef Producers, and a large rancher in southern Alberta. From their contacts with cattle men in the United States, his organization is convinced that unless at least token shipment of beef are allowed to go from Canada to the United States shortly, we will lose that market, which meant so much to us in the pre-war years in the matter of disposing of our surplus beef cattle, and thus in keeping prices of beef at a level which made it possible for cattle producers, and beef producers particularly, to operate at a profit. Mr. Ross states that beef producers are not interested in the three to four cents a pound more which can be obtained on the United States market. They are quite content to let the government take this in the form of export licence fees, or in any other way that it sees fit. But the beef producers are very anxious that this market be not lost in the future, and to ensure this they believe, with their expert knowledge of the situation, that some shipments of beef to United States markets are essential at the present time. To use Mr. Ross' words, "We have to keep the ditches wet, or there will be no flow in the future". I earnestly recommend to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) that this matter receive his immediate attention.

Another thing which exercises the beef producers is that the Income War Tax Act places them at a disadvantage as compared with people in any other business. The proceeds from any cattle sold by cattlemen are considered as income, and taxed. But a cattleman's breeding stock, his cows, are actually his capital, or his tools, comparable to a grain farmer's machinery or a manufacturer's plant.

A cattleman normally runs let us say 300 head of breeding cows. If, owing to a dry year or adverse conditions of any kind, he is unable to carry those cows through the winter and has to sell off, we will say, half of them, along with his normal turn-off of beef cattle—say 250 head—with income tax at present levels it means that he gets practically nothing back for those 150 cows. He is in a position where he has lost his capital, or his tools, and is not able to go back into production on anything like his former scale. Surely this is an injustice which parliament should redress by a provision in the Income War Tax Act to the effect that a farmer or rancher's normal breeding cows, brood sows, and the like, shall be regarded as capital, and not have to pay income tax upon the sale thereof.

I should like to compliment the Minister of Agriculture, who, I am sorry to see, is not in the house at this time, upon his eloquent dissertation of last night. I am certain he convinced himself and hon. members on his side of the house that the government's bonus on coarse grains and the price ceiling set on hogs has not been responsible for the marked decrease in the number of hogs produced. I am equally certain that he did not convince the men whom I was glad to hear him credit with knowing more about farming than any other group, that is, the men who milk the cows and feed the hogs. In this I refer more particularly to Alberta;

and the fact that the farmers in that province were not, and are not, convinced of this, is amply demonstrated by the very large decrease in hog production which has taken place in that province, despite the fact that these farmers had plenty of feed.

I can assure the minister, too, that from conversation with large numbers of men who formerly produced hogs, but who are not now producing them, it is clear that the sole reason they stopped such production was that it paid them much better to sell their grain. They maintain that they will not go back into hog production unless the price of hogs is raised. I can also assure the house that, so far as my constituency is concerned, hog production at the present time is falling from month to month.

I was glad to hear the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Wylie) discuss the question of irrigation for southern Alberta, when he addressed the house on Thursday last. I join with him in the hope that this question will not be made a political football, and that the government will proceed immediately with at least one of the irrigation schemes surveyed and talked about so much in Alberta.

I do not purpose at the moment giving the house any of the mass of facts and figures which is available to show the tremendous benefits which the construction of irrigation systems in western Canada would produce for the whole dominion. The hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) has already done a great deal along this line, and on behalf of Alberta I should like to thank him for his work, and for what he has accomplished in bringing to the attention of the house and of all Canada the possibilities of irrigation, and of many other natural resources in western Canada.

I was pleased, too, to hear the Minister of Agriculture state in his speech last night that the government proposes to go ahead with irrigation schemes, and I trust it proposes to do so immediately—not three or four years in the future.

During the debate several hon. members have discussed the subject of immigration. I hope this is an indication that there is an increasing interest in this matter, and that the fear-begotten closed-door policy, and ideas of the kind which were prevalent in the pre-war era, are disappearing. While we had hundreds of thousands of people on relief rolls, anyone who proposed an immigration policy or made the suggestion that we should bring more people to this country was looked upon as a lunatic. Such an attitude of mind was quite understandable at that time. Now, however, I think we should go back to the basic truth that we just have not enough people in Canada to make our great transportation systems economically sound, to make for a well-balanced economy, to develop properly our natural resources, or to support our multitude of governments—municipal, provincial and dominion—in the manner to which they have become accustomed.

To elaborate on the last point: our taxes are too high, but I see no good prospect of reducing them materially except by getting more people into the country, producing more wealth, and thus spreading the load.

However, I would not be in favour of a policy of unrestricted immigration. I believe the test as to whether a man should be admitted to Canada should lie in the answer to this question: can we readily and rapidly assimilate him? If the answer is no, then he should be excluded. Our experiences in the past fifty years should be a good enough guide to us in deciding as to whom we can or cannot readily assimilate. Certainly in that class would come all orientals. I believe we should rigidly close the doors against them. When I take this stand I trust that hon. members to my left will not accuse me of racial prejudice. My views are not founded upon racial prejudice, or racial grounds at all, but rather on common sense, observation, and a strong desire to build a great and united Canada.

I believe that even hon. members of the C.C.F. will admit that more than ninety-nine per cent of the white population of Canada will not intermarry with orientals. Those few who do, and their children, are exposed to all the cruelties, hardships and humiliations of social ostracism. I think it is only honest to make this admission, and to admit also that these oriental people cannot be assimilated into the broad stream of Canadian life. They cannot be made into thorough-going Canadians, and therefore it is better for them, as well as for us, to keep them out of the country.

Throughout the debate I have been glad to hear a large number of speakers say something on the subject of national unity. I think this is basically the greatest problem we have in Canada to-day. If we are to make this the great and united country which it is possible for us to build, we will all have to pitch in and work to that end. National unity has had a great deal of lip service in the past, but as far as I have been able to find out very few people have really worked actively and in a practical manner in order to get results.

We have had far too much sectionalism and distrust and suspicion in each part of the country toward every other part of the country. Provincialism too often has been fostered and encouraged for political reasons, which is one of the chief reasons it still exists to the extent it does at the present time. I trust that this sort of thing will soon become a thing of the past. We cannot afford to gamble with the future of Canada for political ends on this issue.

I think we must start a hard-pushed publicity campaign to foster Canadianism. We should make full use of our schools, our radio and our press to do this. People in this country to a large extent are Scotch-Canadians, Irish-Canadians, French-Canadians, Polish-Canadians and every other sort of hyphenated Canadians. What we need in place of that are just plain Canadians, and in order to get that we must teach Canadianism. The thing will not come of itself. The proposal of the government to adopt a Canadian flag and Canadian citizenship is a step in the right direction. That will help materially in getting people to think of themselves as Canadians. There has been too much harking back in this country to racial origins, and this has retarded the growth of a national spirit.

I know this from my own experience. I am of Scotch descent, and although my forefathers came to this country well over a hundred years ago, as a boy I was taught to think of myself as a Scotsman. Until the age of nineteen or twenty years I referred to myself as a Scotch Canadian whenever the matter came up. That sort of thing is fairly typical of the majority of people in Canada, but it is an attitude of mind which must be broken down if true national unity is to be secured.

Before concluding, there is another question about which I should like to say a few words, the trans-Canada highway. The hon. member for Medicine Hat introduced the subject in his speech a few days ago and said that he hoped the hon. member for Calgary West and I would support the project. I want to assure him that we support him most strongly, and will press for the adoption by this house of the ideas contained in a report on the subject prepared by the Calgary board of trade, from which I should like to read a few extracts, as follows:

> Canada requires an adequate highway system built around a hard-surfaced trans-Canada highway equal to any one of the many excellent transcontinental highways in the United States, otherwise Canada stands to lose her favourable balance of trade and economic world position through the loss of tourist traffic.
>
> Past experience has taught us that many provincial governments are not financially able to construct highways of such high standards through sparsely populated areas, and if we depend on the provinces to build such a highway system it is not likely same will ever be completed.

And again:

> We propose that the dominion government should embark on a programme similar to the United States federal aid programme, providing approximately ten per cent of the money being spent in the states, namely $50,000,000 a year, for a number of years, on a dollar for dollar basis with the provinces, and thus guarantee the expenditure of at least $100,000,000 a year on approved hard surfaced highways in Canada. We believe an adequate system of highways including a trans-Canada highway would not only satisfy and keep a large percentage of Canadian motorists at home, but attract sufficient motorists from the United States annually to more than repay our annual expenditure for such highways.

The Calgary board of trade is preparing a brief on this subject of a trans-Canada highway. When it is presented to the government I hope its recommendations will receive very serious consideration.

Mr. H. R. ARGUE (Wood Mountain): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne I want to say what many hon. members have said, that I too am a new member. As some of the other new members have had difficulty in speaking, I am sure I shall be excused if I have even more difficulty, because I happen to be the youngest member in this house. I hope I shall be able to equal the enviable record set by the other honourable young members. Those young members who have spoken have given the lie to the contention held in many quarters that a man must have graying hair and must limp in here on a cane before he is sufficiently mentally developed to make a real contribution.

A number of hon. members have referred to their constituencies, and I trust I shall be pardoned if I give the house some information about the constituency I represent. I represent the constituency of Wood Mountain which is situated in southwestern Saskatchewan. This constituency is composed of people of many nationalities. I was somewhat taken aback when I heard reference made to the apparent conflict between the different nationalities in Canada. I should like to tell the house that the people of all nationalities living in my constituency have learned to live harmoniously together.

I am afraid I shall not be able to boast of the great grandeur of my constituency or of the metropolises situated therein. It is largely an agricultural constituency, and there are only two towns, Assiniboia and Gravelbourg, which can boast a population of over one

thousand people. The constituents of Wood Mountain are not wealthy, and I think hon. members will have guessed the reason why. They are largely farmers, and the farmers of Canada have never received their fair share of the national income.

Another reason is that we are situated in what might be called the dry belt of the west. Because of climatic conditions we suffer periodic crop failures. But let us have no illusions; that part of the west is still a great agricultural area. It has contributed in no small measure to the large quantities of meat and butter and grain that have been used to feed our gallant allies. Wood Mountain constituency can boast of one of the largest credit unions in Canada, the Lafleche credit union. Credit unions in Saskatchewan are growing up like mushrooms because the banks have failed to satisfy the needs of the farmer.

I should like to digress for a moment and say something about banks. As most hon. members know, the banks have the privilege, and they follow it in practice, of lending ten times as much in bank credit as they have in actual cash. Chartered banks also have the privilege of discounting so-called gilt-edged securities with the Bank of Canada. By this means they are able to lend many times the amount of bank credit compared to their actual cash. In 1893 bank assets in this country totalled 302 million dollars; bank assets in 1943 totalled 5,150 million dollars. Bank assets for the last fifty years have increased at the rate of 35 per cent per year.

Banks were first organized for the business of making loans. When they were in business in the early years of this country their assets were composed almost entirely of loans, but starting about the year 1930 the structure of bank assets has changed enormously, until to-day, of the over 5,000 million dollars of bank assets, something over 2,700 million dollars are invested in government bonds and industrial stocks. The banks have not been able to survive in what we have been led to believe to be free enterprise. They are to-day a leech on all the people of Canada to the extent that they have that amount of investments in dominion government bonds and industrial stocks. The banks are no longer content to control merely the currency, the lifeblood of the nation; they want to own and control the whole Canadian economy. We of the C.C.F. believe it is time that the people of Canada owned the banks, and not the banks own the people as they do at the present time. For that reason I would suggest to the government that they take into very serious consideration the question of giving to the credit unions the full privileges and rights of the chartered banks. If that is done the people of Saskatchewan will have their own banks and will no longer have to go hat in hand to the banking institutions of Canada.

I might add that the banks are not to-day satisfying and have not satisfied since 1930 the credit needs of the people of Saskatchewan, and in particular the farmers. In 1926 there were 427 branches of the chartered banks in Saskatchewan. According to the 1943 report in the Canada Year Book, the branches of the chartered banks in Saskatchewan number now 213. That is, over half of the banks in Saskatchewan have closed their doors since 1926. The people of Saskatchewan are not sorry that they have closed their doors, but we do want to have banks of our own, and we can have them if the credit unions are given the full privileges of the chartered banks.

There is one part of government financial policy to which I should like to refer, and that is income tax. First I want to assure this house that we in this group are not opposed to the principles of income taxation. We believe that those best able to pay should pay. But we believe that the burden of the income tax has become too difficult to bear for those in the lower income brackets. Consequently, as the leader of this group suggested in his first speech in this new parliament, we feel that the income tax exemptions should be raised to $1,200 for a single man and to $2,000 for a married man.

A word as to how the income tax affects the farmers. In 1939, when war broke out, the farmers of Saskatchewan and of almost all parts of Canada had just come through a very serious economic depression. Consequently the farmers of Saskatchewan have been labouring under a terrific load of debt. According to the present income tax law, a man cannot count as an exemption from his income the amount he pays off on his mortgage. We believe, Mr. Speaker, that the difficulties and hardships and the economic depression which the farmers suffered in the hungry thirties should be considered in the income tax law, and that the law should be revised so that the amount of principal which the farmer pays off his mortgage shall be exempt from taxation.

There is another aspect. We believe very strongly, particularly those of us who come from areas in which crop yields fluctuate tremendously, that the average farmer's yield for one year or even two years is not good enough as a base for calculating income tax. The farmer's yield should be averaged over a period of at least five years, and on that

basis the income tax should be calculated. I am sure I speak for all the members of this group when I say that we intend to do everything in our power to see that the inequitable income tax laws are amended so that the common man in this country shall have a chance to make a living and maintain his family in decency.

A word about professional agriculturists. We have from time to time in this debate heard that many of our scientists are underpaid, and that there is great danger that we shall lose them to the United States. I assume that the scientists spoken of were chemists, physicists and engineers. I want to put in a plug for agricultural scientists. I happen to be myself, a graduate of an agricultural university. We in Saskatchewan know in a very real sense the benefits that come from research in agriculture. Professional agriculturists have recently given to us rust-resistant wheats, smooth-awned barleys, and royal flax. We now anticipate that in the not distant future we shall have a sawfly-resistant wheat. I would suggest to the government that the salaries of agricultural scientists be increased so that we may retain in Canada those now here and give some encouragement to young farmers to follow what I believe to be an essential and noble profession.

I should like at this time to express my pleasure at the unanimity shown by all speakers in the hope that we shall get a real measure of social security. There should be increased benefits in the way of provision for health, old age pensions, jobs for the workers and houses for the people. I am sorry to say, however, that the government's method of handing over the house-building programme to private enterprise has already failed. We in the C.C.F. believe the measure of prosperity which Canadians have had during the war, when two millions of our best workers were taken out of the production of consumer goods, gives an insight into the kind of Canada we can have if our economy is organized and planned so that its basis is production for use and not for profit. I would press for a comprehensive house-building programme, and in doing so may I suggest that all the slum conditions are not in our largest cities. I venture to say that every town in Canada has a shortage of houses. I protest against the slum conditions in which many farmers are forced to live. The government should formulate a comprehensive house-building programme which will guarantee to every family a decent house compatible with the real wealth which Canada can produce.

I want now to make reference to the newly announced government policy of a floor price on wheat basis No. 1 northern at Fort William. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) assured the house that the $1 per bushel for wheat is but the initial price, but the history of floor prices of agricultural products has been that the floor price becomes in effect the price the farmer receives. I am sure the government believes that the price of wheat in the near future will fall to $1 a bushel, or if not, why was the floor set so low?

Mr. GARDINER: I do not want to interrupt, but may I just make this correction? I did not say one dollar was the initial price. I said one dollar is the lowest initial price that can be set under the policy. At present the initial price is $1.25.

Mr. COLDWELL: At the moment.

Mr. GARDINER: And until it is changed it remains at that.

Mr. ARGUE: Pardon me; $1.25 is the initial price for the crop delivered this year, but the assurance we had was that $1 per bushel would be the lowest initial price until 1950.

Mr. GARDINER: That ever will be set, but it may not be set lower than $1.25.

Mr. ARGUE: Oh, yes; but judging from the government's record in the past we are afraid that $1 per bushel will in fact be the price. Another thing I should like to add to that is that $1 per bushel is not on all the bushels of wheat—necessarily—that a farmer can raise, but on the authorized deliveries, and we have had no assurance as to what those authorized deliveries will be. Consequently, if the government should see fit to decide that five bushels per authorized acre is the total amount of wheat a farmer can market in one year, this government will certainly assure economic death to all farmers in western Canada. We in the C.C.F. have always contended that the farmer should receive for his products a price based on parity, a price in line with the prices of goods a farmer has to buy. The farm management department of the University of Saskatchewan calculates that parity to-day is more than $1.40 per bushel. The government, instead of raising the price of wheat near parity, has announced a floor price very much lower than parity. The price which a farmer pays for fuel, for machinery, for interest on mortgages is relatively fixed. These are "stick-y" prices, and if in the future—and we of this group certainly hope it will not be the case—

the prices of agricultural products fall, the farmer facing fixed costs will find it almost impossible to survive.

We hear a good deal of talk from the government about social security, about public works programmes timed to prevent depression, but in its policy of agriculture it is dealing a death blow to security and prosperity. It is saying in effect, "We herald a new depression with a floor of only $1 per bushel for wheat." If labour is to be forced to take wages lower than those of the last few years, and if the farmer is to receive a reduced income, I am convinced that the government's scheme of timing public investment is doomed to complete failure. We in this group will be satisfied with nothing less than full production, and labour and the farmer receiving their full share of that production.

I want to bring before this house changes which we believe should be made in the Prairie Farm Assistance Act. The act was passed as a measure to alleviate suffering in areas of the prairie provinces and the Peace river which periodically suffer crop failure. That these areas are an important part of our agricultural productive system is well known, because of the large quantities of meat, butter, eggs and grain which have been produced in the war years—quantities which have contributed in no small degree to the successful feeding of the allied armies, and will contribute in like degree to feeding the starving people of Europe. This year large areas in Saskatchewan and Alberta have an almost complete crop failure. I have tried to obtain some statistics as to crop conditions in Alberta, but was unsuccessful. However, the Minister of Agriculture intimated last night that about half the farming area of Alberta is experiencing this year, a crop failure.

Before me I have the last estimate of crop yields coming from the Saskatchewan Department of Agriculture, under date of September 17, and looking over the map I would say, that about half of the area of Saskatchewan is this year experiencing a crop failure to the extent that yields for wheat will be less than ten bushels per acre.

The Hon. L. F. McIntosh, the Minister of Agriculture for Saskatchewan, as reported in the Regina *Leader Post* of recent date, stated that farm income from grain in Saskatchewan this year will be forty per cent less than last year. Surely a crop failure area of that size, and a drop in farm income from grain to the extent of forty per cent for Saskatchewan, warrants a comprehensive study of the inadequacies of the Prairie Farm Assistance Act.

There is a common belief that Saskatchewan farms are of enormous size, but such is not the case. In southwestern Saskatchewan the average size of farm is 325·2 cultivated acres, and in the north the size is 143 cultivated acres. The P.F.A.A. payments to be made to farmers in the prairies in any year declared an emergency year, and if the yield is from 4·1 to 8 bushels per acre, is $1.50 an acre for half the cultivated acres up to 400 acres. If the yield is 0 to 4 bushels, the payment is $2 an acre on half the cultivated acreage up to 400 acres. But to calculate the amount of money the farmer will receive under P.F.A.A., let us assume that a farmer is fortunate enough to have a crop failure when 171 townships in Saskatchewan have yields of less than five bushels an acre, that is, when the crop failure clause comes into effect. Let us assume that in the area under five bushels the average yield is half of five, or 2½ bushels per acre. If wheat sells at $1 a bushel at shipping point and harvesting costs are low, the farmer may have something like $1 an acre, or $162 over and above harvesting costs. Then the average farmer in southwestern Saskatchewan, the area of largest farms, would receive $2.50 an acre on 162·6 acres, or $406.50. If besides he has a crop of 2½ bushels an acre he receives a total income from grain and the P.F.A.A. of not more than $569.

Calculating farm operating expenses as three-quarters of the cost of hiring the work done, that is allowing the farmer no wages, then seeding and summer fallowing for the coming year would cost at least $659. This leaves the farmer, then, on operating expenses alone nearly $100 in the red, besides owing the municipality for taxes, owing interest to his creditors, and, what is more important, with no income for himself and his family.

The argument might be put forth that in times of crop failure the farmer can sell some of his live stock and in that way supplement his income. But in years of crop failure shortage of grain and fodder makes the retention of live stock a costly matter. It may well be that the farmer is forced to reduce drastically the numbers of his live stock and still have insufficient moneys from that source to pay for the wintering of his foundation stock. That was the experience of farmers in 1937.

The federal government has of recent date set out its proposals, many of which are admirable, before the dominion-provincial conference. At page 6 of the proposals the government of Canada states:

The achievement of greater stability in the flow of consumption expenditures is dependent, to a significant degree, on the policies that are adopted to protect the basic incomes of the groups whose position is most precarious.

Again, on page 7:

In familiar terms, our objectives are high and stable employment and income, and a greater sense of public responsibility for individual economic security and welfare.

Again, on page 17, speaking of agriculture, the dominion's proposal states:

No industry has made a greater contribution to the Canadian war effort than agriculture. This achievement has left problems of conversion to peace-time conditions comparable to those of manufacturing industry. Many branches of agriculture were greatly expanded in response to war needs and over-all production increased to levels far exceeding those of the past. This accomplishment drew heavily upon agricultural resources, resulting in heavy depreciation of machinery and equipment and great strain on the depleted farm population. The dominion government feels it has a responsibility to assist the industry in making the necessary readjustments to peace-time circumstances and to work in cooperation with the provincial governments, to provide for a greater degree of stability in farm income, and a greater measure of security than has prevailed in the past.

Then on page 28 we find:

A significant volume of social security payments, flowing into the consumer's spending stream, will stabilize the economy of the country as a whole and work against a fall in the national income. Social security payments therefore become, in these circumstances, a powerful weapon with which to ward off general economic depression.

Here the federal government has stated very definitely that it will seek to prevent violent fluctuations in the farm income. It has stated that social security payments will work against a fall in the national income. This is admittedly a good policy, but nowhere in the dominion's proposals, or in the speech from the throne, is there even a hint that the P.F.A.A. payments will be increased. The P.F.A.A. as it is now constituted is wholly incapable of maintaining even a minimum of security for the farmer.

Surely the government would be well advised to do more than pay lip service to social security, and implement comprehensive security for the farmer against crop failure.

I have shown that payments under the P.F.A.A. will not meet even next year's operating expenses, and in no way can it be conceived that the act now provides one dollar towards feeding, clothing and sheltering the farm family. The hard cold fact remains that in time of crop failure the farmer has no security.

[Mr. Argue.]

Speaking of the P.F.A.A., a report submitted in 1944 to the Saskatchewan reconstruction council states:

Of the five years in which the act has been in force, three of the years were more or less average. For the prairie provinces as a whole, one, 1941, was a very poor year, and, one, 1942, was the largest crop on record.

I have made a few calculations from that statement. For the three average years the payments totalled $22,864,272. The average payments for the three years of average crop were $7,621,424. The collections for those three years totalled $7,602,948 and the average collections per year were $2,534,316. The average cost of awards was $5,000,000 a year in round figures. We in the C.C.F. ask that the maximum payment be raised from $2.50 an acre to $6 an acre. This new figure would then cost the government about $15,000,000 a year.

I believe that Canadians have come to realize that prosperity, like peace, is one and indivisible. If labour and small business is to prosper, then agriculture also must prosper. Indeed prosperity in Canada generally depends in large measure on a prosperous agriculture. Prosperity cannot be built on an impoverished agricultural economy. If agriculture in the west is to be prosperous, farmers must be guaranteed an income in time of crop failure sufficient to give the farmer and his family a reasonable living and sufficient to carry on farming operations for another year. The sum of approximately $15 million a year would go a long way toward doing that, and I suggest that that is indeed a small item in the modern Canadian budget.

I should like to mention some proposed changes in the Prairie Farm Assistance Act:

1. That the payments be increased to $6 per acre for a zero to a four bushel yield, payments to be increased to $3 per acre for a 4·1 to eight bushel yield, and that elevator deductions be not greater than three per cent, which is three times present deductions.

2. That the payments be made to include all bona fide farmers to ensure that the man who has borne the expense of seeding and summerfallowing shall receive the payment.

3. That payments be made on an individual yield basis rather than a township yield basis, to ensure that every farmer who has a crop failure receives the full benefit.

4. That the minimum payment when the crop yield is less than four bushels per acre be $500, and that the minimum payment for a yield of 4·1 to eight bushels be $300.

The government has committed itself to a programme of social security, and to a programme that will prevent violent fluctuations in income for the farmer. An adequate Prairie Farm Assistance Act would assure the farmer against a falling income from one source, that is crop failure. A $6 per acre payment in time of crop failure is surely very little. It would mean for the average farmer in the area composed of the largest farms an income of still less than $1,000. Surely such a payment is but simple justice. I would suggest to the government that there is no single piece of legislation so universally demanded and so essential to the farmers of Saskatchewan, Alberta, and to a lesser degree Manitoba. I suggest that the measure I propose is essentially a social security measure. It would prove to western farmers that when the government says that social security measures will be implemented, it means what it says. Farmers demand a substantial increase in the P.F.A.A. payments, at least to the extent of $6 per acre in a year of crop failure. Farmers in the west will not rest content until their demands for adequate protection against crop failure have been met.

Mr. NORMAN JAQUES (Wetaskiwin): I wish to make a few general remarks which I hope to elaborate during future debates. First of all, I should like to deal with the criticism or the remarks made by the hon. member for Grey North (Mr. Case). He made them in a very generous and pleasant way and I hope that he will accept mine in a similar spirit. The hon. member said, as reported at page 369 of *Hansard:*

> I wish to say to my hon. friends that I do not think Canada, of all countries in the world, is in a position to give leadership in monetary reform.

May I say at the beginning that social credit is not only, or even mainly, a system of monetary reform. Social credit is a philosophy of life, and the monetary proposals are designed to make possible a Christian way of life, of individual freedom and individual responsibility.

The hon. member for Grey North went on to say:

> We produce a tremendous volume of goods in this country, and we must find a market for them in the markets of the world. The home market could never consume the amount of goods we produce, because we produce enough for 50,000,000 people. The productive capacity of this nation during the war absolutely staggers human imagination.

I am not quite sure what that 50,000,000 means. I do not think it can be meant that 11,000,000 Canadians produce enough goods for 50,000,000 people because, if you take the total production of Canada in the last year or so, you will find it certainly would not be sufficient to give even the bare necessities of life to 50,000,000 people. It is true that of some articles we produce a great deal more than we can use, and naturally we must find a market for the surplus in order that we may be able to bring back in exchange goods that we do not and cannot produce in Canada. That, of course, is understood, but apparently many hon. members are still of the opinion that there is a necessity for increased exports over imports. As they have said, "we live on our exports." Social Crediters simply reverse that and say that we live on our imports.

We Canadians are not the only people in the world who, under the pressure of war, have stepped up our powers of production. That is true more or less the world over. When I was in England the winter before last I met some prominent manufacturers, and one of them, who was one of the largest producers of aeroplanes in Great Britain, told me that the factories in Great Britain alone could produce in one week the world's peace-time needs for aeroplanes for five years. I think those figures are impressive.

At this time I should like to explain the fundamental difference between the economy of Major Douglas, or social credit, if you prefer that, and the ordinary orthodox economy. I think the basic difference is this, that the orthodox system of economics is founded on the idea that production automatically finances consumption, and that the wages, salaries and dividends distributed in producing, or in connection with whatever is produced, will equal the sum of the prices which must be charged if the producer is to recover all his costs.

Douglas denies this. Perhaps I might put it into the language of Mill, that great orthodox economist. His statement is one which I believe stands as one of the foundation stones of orthodox economics, and goes something like this: It is sometimes asked if there can be a shortage of what is known as purchasing power. Those who ask this question cannot understand what is meant by purchasing power. Every seller is, in the end, a buyer. Could we suddenly double the production of the country we should double the supply of goods in every market, but we should by the same stroke double the demand. Therefore there cannot be a shortage of purchasing power.

Some years ago I put that statement to the committee on banking and commerce, at a time when Mr. Towers was a witness. He said that it was some time since he left school, but that he agreed with it and thought it was perfectly sound. Then I said that I would like to put it in a slightly different form. Every birth in the end is a death. Could we suddenly double the number of children in the country we should double the supply of babies in every nursery, but we should by the same stroke double the deaths. How, then, does the population increase?

That is a perfectly fair statement of Mill's axiom. Mr. Towers excused himself by reason of his modesty for not answering the question. Seriously, however, how does the population increase, when every birth must end in death? Mr. Stevens, who was a member of the committee, answered at once that the birthrate was greater than the deathrate; and, of course, that is the answer to the statement of Major Douglas. It is that the rate of flow of prices is greater than the rate of flow of purchasing power. Once that idea is grasped, it can be seen easily that in normal times—not in war time—there is chronic shortage of purchasing power. It is for this reason that all orthodox governments, or those governments operating under an orthodox system of economics, demand, and plan their economy on increased exports. It is for this reason that they send goods out of the country. The wealth leaves the country, but wages and salaries remain behind. In that way to some extent they get around the chronic shortage of purchasing power.

But every industrialized country is in the same position; they all try to export more than they import. Hence you have tariffs, dumping duties and every other means to keep other people's goods out. That is why they speak of a favourable balance of trade when we send out of the country more than we bring in. The orthodox economist considers that this condition is one which indicates a favourable balance of trade—which as Euclid used to say is an absurdity. So much for that.

Our C.C.F. friends to my right have been criticizing private enterprise. Apparently they place upon private enterprise the blame for our troubles, and say that we should produce for use and not for profit. Well, for the greater part of my life I have been a farmer, and it always seemed instinctive and a self-evident truth that the most profitable thing to produce would be that which would be most generally useful. If you can supply a universal demand, then there is no doubt about your profit; but if you produce somethnig which people do not want, you may have to take a loss.

In criticizing the capitalist system our C.C.F. friends refer to it as a profit system. It is a great deal more than that; it is a system of profit and loss. I know of no other way by which dishonesty, inefficiency and, if you like, stupidity, among producers can be penalized than by allowing them to take a loss when they are inefficient or stupid, or produce something that is not wanted.

A word about nationalization, something which many people seem to think is a cure-all. I suggest that the acid test of nationalization is this: Will it lower production costs without lowering wages? Will it guarantee employment without curtailing individual liberty and freedom? That, to me, is the acid test of any new economic idea.

There is one thing about the C.C.F. I never have been able to understand. Coming from an agricultural community, I have never understood why farmers should "fall" for socialism when, of all people in the world, surely the farmers are the most individualistically-minded people. At hundreds of meetings throughout western Canada I have asked farmers why some of them support a proposed system of socialism. Invariably the answer is, "But of course socialism will not apply to us farmers." I have had a wide experience in the west, and I think I can say that the reason why the C.C.F. party won in Saskatchewan was that they managed to convince the farmers in that province that under a C.C.F. government they would not be socialized. On the other hand in Alberta, where I suggest the people are more wide-awake and better informed, the farmers were convinced that under a C.C.F. government they would be socialized. Therefore they voted for Social Credit rather than C.C.F. candidates. Socialists make an appeal to the masses and I think, I believe the reason is that the mentality of the masses is not the sum of the knowledge, or mentality of the individuals composing the masses; it is merely the lowest common denominator of the mentality of the individuals comprising the masses.

Then we have planning. Socialists seem to think we do not know what we want; we do not know when we want it, and we do not know in what quantities we want it. They say there must be some centralized authority in Ottawa or some other place to tell the people not only what they want but when they want it and when and how they are to get it. Social Crediters cannot agree with that. As a matter of fact, we have the most perfect system of planning in our monetary system.

If we regard money, dollar bills if you like, as economic ballots, so that every time we spend a dollar we are voting for the reproduction of what we buy, then we have what I would call economic democracy. But the supply of money is no longer, if it ever was, controlled by the people as a whole. It is controlled by some tiny minority. We know before the war you could go into a store and see the goods piled on the shelves, and there they stayed because the general public did not have the necessary economic ballots or dollar bills in their pockets to indicate to the manufacturer that he could go ahead and produce some more.

What does social credit propose to do to remedy that situation? I am not going to apologize for saying this again, because there are over one hundred new members who have not heard this before and it will not hurt some of those who have heard it before to hear it again. We propose simply to find out the total production and the total consumption of the country, and the difference between the two would show the shortage of money or purchasing power. We would equate the two by distributing the difference, so as to make them balance, by means of national dividends. I am not going into the ethics or morals of national dividends at this time, but that is the simple proposal.

Of course our opponents will say that when you distribute so many million dollars or a billion dollars, whatever it is, you would then have nothing but inflation and the extra money would be used in paying the extra prices. Douglas is a Scotsman; he is a very great Scotsman, and he knew enough to get around that trouble. He proposed to kill inflation before it started by having part of the dividend, or all of it if that were considered desirable, distributed in the form of price discounts or, as some say, compensated prices.

This simply means that retail prices would be reduced by a given amount, and then the retailer would be compensated the amount he was out of pocket. I remember when that was proposed in this house ten or so years ago. At that time it met with great ridicule, but as a matter of fact that system very largely has enabled Great Britain to carry on during this war. When I was over there I was told that the money paid out to retailers in the form of compensated prices amounted to three-quarters of a billion dollars. Not only was it used in Great Britain, it was used in this country but to a much lesser extent. For instance, the consumer of milk has been able to buy that product for two cents a quart less and the retailers have been compensated. That is pure social credit; that is a compensated price. The only difference is that in war time and under orthodox economics, the money to pay it is derived from taxation. That is necessary because in war time there is too much money floating about. However, in peace time the money for that purpose would be created by the Bank of Canada without debt and without interest.

Just a word on old age pensions. I should like to add my support in the strongest possible way to everything that has been said during this debate in favour of increasing the old age pension. I would not trust my language to say what I really think about the way the old people of this country have been living and are forced to live. It is a national and an international disgrace. I can only hope that when the readjustment is made these old age pensioners will receive at least a decent living pension. I am not going to say how much it ought to be, but I certainly would not have it less than $50 a month and I would not have the age limit over sixty years.

To change the subject a little, I should like to endorse what was said yesterday by the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Hlynka). When I was in England the winter before last I spoke to many Polish and other soldiers and refugees, and since then I have read everything I can lay my hands on about this matter. I am not going to say anything at this time except to quote from a statement which was issued not long ago by the former premier of Poland, Mr. Tomasz Arciszewski. He said:

> The government that has been formed in Poland is not new. It consists of sixteen communists and crypto communists under fraudulent party labels. The new premier is a soviet citizen and an official of the comintern for the past twenty years.

And again:

> Poland to-day is ruled by the N.K.V.D.

That is the soviet secret police.

> The Polish army now is controlled by officers of the red army. Thousands of Poles are being deported daily to Siberia because they are Polish patriots—those deported include women and children. As an old socialist I can say that under the regime imposed on Poland by Moscow Polish democracy is doomed and the entire struggle of five years against totalitarianism will become a mockery.

That was a statement issued by a former premier of Poland.

On August 20 last, Mr. Bevin, Foreign Secretary in the British Labour government, speaking of Hungaria, Bulgaria and Rumania, said:

> These governments which have been set up do not, in our view, represent the majority of the people, and the impression we get from recent developments is that one kind of totalitarianism is being replaced by another.

The whole world is now being deluged with details of German atrocities. Those atrocities are not due to the German people as Germans. They are due to the German people as totalitarians, and the result of totalitarianism is the same wherever it controls the lives and fortunes of the people. Propaganda during the war has, of course, been put out for war purposes, and very little truth has been made available to the people of this or any other country. The whole purpose of propaganda is, of course, to confuse the people and to hide the truth, and when it comes to lying propaganda of that kind our C.B.C. need not apologize to anything they have over there in Europe. There has been a steady propaganda day after day, week after week and year after year ever since the war started, to put over the idea of socialism and communism at the expense of our democracy.

I have here a statement issued by the Social Credit Association of Canada, constituency of Vancouver South, from which I quote:

> As the facilities of the publicly-owned Canadian Broadcasting Corporation have been made available to Mr. Elmore Philpott and he has used these to verbally support the armed insurrection of the Trotskyites in Greece, and in addition has openly condemned the actions of Churchill and General Scobie, head of the British army there; and whereas Mr. Philpott has been an avowed advocate of a centralization of power scheme known as federal union, of which Dumbarton Oaks and Bretton Woods are a part; and whereas the facilities of the C.B.C. has not been placed freely at the disposal of the Social Credit Association of British Columbia in order that the other side of the story might be presented to the people, we have therefore taken this, the only means at our immediate disposal, to place before you some essential facts of the power politics of those who crave world dominion and whose propaganda at times has been considered openly seditious.

With regard to the free publicity given by the C.B.C. to the various political parties and their leaders I would say that the free publicity given to the leader of the C.C.F. is out of all proportion to his importance either as a citizen or as the leader of a party. I do not mind saying that I hardly ever listen to the C.B.C. news but what I am informed of Mr. Coldwell's opinion on this, that or the other matter.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. JAQUES: That is all right, but what about the other leaders? I have never heard Mr. Low's name mentioned over the C.B.C., and we have as much right to free publicity as the leader of the C.C.F. I think we might hear a good deal more of the views of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) over the C.B.C. I think his ideas and his proposals should be put before the Canadian people more than they are.

I do not mind how much radio time a party buys. If the C.C.F. likes to buy hours of time, that is all right, for all know that what they are listening to is C.C.F. propaganda, and they are not deceived. But when there is all this free advertising—the C.B.C. is supposed to be absolutely non-partisan, almost *ex cathedra*—and people hear these ideas put forth day after day, it has an effect in time. Even during the election the Social Credit party, which then had as many members in the House of Commons as the C.C.F.—and we have had a Social Credit government in Alberta for ten years, whereas the C.C.F. have had one in Saskatchewan for only ten months—got only four one-quarter hours, the same as the communists got, a party that was banned during the war for subversive activities. I repeat, we got just the same amount of time as the communists. I understand, and I have heard it on good authority, that the ex-minister of national war services was let out because he opposed this propaganda which has been put over by the C.B.C.

Mr. KNOWLES: Who let him out?

Mr. JAQUES: I can understand that he would object to it. I know I do.

Finally I wish to quote from "The Road to Serfdom", by Professor Hayek, and I hope that every member of this house and everybody outside the house will read "The Road to Serfdom". Professor Hayek says at page 184 of this book:

> And, undoubtedly, not merely the ideas which in Germany and elsewhere prepared totalitarianism but also many of the principles of totalitarianism itself are what exercises an increasing fascination in many other countries. Although few people, if anybody, in England would probably be ready to swallow totalitarianism whole, there are few single features which have not yet been advised by somebody or other. Indeed, there is scarcely a leaf out of Hitler's book which somebody or other in England or America has not recommended us to take and use for our own purposes. This applies particularly to many people who are undoubtedly Hitler's mortal enemies because of one special feature in his system. We should never forget that the anti-Semitism of Hitler has driven from his country, or turned into his enemies, many people who in every respect are confirmed totalitarians of the German type.

I now conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, but I hope to elaborate them in future debates as the occasion arises.

Mr. BENOIT MICHAUD (Restigouche-Madawaska): Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with all those who have congratulated you upon your elevation to the high position which you now occupy and which you seem to discharge with such distinction and impartiality.

I also wish to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the address upon their splendid performances. At the same time, I apologize to them for having been unavoidably absent while they were speaking.

As a newcomer to this house I did not intend to participate in this debate. But when I see so many young members rising in their places and speaking with such ease, such assurance, and in many cases such eloquence, I feel that I would be remiss in my duty if I did not raise my voice to speak some of the things which I have to say, particularly since nobody from New Brunswick has as yet spoken. In addition, when I look around me I find so much food for thought that I cannot hold my peace any longer. I find, so far as I have been able to make a calculation, that there are ninety-seven new members like myself entering this twentieth parliament; that sixty-one members entered this house during the last parliament, and that fifty-nine more came in between 1935 and 1940. This leaves but twenty-nine members of the present parliament who sat in this house prior to 1935. Political life in this arena appears to be so short that unless one speaks his mind while a new member he may never have another opportunity of being heard.

As a new member, I presume I should introduce myself. I have the honour to represent the constituency of Restigouche-Madawaska, formerly represented by the ex-minister of transport, who is now Chief Justice Michaud of the king's bench division of New Brunswick. Incidentally, another namesake, Mr. Pius Michaud, of Edmundston, sat in this house for eighteen years. Those who sat with him—and I think there are still seven or eight of them—may be glad to hear that Mr. Pius Michaud is still enjoying good health.

At this moment may I remind the house that a part of the riding which I now represent, Madawaska county, was once represented by a gentleman who holds, I believe, a unique record in the history of this parliament. I refer to the late Senator Costigan, who came to the House of Commons in 1867 and sat continually until 1906, when he was elevated to the senate and sat in the senate until 1917, or a total of fifty years in both houses of Parliament. I think that is a record in the federal parliament.

At this stage, I feel I should pay a tribute to my immediate predecessor, who discharged in a most commendable manner his mandate, first as a private member, and then as a minister of the crown. Upon assuming his succession as a member for Restigouche-Madawaska, I feel that he has set for me a very high standard of service and efficiency, a standard which I shall do my utmost to emulate, and in this undertaking I shall welcome the cooperation of every member of this house.

Many hon. members have spoken with gratification of election results in their own constituencies. Others have expressed the view that as a matter of chivalry we should not bring to the attention of the house the fact that one or two or more opponents lost their deposits. I shall heed their suggestion. I wish to say, however, than in my campaign I appealed for an over-all majority over the three opposition candidates, and I am pleased to inform the house that the constituents of Restigouche-Madawaska supported this government in the proportion of fifty-five per cent. For the confidence which they have placed in me so generously I am most grateful; at the same time I consider that I have great responsibilities toward the good hard-working people whom I have the honour to represent. These responsibilities I propose to discharge to the utmost of my ability, and I trust that Providence will make it relatively easy for me to do so.

The people of my riding were satisfied with the present administration and expressed that satisfaction at the polls in no uncertain terms. I cannot illustrate that fact any better than by relating an incident which occurred to me two or three days before the voting. A settler, well known to me for his staunch Tory affiliation, came into my office and said that he wanted to speak to me privately. What he said was short and to the point: "I did not vote for you last summer", referring to the occasion when I was a candidate in the provincial election, "but I am going to vote for you this time. Mackenzie King, that's a good man"; and he went on to tell me in a few short sentences why he thought the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) is a good man.

May I also take this opportunity to offer my sincere congratulations to the newly appointed Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Bridges). Thirteen years ago this very day, I was working with him in his office pending my admission to the bar. Two years later he was elected to the legislature of New Brunswick. The Liberals elected on that occasion were so numerous that he did not have a chance of

getting into the cabinet. However, on the opening day he was elected, sir, to the honourable position similar to the one you now occupy. The hon. member for York-Sunbury, who served for three years in this war, comes from a distinguished and highly educated family, one held in high esteem all over New Brunswick. His father was chief superintendent of education of New Brunswick for many years, and enjoyed a most enviable reputation. His grandfather on his mother's side was a brilliant jurist who adorned the supreme court of New Brunswick for many years.

While making allowances for differences, I cannot help remarking that the career of the Minister of Fisheries and my own have had many points in common, and thirteen years ago little did we dream that we would be sitting together in this house. We both started teaching school, then drifted into law and finally into politics, provincial and federal. During the few years I practised law in Restigouche county we had occasion to meet in court on opposite sides, and I am pleased to state that I never came across a more loyal and more gallant opponent. Possibly because he is nine days my senior, he always managed to get ahead of me in life, in teaching, in law and in politics, matrimony being the only exception. The new minister has had a very successful career at the bar, and for that reason he should prove to be a valuable addition to the cabinet. I rejoice at his elevation to the responsible position he now occupies, and I wish him continuous success and good luck.

I suppose I should say a few words about my constituency. Restigouche-Madawaska is the largest constituency in New Brunswick. It is the third largest from the point of view of population. It is 210 miles from one extremity of the riding to the other. The main industries are, first, farming, including potato growing to quite a large extent. Incidentally, Senator Pirie, potato king of the British empire, began his phenomenal career by growing potatoes in the parish in which I was born and brought up and now he carries on extensively in my own constituency.

We also have lumbering, including three large pulp mills. Veneer logs are cut and processed in Saint John, New Brunswick, the largest mill of its kind in the British empire. Fishing is also one of our main industries, particularly in Restigouche county where salmon, smelt and lobster fishing is carried on. We have some of the most valuable angling licences in the world. It will be recalled that last summer the Duke and Duchess of Windsor were guests in the Restigouche river district and, according to newspaper reports, they gave a good account of themselves.

May I refer briefly to the record of enlistments from both counties of Restigouche and Madawaska in the present war. Voluntary enlistment was second to none in that part of New Brunswick. I know of no case of desertion which is hanging fire at the present time. I know of only one case of absence without leave, and since I have had no requests from anyone, I have every reason to believe that those who are in trouble with the Department of National Defence are very few. Of this record I am proud. A few days ago when an hon. member representing one of the Winnipeg constituencies was speaking he made reference to the Royal Rifles. I may say that a great many young men of Restigouche county were in the Royal Rifles regiment and a few of them who were well known to me will never return. We all rejoice in the reunions that have taken place or that are about to take place after almost four years of horror, but we must not forget those who made the supreme sacrifice. To this day I know of families who have never heard from their dear ones and do not yet know whether those men are alive.

During the course of the debate reference has been made to the housing problem. We have quite a housing problem in a few of the towns in my riding—Campbellton and Dalhousie for instance—and at this point I would endorse the remarks made by the hon. member for Hastings-Peterborough (Mr. White) some time ago on the recent amendments to the rentals order, whereby owners and purchasers of homes have been denied the right to possession on the giving of notice as in the past. It seems to me that this recent amendment has not brought any great measure of redress; on the contrary it has worked a great hardship in many cases. I am unable to concur in this most extraordinary interference with the civil rights of individuals. The order as it stood prior to July 25 was irksome enough, but it was justified in view of the war emergency, and it had a fairly good effect in bringing about a number of transfers of property. I hope that the matter will be reviewed at an early date and that the order will be amended so as to enable bona fide purchasers to obtain possession of their homes as was the case prior to July 25.

I should like to mention something about the difficulties which I have experienced in New Brunswick in obtaining loans from lending institutions under the housing act. Apparently the lending institutions are not eager to make loans. I have written and in a great

many cases have not received a reply. Of late, however, I did receive a reply from one of the companies together with their application form, but on glancing over it I am inclined to think the conditions are so hard that very few people will be able to meet them. For that reason I shall welcome any amendment to the housing act. To my mind the government should finance the building of homes somewhat along the line advocated by George Creed, president of the league for Economic Democracy, in his recent book entitled, "Money, Master or Servant". An editorial along the same lines also appeared in the *Liberal Advocate* of May, 1944, I believe.

It was my intention to say a few words about my good friends of the Social Credit party who took such an interest in my constituency recently.

An hon. MEMBER: You were not afraid, were you?

Mr. MICHAUD: No. Glance at the results and you will see that there was no reason to be afraid. As early as 1938 Mr. Louis Even organized a huge meeting in my native parish and on that occasion I took the trouble to travel 125 miles to listen to him. From then on I did not pay very much attention to their activities, but I know that for a period of three months prior to the election in Restigouche-Madawaska they carried on a passionate courtship and my constituents were honoured by the visit of none other than the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Low), the hon. member for Jasper-Edson (Mr. Kuhl), and the Hon. Lucien Menard, attorney-general of Alberta. I attended two of their three meetings. I happened to be unavoidably absent from my home town on the third occasion.

I have no time to-day to refer to any of the utterances of these gentlemen in this house, but I wish to make my position clear on a few fundamentals. In the first place, I do not believe that a single member on this side of the house favours full employment as an end in itself. Just a few days ago the hon. member for Jasper-Edson asked us what our aim was as regards full employment. I think we are all agreed that we are seeking full employment as a means to an end, as a means to acquiring purchasing power, but I do not suggest that it is the only way to acquire purchasing power. It is one which cannot and will never be done away with completely. To what extent the acquisition of purchasing power will depend upon employment in the future remains to be seen. It is a fact that working hours have decreased within the past twenty years, and in my opinion they will eventually be further reduced. When I see so much work remaining to be done in Canada, work which cannot be done by machines alone, I cannot conceive the possibility of any substantial reduction in working hours until all useful projects are completed in this country, and I have my doubts whether this condition of bliss will ever be achieved. Just what this full employment should mean in terms of wages or income I am not in a position to say. I cannot give any expression of opinion any more than to say that wages and income should be such as to make possible a substantially higher standard of living than that at present enjoyed by the average thrifty worker. I just wish to add that I firmly believe in the principle that all that is physically possible is financially possible. As I see it, the only limitations to our accomplishments are materials and man-power. If materials and man-power are not sufficient to meet all the demands of the people then priority should be established.

I was very much amused at the remarks of the hon. member for Edmonton East (Mr. Ashby) when he said some time ago that the people from the east are becoming enlightened. I am sorry that he is not in his place at the moment. With his statement I heartily agree. Indeed the people from the east are becoming enlightened, and they proved it quite well on June 11. In the maritimes, out of twenty-six ridings, government supporters carried nineteen. In Quebec there are at least fifty-eight sure supporters out of sixty-five members. Not being very familiar with the geography of Ontario, I am not in a position to say how many Liberals were elected east of Ottawa. By looking at the map I am inclined to think we have quite a few supporters from Ontario east of Ottawa.

Reference has been made to the proposed income tax reduction in Australia. I understand that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) gave some figures on the income tax structure of Australia and New Zealand a year or so ago. According to a statement published in the Toronto *Daily Star* on June 27, 1944, a married man with two children with an income of $1,200 would pay $96 in Australia and $150 in New Zealand. One with an income of $1,500 paying $24 in Canada would pay $188 in Australia and $229 in New Zealand. Take off twelve and a half per cent from this, and have your choice. I am sure that this government will allow anyone to pay according to the rates in Australia.

We have heard a good deal about living conditions in these countries. I do not mind listening to hon. members from the prairies telling us about their own problems concern-

ing wheat and irrigation projects, and I hope they will bear with us when we talk about our maritime problems. I am not very much interested in hearing about New Zealand or Australia, because I think very few people know exactly what conditions are in those countries. I daresay none of the hon. members who speak in such glowing terms of far distant countries would take the chance of exchanging this country for any one of those foreign lands. I believe that we live in a most wonderful country, possibly the best in the world, and I say it with all the sincerity at my command. Let us not belittle it by comparing it with other lands unless we are positive that such countries are better governed than we are. Let us have faith in our country. It is true that it may not be all that we should like it to be, but I would ask my good friends across the way to stop looking for a depression bear behind every bush. Let us all get together in a true spirit of cooperation and offer constructive suggestions to the government instead of trying to embarrass it.

To my mind there are two big problems confronting this government, namely, housing and unemployment. The speech from the throne discloses that the housing act will be revamped. I am glad to hear that because I think it requires material amendment. According to statistics given by the Department of Labour I believe that we still have more jobs seeking men than men seeking jobs. Apparently labour is unwilling to accept a cut in pay. We had this situation in Campbellton a short while ago when approximately 120 men were out of work as a result of a small shell factory closing down. I believe that most of them have now taken other positions and very likely at reduced wages. All this was done without too much commotion. Naturally the problem is more difficult of solution when a large number of men are involved. In order to arrive at some equitable solution of this big problem, both labour and industry will have to compromise in their demands. In this connection I find an editorial in the Ottawa *Journal* of September 11 very much to the point. It is long and I shall not trouble the house with reading it, but I wish to emphasize the main ideas contained in it. It suggests that full employment does not mean selected employment. It also suggests to industry not to take advantage of labour, and it concludes with this principle:

> The fortunes of workers and of industry in this country are indivisible.

It will not be long, however, before the people seeking jobs will outnumber the jobs available. In my opinion, if and when this situation arises, and if private enterprise is either unwilling or unable to cope with the situation of providing jobs, then it will be the duty of the government to come in with enterprises of a public nature. If the lending institutions are not reasonable in granting loans to prospective home builders, then the government should make the money available for the urgent task of home building. If the building of homes cannot take care of all the unemployed, then there are plenty of public works urgently needed; and may I take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to suggest a few public projects which are badly needed and would be greatly appreciated in my own constituency. First and foremost is the interprovincial bridge between Campbellton and Cross Point. This project has been under consideration for upwards of twenty years. I understand that an interprovincial bridge is generally built under some sort of three-way arrangement between the two provinces concerned and the dominion government. Negotiations between the provinces of Quebec and New Brunswick have taken place at different times in this connection, the latest occurrence being less than a year ago. At that meeting there were two ministers of the New Brunswick government and at least one from the Quebec government, besides provincial members from the two provinces. I take the liberty of bringing this matter to the attention of the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) and I urge that as soon as materials are available the project be given immediate attention. There is no question that the man-power will be plentiful when the steel and other materials can be released.

There is also urgent need for a new post office building in Campbellton. The present one has served its time and could be used to shelter other departments of the government at present located in rented buildings. I do not know whether there is a scarcity of building material for such constructions, but a time will come in the near future when materials will be available. There is one project, however, which in my opinion should not be difficult to undertake, because materials and labour for it are easily obtainable right on the spot. I am referring to the Dalhousie wharf, which is in a deplorable condition. There is plenty of lumber in Restigouche county as well as labour.

A new ferry service was reinstated last spring between that town and the Quebec side. It is urgently needed and should never have been discontinued, after having been in operation for a great many years. But unless

some repairs are made to this ferry wharf it will be very difficult for the ferry service to continue with any success. To my mind there is no justification for allowing both wharves to remain in their present state of disrepair, and I warn the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Fournier) that I shall never miss an opportunity to bring this matter to his attention unless I receive the assurance that repairs will be undertaken in the near future.

Before resuming my seat I wish to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I am highly honoured in having the privilege of occupying a seat in this House of Commons with such distinguished citizens from all parts of Canada. Judging from the tone of the remarks which I have heard up to this day, I feel that every hon. member in this house has but one aim and objective, namely, the welfare of the greatest number of his constituents. Unfortunately, we differ, and at times radically, on the methods of approach to achieve our common aim. I shall always try to remember this point in the course of the discussions in this house. If it does occur to me to criticize the views of other hon. members who do not see eye to eye with me on matters of public interest, I wish to assure them that I do not question the sincerity of their motives. In return, I hope that fellow members will do me the same courtesy. With this attitude of mind, I believe that we can tackle with confidence the ardous task ahead of us. By an honest and sincere exchange of views during the coming four or five years, we should be able to make this Canada of ours a land wherein it will be easier to live in peace and contentment.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. W. CHESTER S. McLURE (Queens): Mr. Speaker, you have listened to speeches by hon. members from every province in this Dominion of Canada, save one. As representative of that province I felt it was my duty to say a few words about the garden of the Gulf. Let me state two facts at the beginning of my remarks. Prince Edward Island is the banner province of this dominion, bar none. Prince Edward Island is the province which the dominion government has neglected ever since we came into the union in 1873. During my rambling remarks I shall attempt to give my reasons for making that statement.

In rising to speak on the address in reply to the speech from the throne, I do so because this debate affords an opportunity to a member to speak on any subject without his remarks being termed irrelevant. I feel I would be remiss in my duty as a member of this house if I did not offer a few words of congratulation at this time. My first desire is to congratulate you, sir, upon being raised to the position of Speaker of this house by your peers in this chamber. Your appearance, your qualifications and your experience fit you admirably for that position. But I regret that I was the first member of this house to be called to order by Your Honour. However, I bowed to your ruling.

I should like to say to the mover (Mr. Benidickson) and the seconder (Mr. Langlois) of the address in reply that any adjectives which I might use by way of congratulation would be simply a repetition of the fine things that have been heaped upon them. I concur in all that has been said regarding them, but I wish to add that this was a well planned honour to the service men of Canada.

I would have desired the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) to be in his place at this moment because I should like to offer him a few words of congratulation. When I entered this house a few days ago and as I looked across to the other side from time to time since then, I could not help noting the pleased expression of the Prime Minister. I could not say whether that was due to his being in the same old position of Prime Minister of Canada, but I did have another thought in mind. I wondered if the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Reid) had piped him in as king of Glengarry.

I wish to offer my sincerest congratulations to the leader of His Majesty's most loyal opposition (Mr. Bracken). May health and strength be granted to him—and likewise to the Prime Minister—to aid him in the great task of restoring responsible democratic government to our dominion. When the Prime Minister was speaking the other day he cracked what was perhaps a good joke about my leader. The Prime Minister said that it took him only two or three weeks to enter parliament after being defeated in his constituency, whereas it took my leader two or two and a half years to get into the House of Commons. I have it on the Prime Minister in two ways. It took me ten years to get back into the house, and that surpassed him. But I did not leave my constituency of Queens because I knew that sooner or later the electors would find out that I was the better man. Had they found it out sooner I would have been delighted.

If time permitted I should have liked to extend my congratulations to the leaders of all groups in the house and also to the young members who have spoken for the first time. All I can say is, congratulations and carry on.

When one returns to this house, after a period of years, one glances around and sees a great many new faces and perhaps regrets that some of the older ones are not here. As I glanced around I saw one of those great masters of the universe, the hand that rocks the cradle, the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mrs. Strum). Congratulations. And let me give this old toast in her honour:

> Here's to our lovely women
> Who fill our lives with little bees and honey;
> They break our shocks;
> They mend our socks.
> But, oh, you bachelors,
> Aren't you afraid how they will spend your money?

I wish to make a few remarks on the great and glorious news that flashed around the world during the last few weeks of victory, the cessation from war—victory, with unconditional surrender over the nazi gangsters whose thought was world domination; and victory once again on the Pacific coast over those human rats who thought they were the elect of the world and could destroy our civilization. Now we have a liberated Europe and a controlled Pacific, and I thank the overruling Providence for the victories that have come to our armed forces. I give thanks to those of our nations and to those of the allied nations, to the countless heroes among the men and the women who faced capture, faced shackles, faced crippling injuries and faced death itself to make your freedom, Mr. Speaker, and mine secure. To those heroes of our nation and our allied nations I bow in sincere gratitude. To those who made the supreme sacrifice and passed out of the sight of man on to the paths of glory I have no words adequate to express my thanks and devotion. May we one and all be worthy of the price they paid.

While giving thanks to the Divine Ruler of the universe for our great allied victory, I am inclined to believe, as I read the papers from time to time of the atrocities of the Japs, that the Great Ruler may never fully pardon the American nation or the British nation for not absolutely destroying and driving into the sea those human rats of the Pacific. God forbid that our nation should ever allow one of them to set foot on Canada again. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, you may think I am bitter, but let those atrocities that have been written up come home to you, and there is not a member of this house, I believe, but will say: Away with those human rats.

I have noticed by the different speeches which have been made in this debate that it is customary for a member to introduce himself to the house. In case hon. members may not know it, may I say that I have the honor to be one of the representatives of that dual constituency of Queens in the Garden of the Gulf. I wish to inform this house that I am the Progressive Conservative, and not the Liberal representative of Queens as the press stated a few days ago. However, I pardon them for a slip of the pen more easily because I happen to be one of the owners of that great standard of news, the Charlottetown *Guardian,* and I know how easy it is for a writer to make a slip. The Charlottetown *Guardian* is known for its worthy and careful writing, and it has the slogan "It covers the Island like the dew." Since we are a prohibition province, that means the morning dew, and not rye.

The chief topic in this debate is the address in reply to the speech from the throne and for a few minutes I wish to direct my attention to it. As I read and re-read the speech from the throne, I considered that it was quite academic. It would make good propaganda for a political thesis on war-time doings and the war. The speech from the throne is a governmental document prepared by the cabinet and placed in the hands of His Excellency by his constitutional advisers. Therefore any criticisms of mine or of anyone else's in this house of the speech from the throne do not reflect upon His Excellency the Governor General either in person or in public affairs.

The speech from the throne can best be described as a synthetic speech. Do not mistake me. I do not mean sympathetic; I mean synthetic. Let me draw to the attention of the house one brief sentence, from page 8 of *Hansard,* which is to be found in the document placed in the hands of His Excellency. It states:

> The government has received a definite mandate from the people of Canada.

To have a definite mandate from the people a government must win a majority of the seats so contested. Did this government win a majority of the seats contested? Decidedly no.

In the speech from the throne it was expected by the people of Canada and their representatives in this house that the government would deal with live issues, issues of the present time, and not the morbid history of past doings or misdoings of a government which does not now represent the majority. Why did the speech from the throne not contain something definite on such subjects as jobs for the jobless, taxation reform, hospitalization for veterans, encouragement for

the industries of Canada in order that private enterprise may be able to develop and make jobs for the jobless?

Besides the definite omissions which I have mentioned, here is one more of many omissions. Hon. members all know that sins of omission outweigh by far sins of commission. Here is one great omission. Now that the war is over, the duty which faces this government and parliament in priority over everything else is to remove with all convenient dispatch those block-busters of business, industrial and agricultural production, and free enterprise. The nation has stood for regimentation from 1939 to 1945, for government by control boards of all kinds and descriptions, for government by orders in council. During the past war years a reign of dictators has developed through war-time controls in Canada. Now that the war is over, this must not be permitted to continue, or it will undermine and destroy the rights and liberties for which we have so long struggled. Controls and controllers may have been necessary in some things during the war, and Canadians patriotically stood for them in the interests of an all-out war effort. But now that the war is over, let us not permit these controls and dictatorships, which are insidiously and definitely becoming part of our every-day life to continue. These controls in their particular branches are nothing less than dictatorship. To a large extent they have taken away from us our civil rights and have denied the right of the citizen to appeal to the courts. It should be the first duty of this government and this parliament to see to it that the hard-earned civil rights of the people are restored to them, and that these dictators —or call them what you will as long as you use parliamentary language—shall be scattered to the four winds of oblivion, and responsible democratic government restored to Canada.

It is not my intention to criticize further the speech from the throne. It has been torn asunder, with the government which produced it, by other speakers, and parliament is waiting to learn what the ministers of the crown are going to do.

I said a while ago that, if time permitted, I would refer to my own constituency of Queens county and to Prince Edward Island. First, let me ask this question: what representation has my constituency or my province in the federal cabinet? Here is the answer. The official announcement made by the Prime Minister a few days ago was to the effect that Prince Edward Island, the cradle of confederation, is deprived of representation in the inner councils of the federal government. It was generally believed by the people of Prince Edward Island, when a shuffle of the cabinet was made prior to the election, with the Prime Minister's own statement that every province including Prince Edward Island would have representation in the cabinet, that after the election was over, the Liberal member of the dual constituency of Queens would receive the portfolio of fisheries, a position which, from his practical business experience, he could have filled admirably. But no, Mr. Speaker, we as a province are neglected and left out in the cold. The Prime Minister forgot that when he was looking for a roosting place to enter parliament my province of Prince Edward Island gave him his only opportunity. It is also true that when the Prime Minister was looking for seats for the Hon. Charles A. Dunning and the Hon. J. L. Ralston we gave them our suffrages. But perhaps some hon. member may be saying to himself, or thinking, "Well, Prince Edward Island had good representation with high ranking men in the cabinet." But no, Mr. Speaker, they were mere bagmen, serving their own private interests and had not the interest of Prince Edward Island sincerely at heart. Under the terms of confederation, when a province has elected members of parliament, especially a parliament controlled by men of its own political complexion, it should not be debarred from representation in the councils of the government. But that representation is denied us. Can you call that democracy in any degree?

Let me say a few words with reference to confederation. In 1867 the Dominion of Canada was confederated. The aims and objects of that union were consummated and joined together by a documentary agreement with all classes and creeds, all provinces and races and all territories that went into that union. Confederation had a birthplace and a cradle. It was fitting that my province of Prince Edward Island should be that birthplace, and some time in the future I may have an opportunity to give to this house some of the details of the birth of confederation.

But Prince Edward Island did not choose to join the union in 1867. Why? Because the terms offered were not considered fair and equitable to that province. We therefore remained out of the union and we paddled well our own canoe. Something comes in here that may be of a little interest, namely, the question of unity. We have heard much of late, and especially during the election campaign, of the need of unity in Canada. If we presuppose that men are honestly talking about unity, what is the greatest need today with respect to unity? Simply that we all, in all the provinces, should know what

we mean, each in his own province, when we demand a square deal from the government of Canada.

Each province is now a part of the great Dominion of Canada, and my province, as the cradle of confederation, is an essential part. The personnel of my province is the acme of good citizenship since it embraces the four great races of the world: the diplomatic, governing Englishman; the shrewd, canny and industrious Scotsman; the fighting and industrious Irishman; these three great races combined with the joyous, light-hearted, home-loving Frenchman, giving to our province a unity that should be not only greatly admired in that province but greatly desired throughout Canada.

The people of our province live in a land that is worthy of respect and admiration, a land fertile and productive. There is no land more pleasing to the tourist to look upon, a land where the industrious farmer is offered the best soil for farming which is to be found in Canada. All these things, all this beauty in Prince Edward Island, are bathed in the waters of the Atlantic, rich with fish of all kinds, herring, cod, mackerel, lobsters all in abundance, and besides that the great bivalve fish now produced by aqua-farming, the oyster. These are the endowments of Prince Edward Island, and I could mention many more such as the ponds and bays that bring ecstacy and joy to the men who follow the art of the great fisherman Izaak Walton.

Notwithstanding all these endowments, and many more I could mention, which a kind nature has bestowed upon us, we must demand justice, mercy and a fair and square deal from the dominion of which we are a province.

I said a moment ago that our province did not choose to enter confederation in 1867, but after we had been wooed for six years by the dominion the union was consummated in 1873, our province having secured better terms, especially with regard to our transportation. There was this unique clause in that documentary agreement, namely, that we should have continuous, efficient and adequate communication with the mainland. That part of the contract has never been implemented to the full by any government.

Time does not permit me in forty minutes to give all the details of the treatment which my province has experienced in the matter of winter communication. Suffice it to say that until 1910, and even later, the only sure way of continuous communication to and from the mainland in the winter time was by small iceboats provided with runners, hauled and propelled by passengers and crew across the strait of Northumberland, a distance of some nine miles. True, we had during that time such steamers as the S.S. *Stanley,* S.S. *Minto* and S.S. *Earl Grey,* plying in the winter time between Pictou, Nova Scotia, and Georgetown, Prince Edward Island. These boats gave some measure of transportation, but often they were held up for eight or ten days at a time and we had neither mail nor anything else from or to the mainland. Every election, for as long as I can remember, politicians would come to us with the same old promises, although some of the promises had more sugar-coating on them. In the election campaign of 1911 the two great leaders of the two great parties, the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Right Hon. Sir Robert L. Borden, came to our province. They studied our transportation problems, and they realized the injustices we had suffered. The electors of our province at that time were determined to have a definite commitment from either or both of those great men. I might say that Right Hon. Sir Robert L. Borden pledged himself and the party he represented to inaugurate a ferry between Cape Tormentine on the mainland and a point nine miles distant across the Northumberland strait on the Prince Edward Island shore. This place is now named Borden in honour of Sir Robert. What was his pledge? He pledged to give Prince Edward Island a service that was long overdue, and that we should have some continuous winter communication. Accordingly docks were built at Tormentine and Borden and an icebreaking ship was built on the Clyde for this ferry service. This was the first—

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but I have to remind him that he has spoken for forty minutes. With the consent of the house he may carry on.

Mr. McLURE: May I continue?

Mr. SPEAKER: If it is the consent of the house.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Continue.

Mr. McLURE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and hon. members. I said we had our docks built at Borden and Tormentine, and a ship built on the Clyde as an icebreaker. This was the first real attempt to give us justice as a province of the dominion. The docks and boat were built in 1915, and a steamer, the S.S. *Prince Edward,* demonstrated that continuous winter communication could be solved. This boat has done wonderful service, and let me say to you, sir, that she is still the only boat we have on that ferry service. She has been in the service for thirty long years.

Under the Bennett government we had another good steamer built in 1931, the S.S.

Charlottetown. Hon. members know the fate of this ship in 1941. This steamer has never been replaced. Why? No one knows except it be the ministers of the government opposite. Excuses of the most frivolous kind were given. Some of the excuses were lack of material, no yard space available to construct a ship of this size; but all of those were not good excuses. The government could have built a ship for us in United States yards where they were crying aloud for work at that time. The United States had not entered the war and did not enter the war until five or six months after the S.S. *Charlottetown* was lost.

Prince Edward Island has been promised a boat since July, 1941, but as yet we have no definite knowledge as to when she will be in service. I may say here and now that I hope to place on the order paper some questions that will elicit an answer of some assurance with regard to this boat.

We are under the greatest handicap of any province in this country. Look for a moment at our freight rates; look for a moment at how we are subjected to delays in the transporting of goods. Let me cite one example, the handicap to which our producers are subjected. It can be pointed out that to take a five-ton truck laden with farm produce from Borden to Tormentine, and to bring back that truck loaded again, probably with coal or something else, another distance of nine miles, costs over $50; I think, to be exact, $50.65. It costs that amount to move five tons of produce a distance of eighteen miles, while on land in the other provinces, and even in our own, to move that truck and freight would cost not more than $4.50.

Our contention is that according to the terms of confederation we, the province of Prince Edward Island, should have the Northumberland ferry treated as a highway, and that whatever charges are to be made for freight over it should be and must be borne by the dominion government.

There is a great deal more that I could say with reference to our transportation problems, but I wish to say that in this house there are a great many men who know Prince Edward Island. I know that any remarks of mine with reference to our transportation problem will have the fullest support of the other hon. member for Queens (Mr. Douglas), the hon. member for Prince (Mr. McNaught), the hon. member for Kings (Mr. Grant), all of Prince Edward Island. It would also receive the unanimous support of a number of hon. members who have visited my province and know the conditions. I should like to mention the men who I know will support us in getting a square deal from this dominion. They are as follows: The hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon (Mr. Black), the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Black), the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church), the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker), the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon), the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Harris), the hon. member for St. John-Albert (Mr. Hazen), the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings (Mr. Ilsley), the hon. member for Rosedale (Mr. Jackman), the hon. member for Cape Breton North-Victoria (Mr. MacLean), the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol), the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. McKay), the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Rowe), the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Black), the hon. member for Royal (Mr. Brooks), the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Claxton), the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis), the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Hackett), the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Hatfield), the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Homuth), the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis), the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. McCulloch), the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Matthews), and the hon. member for Colchester-Hants (Mr. Stanfield), and the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Bruce). Probably there are some other members whom I have omitted.

I would say in conclusion—and I wish to be careful in this—that if the Prime Minister were in his place at the moment I would say to him and to the members of the cabinet, to all hon. members of this house and to this parliament that if you do not know the facts concerning my constituency and province it is to your discredit. We are penalized in our province. Hon. members should know, and will know if I am permitted to speak in this chamber, about the burdensome restrictions, conditions and discriminations under which my province struggles. To hon. members I say that if I have underrated their knowledge, then I crave their pardon. But it is different with the cabinet; if they know, it is to their shame as a government that they do not at once give us justice and a square deal.

Here is something that this government has known during the past six years: the part my province played in an all-out war effort when we were first in enlistments; first in the buying of bonds; first in the buying of war savings stamps; first in contributions to the Red Cross, Russian relief funds and other funds; first in the production of

foodstuffs—first in everything for an all-out war effort. On all occasions my province exceeded its quota on a per capita basis, accepting the last census of about 88,000 souls as the figure from which to work.

Much of the publicity from my province has been of a boasting, halting, or apologetic nature, just as if we were on the defensive, and not a part of this great dominion. Why should there be a gradual decrease in our population from 109,000 in 1873 to 88,000 in 1941? Some say that this is on account of the burdensome restrictions, conditions and discriminations imposed upon us; but I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the house that it is owing to the fact that the terms under which we entered confederation in 1873 have never been implemented. The dominion has not lived up to the signed document. My province is not asking any special favour; we are not seeking gifts. But as a province we demand justice, fair play and equal rights through the implementing and the long delayed fulfilment of confederation. If the dominion does not wish to recognize us as a province, then I say, give us justice by our liberty.

Mr. T. J. BENTLEY (Swift Current): Mr. Speaker, I am another one of those new members.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: But do not ask for an hour and a half.

Mr. BENTLEY: I can assure my good friend from the peach country that we from the wheat country are not even as long-winded as they are out there, let alone those in the spud country.

Before proceeding to the few things I should like to say to-night, may I pay my compliments to you, Mr. Speaker, upon your accession to the position of Speaker of the House of Commons. May I go further and congratulate the house upon having acquired so gracious a gentleman as yourself to act in that capacity. As host you have on several occasions, and indeed quite recently, been most tolerant and gracious to hon. members who have overrun their allotted time. I shall try to avoid that this evening, but I may possibly offend in some other direction; and in such event I hope Your Honour will realize that any offence I might commit would be through ignorance, certainly not through intention, and that under such circumstances you will show tolerance.

May I add my word of praise and congratulation to those of other hon. members who have referred to the young gentlemen who moved and seconded the address in reply, from whose observations this long debate has developed. If they continue in public life—and I assume they will—they have many years of great public service ahead of them. I believe the evident sincerity of their utterances bears out that contention.

May I make one further observation in this strain before proceeding farther. It gives me pleasure to congratulate by predecessor from the constituency of Swift Current, Mr. Graham, upon his appointment as assistant to the Clerk of the House. Mr. Graham is a highly respected citizen in that place about which I shall speak later in my speech. I appear as member purely because of a change in political ideas, and not because of anything in his character which would make him unfit to continue as member, so long as he cared to do so.

An hon. MEMBER: Eskimos.

Mr. BENTLEY: We have not any of those up our way.

Many of the speeches have been encouraging to those of us who are new in the house. The general feeling of good will has been helpful. With one exception, I believe those belonging to this group come from western Canada. Perhaps through the fault of no one, there have been times in the past when there appeared to be great division between east and west. Why this should be so, I could never understand. Hon. members from all parts of the house have stated during the debate that they are most anxious to see an end of national divisions among Canadians. My view is that there should be no more hyphenated Canadians, and that we should go even farther than that. Not only should we not recognize English-speaking Canadians or French-speaking Canadians as such, but there should be no such thing as western Canadians and eastern Canadians. Let us all be Canadians, although living in different geographical centres.

Statements along this line have been expresed from all sides of the house, and I have been pleased to see that spirit prevail. Hon. members from all quarters have said, too, that they share the ideas expressed in the speech from the throne. Hon. members in this group join in that expression of agreement.

May I draw the attention of the house to one slight difference between the views held by other groups, and those held by this one. No hon. member from any other group has indicated a willingness on the part of his group to adopt some other methods if at any time during the course of this parliament it becomes evident that such action is necessary to implement what is promised

in the speech from the throne. However, my leader, the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), when he spoke in the debate made it clear that this group was prepared to support every measure which, either in whole or in part, will bring about any of the good things foreshadowed in the speech from the throne. He made it clear, too, that this group does not believe that that machinery can be made to operate, or that plans can work properly under the present system of so-called free enterprise, something which in our opinion more nearly approaches monopolistic enterprise.

However, despite our lack of confidence in this free enterprise system, and because of our anxiety to have a prosperous and united Canada, we have indicated our willingness to sink our differences, and to do our best to help make the present machinery work. I have heard no other leader or member of any other group indicate that if time and circumstances prove that the machinery of the government to do the job they said they were going to do should fail or break down, he would be prepared to give up his ideas and try new ones. I am going to explain what I mean by that a little later on. I will exemplify it in connection with one particular item of our national business which is close to western hearts.

Before I do so I wish to introduce myself and my consituency. In the first place I am a Canadian citizen. My people settled in Halifax in 1753 and, so far as I know, since that time all of them were either born here or came over with the United Empire Loyalists or were of some other local North American stock. I am not bragging about that because I had nothing to do with it, but I am not the least bit ashamed of it. In fact I like the old province of Nova Scotia very much.

I was glad to hear some of the speeches that have been made by my fellow countrymen. I am such a Canadian citizen that I suppose I have broken the laws of this country more than most hon. members. But I could not avoid doing so, I had either to lie or to break the law. The law of this country does not permit me to be a Canadian citizen. When I joined the army, which I did last time; when I registered the birth of one of my children; when the census taker came around; when I had my national registration card made out, which by the way I carry all the time, I was asked to give my nationality. In each case I said "Canadian", but the interrogating gentleman undertook to make me name some other nationality. I could have told him Chinese, but I would have been lying because I am not a Chinaman. I could have told him anything but I would have been lying. I refused to give any national category but Canadian. I hope this parliament will put me within the pale of the law so that I do not have to break it or lie any more.

I represent the federal constituency of Swift Current. Some hon. members have said that their constituencies were the best in Canada. Mine is to those who like it; it would not be to those who do not. We are a bald prairie constituency and many of us like it, so we stay there. We do not blame other people from other parts of the country for not liking it. It is a good thing that this is still a free country. You can move from Swift Current to Prince Edward Island if you want to; I think they will still let you go in there. You could certainly go to Prince Edward Island and we are allowed into Alberta. There are many places we could go to, but many of us stay in Swift Current because we like it.

The people there are mostly farmers. There is only one large urban centre and that is not large in the terms of some of the centres in eastern Canada. I believe Swift Current City has a population of possibly 7,000 people now, but normally its population would be between 5,000 and 6,000. Most of the wholesale houses and retail businesses cater to the agricultural trade, except that we are a Canadian Pacific railway terminal with a good C.P.R. payroll. However, the great bulk of our population of 40,000 are farmers or those who are directly serving the agricultural community.

They are good people. Again I will not say on their behalf that they are the best in Canada because they do not want to be classed in that way. They just want to be classed as being as good as the rest of the people of Canada. They just want to be assured that they will have the same opportunities to live their kind of lives with a degree of security commensurate with their ability to engage in enterprising and useful work, which as I have said is farming in the main. I would be doing them an injustice if at any time I claimed for them any greater rights than that. But I do assure you, sir, that we will certainly claim those full rights and I will do my best to see that they are obtained.

We are in the middle of a dry farming area. Like the young hon. member for Wood Mountain (Mr. Argue) who spoke this afternoon and the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. McCuaig) who spoke last night, my constituency is in that area south of the Saskatchewan river. We have some lovely wheat land; we have some fine ranching land and we have some very good mixed farming

land if we only had adequate and constant supplies of water. We would be more able to undertake mixed farming or live stock raising if along with adequate supplies of water for the stock we also had sufficient water to assure our being able to raise continuous and adequate quantities of fodder for the live stock.

The prairie farm rehabilitation association has undertaken a project to dam up Swift Current creek at a place called Duncairn. That project will eventually be completed but we hope that eventuality will not be too far away. We hope the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) and his P.F.R.A. officials will not forget that there is a vast difference between human time and eternity. We hope sincerely that the 30,000 arces which can be irrigated will be irrigated and that the project will be completed not later than this time next year, as it could be. These are some of our little local problems. I will not weary the house with the many more that we have, although I may deal with them later on. However, I should like to bring to the attention of members of this house another problem that is important to us and to the west.

I am not saying this because we in the west want to chisel something out of other parts of Canada. I am not saying this because we think other hon. members are likely to be antagonistic. We do not understand all the problems of the peach producers of British Columbia, of the apple growers of Ontario, of the industrial workers of Ontario and Quebec and of the fishermen and farmers of Nova Scotia. We do not pretend to. We expect to learn and to learn with sympathy of their problems while we are here. We expect to lend our voice and aid as much as we can or as much as we are allowed to in helping them to improve their position and to solve their problems. We are asking only for the same measure of sympathy and help from the other people in this house.

I mentioned a little while ago that this group does not believe that the present administration at Ottawa have the right ideas or the right machinery to do the job they forecast in the speech from the throne. We are prepared to help them do it. Let me produce some evidence to show why we believe this is so. Purely on the basis of the operating economy of this country and in fairness to all its citizens I wish to submit the following evidence.

We from the prairies of the west got a distinct jolt the other day when the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) announced that the price of wheat for export would be pegged at $1.55 a bushel, basis No. 1 northern at the contract point of delivery, and remember that is Port Arthur or Fort William or Vancouver, not where it is delivered to the country elevator. We have no objection to that, nor will the farmers in the west object to it. As a matter of fact they will respect this government for giving that measure of protection to the people in the old country. Many of the settlers in the west came from some of those old countries or have relatives who were left behind when their parents came over here before they were born. So that they are glad to be able to make some contribution to the requirements of those people and not hold them up or put a gun to their heads because there is a scarcity. We have no objection to that contribution. That announcement did not give us a jolt. The jolt to the chin came when it was announced—not as compensation for foregoing a possible sharp rise in the price of wheat because of the extremities of Europe, because such compensation is not needed, but as compensation for the loss of what might have been a very good market for wheat now—that the government would undertake to see that the price of wheat would not fall below $1 a bushel, basis No. 1 northern, Fort William, Port Arthur or Vancouver from the beginning of next year until the year 1950 on the authorized deliveries.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce, on being questioned in the house the other day, said that there was nothing in the order in council that stated that they were going to operate for the next five years on the quota system. Whether or not he thought that we did not understand the terminology well enough to understand what was meant, he said that in the order in council there was no such thing mentioned as a quota system. In the order in council there are no words about quota system, it is true, but the terms "authorized deliveries" and "quota system" are synonymous in the minds of every western farmer, and the Minister of Agriculture, who is here to-night, knows that is so. It was therefore futile for the Minister of Trade and Commerce to endeavour to make us believe that because there was no mention of the words "quota system" in the order in council it did not mean just that. It says "authorized deliveries," and authorized deliveries are the quota system in the minds of every western farmer who sells wheat.

Mr. GARDINER: Would my hon. friend not admit that that system was first asked for by the Saskatchewan pool?

Mr. BENTLEY: I frankly admit that, and will go into that later. But the point I am making now is that we know that the quota system and authorized deliveries mean the same thing. It means that someone in authority—and this has to be so, and there is no quarrel with it—the wheat board officials presumably—and we hope they are competent officers—will be authorized to tell the farmers each year what their authorized wheat delivery shall be. With the guaranteed price of $1 a bushel below which wheat is not allowed to fall, if the Winnipeg grain exchange is still operating, and if the wheat board is not continuing to take all deliveries, it is quite within the range of possibility, and past history indicates to us that this will be so, that the open market price can conceivably hover around that $1 a bushel, which means eighty-three or eighty-four cents to the bulk of the farmers in western Canada at their local elevator point of delivery for No. 1 northern; and remember that No. 1 northern does not comprise all the grain we deliver because we sometimes get grade 5 and grade 6, and even feed wheat in years of frost, and there is a very heavy spread between the price of No. 1 northern and the lower grades. If the wheat board officials or those in authority say to the farmer this year that he can deliver only six or seven bushels you can readily see, Mr. Speaker, that it will be utterly impossible for the farmers of the west to finance their operations. It cannot be done.

I would point out that we are not opposed to the authorized deliveries or the quota system. I believe that that is the general feeling all over the west. There may be some farmers who do not like it, but I am speaking for the bulk of the farmers who are in the big farm organizations there. Here I should like to point out to the government where they might sometimes learn a little from those institutions. I am not going to tell the government to-night why many of us from the prairie provinces have no longer a great deal of faith in their foresight or ability to foresee for some years ahead, but as the minister has said, a request was made in 1932 by the western farm organizations to have the federal government, then under Mr. R. B. Bennett, set up a wheat board to take delivery of western wheat and market it direct. Mr. Bennett did not see fit then to do that. As a matter of fact, when the first forerunner of that demand from the western farmers came as early as 1930 in a resolution passed by the United Farmers of Canada at Saskatoon, asking for a floor or peg price of 70 cents a bushel for No. 1 northern wheat, Fort William, Port Arthur or Vancouver, Mr. Bennett refused and said that he and his administration had no intention of interfering with the free marketing of wheat. From that time on there was constant debate between the Bennett regime and the officials of the organized producers, and in 1932 the western farmers made their request for a wheat board, with power to set up quota deliveries, so that in years of tremendous surpluses, which we were told was our great bugbear at that time—we were told that we were too good at the job; that we raised too much wheat—the wheat board would accept for delivery that volume which could be comfortably sold on whatever export market our Department of Trade and Commerce could find for us and fix the price of that exportable surplus at something approaching the cost of production as near as could be estimated, and the balance of the farmer's surplus production would be left in the granary on his farm as a very fine safeguard against a future bad crop. If you were a grain farmer, Mr. Speaker, you would appreciate just how comfortable a feeling it give you in a year like this or 1937 if you can look out into your yard and say: Well, the crop has gone, we will not get our seed back, but thank goodness last year or the year before we were able to save 1,500 or 2,000 bushels which were not required on the market that year. It gives a feeling of security to the wheat farmer when he can look at his bins and know they are not all empty.

In that year we asked for the quota system. But the Bennett government did not give it to us. In that same winter we sent to Ottawa a petition signed by 107,000 Saskatchewan citizens. Mr. Bennett and his government would not grant that request. It was not until the dying days of his administration in 1935, when he had to face the whole of Canada in an election, that he finally acceded to the request of the western farm organizations and brought in his wheat legislation. Had he and his administration not been so arrogantly certain that they knew better than a bunch of old farmers what should be done to market their wheat, they would have listened and taken advice from the organized farmers at that time, and undoubtedly one would have thought that the Liberal administration that took over from the Tory administration in 1935 would have learnt that lesson. But no. For the next five years until 1940 the western farm organizations continued to make their representations. I am saying this now to the government across the floor, and I am saying it in all sincerity, and can prove it, if proof

is wanted. I shall not have time to do so to-night, but before this session is over I can produce the documentary evidence necessary to prove every statement I make. This organization came to the administration time after time and asked them to operate a wheat board on its behalf to protect the wheat growers of western Canada, but the request was refused time and again. Within a year after the new administration of 1936 took office, the wheat board ceased operating as an active agent in the marketing of wheat, and the peg was held at ninety cents a bushel. Later, in 1938, the price was fixed by the wheat board, through government action, at eighty cents a bushel. The following spring the present Minister of Agriculture came west and told the western people that we could no longer expect to have a pegged wheat board price of eighty cents a bushel; that it was too big a load for this country to carry, that it was costing Canada too many millions of dollars, and that we would have to submit to a drastic reduction, in other words from eighty cents a bushel to sixty cents a bushel, basis 1 northern at the point of delivery at terminal elevators, Port Arthur, Fort William or Vancouver.

Mr. GARDINER: I am sure my hon. friend will agree that the second proposal was an initial payment, not a price; eighty cents was the fixed price.

Mr. BENTLEY: I stand corrected. It was an initial payment of sixty cents through the wheat board, which, deducting an average of sixteen or seventeen cents, would leave the farmers at the point of delivery somewhere around forty-three or forty-four cents at his local point. Again we in the west had to go into action. The officials of organized farmers came and interviewed members of the cabinet here, but the sixty cents a bushel initial payment still stood. Again we had to do the only thing we could—go out and plough through the snow and mud, in the spring of 1939, and get 156,000 names to a petition asking the government not to reduce their payment from eighty cents to sixty cents. Finally, after that petition came here, the payment was reduced not to sixty cents, but only to seventy cents, and was held that way until the winter of 1941-42, when again numerous representations, politely couched, were made to the government by the officials of the organized western wheat growers, to increase the initial payment per bushel from seventy cents to $1 because of the war-time conditions and the already mounting costs of production on the farm. Again we were refused; again we were forced to send a petition, this time signed by 186,000 Saskatchewan people. Business men, professional men, farmers and other citizens took part in this effort and made contributions out of their own pockets to provide the necessary forty-odd thousand dollars to bring 400 western delegates to Ottawa to present that petition to the government.

It should not be necessary for western people to have to go to all that trouble time after time. The government was finally compelled by the logic of events to do the things which it had been asked to do before. Had the government of gentlemen on my right been still in office, it would have been compelled by the same set of circumstances to do as this government has done. Finally we got, not $1 a bushel but ninety cents; even then they would not go the distance. Why? Why would they not agree to $1 a bushel initial payment in the winter of 1941-42, to become effective in the crop year 1942-43? Finally, after much hesitation and after many flutterings of farmers' hearts in the west, we got an announcement that the government would grant us twenty cents increase, making ninety cents a bushel; and I think I am correct in the statement that so far as the Wheat Board Act is concerned the ninety cents initial payment is still in there, even though at the present time the board is making the initial payment of $1.25. Remember again that this was brought about, not because the government had suddenly become sympathetic and wanted to help the farmers, but because the transportation system in war time made it impossible for a farmer or an elevator company to hedge sales of wheat against the future on the Winnipeg grain exchange and be reasonably sure of making delivery against that contract in the month in which the future was taken; and the farther the future was ahead, the less was the prospect at that time of doing so, through nobody's fault unless it be Mr. Hitler's and those who were with him. But it was impossible to lay down the stuff against a contract in the place where the contract is fulfilled in the grain business.

In order to take care of that situation, in order to avoid confusion because of that condition, the government finally brought in legislation stopping trading in wheat futures on the Winnipeg grain exchange, and authorized the wheat board to take deliveries of all wheat delivered in western Canada and pay the farmers the initial payment of $1.25. There was not much complaint about that. We people in the west are pretty realistic.

We are not going to quarrel over all the things that have happened in the past. What I have told you, Mr. Speaker, has been told, not in bitterness, not in any way to make

you think we feel inimical to the government because of its past mistakes. I have given you these facts as evidence that they, here in Ottawa with their officials, are not the best judges as to how to conduct our marketing system or of what the agriculturists of the west need as a first payment for the grain they produce.

We want to see good wages. We do not want to have anyone's wages low. We favour improvement of the lot and increase of the incomes of working men and working women. We are heart and soul with every speech and sentiment expressed in this house in support of raising the wages of those in the lower income levels to enable them to secure a comfortable standard of living. We do not want more for the western farmers than would be fair for the community at large. But we do ask that, as labour has its connections and associations with the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) and his department, as no doubt business and professional men have their own organizations, and methods of advancing their interests, the government give the same measure of consideration to the proposals made by the western farm organizations when their officials come here, and not force the farmers always to have to be signing petitions or bringing delegations to Ottawa and otherwise doing things which they do not actually enjoy doing. We out west are peaceful fellows.

Again, I do not think there will be a great deal of opposition, even now, after the "jolt" of $1 a bushel, if the Minister of Trade and Commerce would give us one assurance; and why does he not want to do it? It would not hurt. Both he and the Minister of Agriculture know conditions out there. They come from the west. Why do they not tell this house and the country that for the five-year period they are going to see that wheat does not drop below $1 a bushel; that in that period they will continue the operations of the Canadian wheat board; that the wheat board will take delivery of all wheat so that there will be no speculation in it; that in the payment for this wheat a participation certificate will be issued and the wheat board will market all that wheat direct, as we expect they are going to do with the $1.55 wheat this year; and that they will take the suggestion of the western farm organizations and make arrangements for one of two things to see that the various deliveries at least amount in the total to 280 million bushels to be accepted by the wheat board at this payment of $1 a bushel—not less than 280 million bushels, which the farm organizations believe it is possible to market every year without a surplus being carried over. This would mean approximately from thirteen to fifteen bushels to the acre to be delivered as authorized deliveries, depending on the fluctuations in the number of acres that may be put into crop, around 20 million acres or something aproximating that every year.

Why do the government not do that? That is all we are asking for from the west so far as wheat marketing is concerned. It is not a great request. It is just an assurance that in these very uncertain years, while this transition from war to peace is taking place, the farmers will be given time to collect themselves and, if necessary, to reorganize the inequalities among themselves, to strengthen and improve the understanding of their organization, to improve the relationship between themselves, through their organization, and this government, whichever one happens to be here from time to time; and while that is going on, to give them this assurance that you will hold the price above or at $1 a bushel and that they will do it through the mechanisms I have suggested. If the government will do that I think they will secure the blessing of every member here interested in wheat marketing and of the great bulk of the farmers of western Canada.

Mr. C. W. HODGSON (Victoria, Ont.): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I wish first to congratulate you on your elevation to the chair and, second, to congratulate the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) on his long term of office and of service to the country. I am sure we all wish him good health to finish out his term of office. Next I wish to congratulate the leader of the official opposition (Mr. Bracken) and to congratulate the people of Manitoba on having seen to it that he was their premier for twenty years. I wish also to congratulate the constituents of his riding on having seen fit to send him to Ottawa to represent and to lead our party. He was very wise, I believe, in not coming into the house on receiving the nomination, because in that period he travelled across Canada, saw all the different parts of the country and made a study of them, meeting people and gaining a wealth of knowledge which will certainly be of benefit to Canada in the future. So far as our party is concerned, it was not suffering from lack of leadership because it was being ably led by my genial friend the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon).

I am somewhat like the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner), who spoke last night.

He said he came here with a majority vote. I am in the same position. I want to congratulate him on coming here on that basis. He said he had only one opponent. I have him beaten, because I had two and I still came here with a majority vote. My Liberal opponent had been a friend of mine for years and I could not say a thing bad about him. He served the country for ten years prior to this year.

In the house we have 103 new members, and 149 members are here on a minority vote. I believe my hon. friends to my left outstrip us all in that regard, because out of twenty-eight members, twenty-five are here on a minority vote.

In introducing my riding, I may say that I did not know that one could come to the House of Commons and do so much advertising. I will avail myself of the opportunity for a few minutes, but I will make it short. I have the honour to represent the riding which was so ably represented by Sir Sam Hughes, who was our member for about thirty years. He was minister of militia in the last war.

My riding is made up of two counties. Victoria has fertile soil and a climate that is adapted to farming, and the farmers are great producers of hay, grain, meat and dairy products. While I am on this subject, I may say that this year one of my constituents made quite a nice shipment of Holstein cattle to Mexico, thus opening up a new venture in trade along that line.

The county in which I live is Haliburton. I happen to be the first member ever elected from that county either provincially or to the dominion house. It comprises the pre-Cambrian rock area and we have the finest stand of timber, bar none, left standing in Canada to-day. We have also in that rock deposits of uranium, which was the basis of the atomic bomb; in the whole area of Victoria-Haliburton we have the Kawartha lakes and the Trent valley canal system, and in Haliburton county alone we have 559 lakes. We have everything that goes to make a tourist country.

The tourist industry in Victoria county is fairly well developed, but in the north it has just been scratched. It would have been developed more fully if the war had not come along, resulting in shortage of labour and materials, with government regulations putting a stop to buildings in that class of industry.

In this municipality, made up of small villages and small towns, we have the town of Lindsay with a population of 10,000. We have some thirty sawmills, four planing and finishing mills, and so on. We have a large tannery, a large woollen mill and many other small industries, and we have two large chemical plants. We have also the dominion arsenal. This plant is one of the finest in Canada, one of the best equipped in the country. I hope the Minister of Defence (Mr. Abbott) can keep that plant running, and if he cannot, I see no reason why the Department of Reconstruction cannot put in some peace-time industry there.

We have a riding made up principally of private enterprise. We have a lot of good labour. It is a railroad centre, and I take my hat off to labour any day in the week because I have been a labour man myself all my life. The reason why I say they favour private enterprise is that ninety per cent of our farms are operated by their owners, as are all our industries with the exception of the dominion arsenal. We have never had any labour trouble; we have the finest group of labour men that exists anywhere.

Anything I say here or any part that I play in this parliament I feel I should do it as my constituents would want me to do it. Although I was sent here with a majority I consider that I was sent here to represent all the constituents of my riding. That will be my thought and view throughout my parliamentary experience.

I think I would be remiss in my duty unless I said something about the flag. Someone has taken upon himself the responsibility of pulling down the old union jack from this parliament building and sticking up another flag in its place without consulting this parliament. That I think was a mistake. However, probably the time has come when we need a new national flag; but, speaking for myself and for my constituents, we think the old union jack is good enough for us.

I should like to say a word about national selective service and the war labour board. But before I do that I should like to welcome all or any hon. members who wish to visit my riding. They would be only too welcome, and if they do not believe what I say about its possibilities and beauties I ask them to come and see for themselves. If they cannot come let them ask the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) or the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley), because they both had a good look at it in the last election campaign. I welcome them back at any time and I hope that they will not wait until the next election rolls around. In fact I should like to have the Minister of Finance there this fall. Although we may differ on politics at times, we do not differ when it comes to a victory or peace loan. If the Minister of Finance

came there and opened the victory loan campaign I might have the honour of introducing him, and I will guarantee him a larger audience than he had when he spoke at Lindsay before June 11 last.

With regard to national selective service, they have been short-sighted and inefficient. That is also true of the war labour board. On August 31, 1942, all the operators and lumbermen received a notice to appear at a meeting in my town under penalty if they were not there. Lists of prices and wage schedules that we could pay to men, both loggers and cutters, were laid down. We tried to live up to this as well as we could, but it was inadequate to fill the bill. I told the board so at that time. However, ten months later, after the operators were put out of business so far as cordwood is concerned, we were paying $3.75 and the war labour board said that we must cut it down to $3.40. The result was that our men left and disappeared into other work, and our organization was broken up so far as producing wood was concerned. At that time I was producing 500 cords of body hardwood a month, and for the benefit of hon. members from the fishing areas on the coast, a cord of body hardwood is the next thing to anthracite coal.

Ten months later I received another notice to meet in the town of Huntsville in an adjoining riding. At that time they told us to go out into the bush and get out cordwood because there was a crisis at hand, and that we could do it at any price. They said to us: "If you have not the money we will finance you; if you have not the men we will give you internees." Well, the house can realize the position I was put in living in a riding comprising people of English, Irish and Scotch descent with a really first-class bunch of workmen in that area. If I had started to bring in internees I do not think I would be here to-day. However, the policy adopted was short-sighted because the operators who were taking out the cordwood saw the crisis coming in January and February, 1942. The government or the department did not see it until June, 1943.

I should like to say a few words on housing, because it affects us too. To-day housing is being handled by two departments of the government. I think one would be sufficient. They have been fumbling the ball more or less back and forth between the two departments. If they had one improved programme of housing they might go through for a touchdown. We do not need wartime housing. If they gave private enterprise half the chances that they gave wartime housing, private enterprise would build more houses and build them better and more economically. We have no wartime housing in my riding, but houses are being built by private enterprise, by soldiers who are coming back from overseas and by citizens. Those houses and that programme are being held up at the present time because of the freezing of materials for wartime housing. Wartime housing is not producing materials of construction; it is stealing them from the producers with the help of the government, and the net result is production of a number of houses at public expense in an uneconomic way at the cost of the building of a greater number of houses by private enterprise at private expense. Wartime housing is not making more labour available; it is only adding competition for the scarce supply existing. The performance of labour on government projects is proverbially less efficient than on private projects. The net result of the intrusion of Wartime Housing Limited is to increase the cost of houses. It has been demonstrated that in the temporary house field wartime housing cannot build as economically as private enterprise. The government would be well advised to release some of these controls and let our returning soldiers, and our citizens go ahead and build their houses.

I have a neighbour living across the road from me. He is not a wealthy man but he gathered together a few dollars to build a house. He started that house in the spring; he worked a lot of the time on it after he had his supper; he worked at night and he finally got the house to the position where he could live in it. He had an order in for windows, doors and the like. He moved in after I had lent him a few windows, and after he had patched up some with paper and so forth. Then he received a notice that his order for windows and doors had to be cancelled owing to government control. That is the situation in many cases, and it is certainly wrong so far as private enterprise or anybody who wants to build a house for himself is concerned.

I could go on and talk for quite a while yet and touch on a lot of other matters, but I have had an opportunity of advertising my own riding and an opportunity of inviting all hon. members to come to my riding at any time and I shall close with these few remarks.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, while we are waiting, and before the question is put, I should like to say briefly that we intend to vote against both the subamendment and the amendment—

Mr. MACKENZIE: Good.

Mr. COLDWELL: —and to vote also against the motion for the adoption of the address.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Not so good.

Mr. COLDWELL: We are going to do so because, if one reads the Progressive Conservative amendment, as amended by the Social Credit party, he will find that it reads this way, and this has not yet been put on the record in full:

> We respectfully submit to Your Excellency that Your Excellency's advisers have:
>
> (a) failed to demobilize our armed forces on a fair basis and, in particular, have failed to prevent serious disadvantage to overseas service personnel;
>
> (b) failed to provide a speedy and effective plan of reconversion from war to peace, and failed in particular to join in partnership with labour and industry in devising a workable scheme to provide jobs, with fair wages, for discharged service personnel and war workers;
>
> (c) failed to take adequate and timely action to meet the ever-mounting housing crisis.

And then, to this the social credit subamendment is attached, and would therefore continue:

> (d) failed to meet the needs of Canada for a prosperous peace and in particular, to provide a means of ensuring that the national production shall be kept at a sufficiently high level to provide every Canadian with a standard of living commensurate with Canada's ability to produce;
>
> (e) failed to provide this country with an effective and scientific financial policy for distributing to all Canadians their fair share of the national production without increasing the burden of taxation or the national debt.

Now, as we see it, both criticize the government for a series of failures. The word "failed" appears a number of times in both the amendment and the subamendment. But neither the amendment nor the subamendment contains any understandable suggestions to meet those failures. And none of the speeches in support of the amendment or subamendment have offered the government any effective suggestions to meet the criticisms which they both make.

Our subamendment, which I am not discussing, because it was defeated, did that. We suggested that certain fundamental changes must be made, and offered to the house nine different proposals which we believed would assist in meeting the situation. In other words, we tried to place before the house some suggestions and proposals to meet the problems facing us.

The subamendment, which will be dealt with first this evening, among other things condemns the government for failing to provide the country with a scientific and effective financial policy. What do my hon. friends to the left mean by that? What do they actually suggest? In none of their speeches can I find an answer to that question. For example, last week when the hon. member for Jasper-Edson (Mr. Kuhl) was speaking he was interrupted by one of the hon. members opposite. I noticed that the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore) and the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Low) both made answer. The hon. member for Lethbridge said, "That is the thing you have to learn", and the hon. member for Peace River said, "Just keep your ears open, and you will hear." These are the replies to similar questions we all invariably receive from hon. members sitting immediately to my left.

Since voting for the subamendment and the amendment merely involves supporting the destructive criticisms of the two parties who have made them, we do not intend to support mere criticsm without some constructive suggestions to meet the criticisms thus made. Moreover, to vote with either of the two parties would mean that we have confidence in them and in their proposals, proposals which have not been placed before the house.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the C.C.F. party in the house I wish to say before the vote is taken that we intend to vote against the subamendment and against the amendment for the reasons I have given, and of course to vote against the main motion because we endeavoured to amend it and because we believe it to be inadequate as it stands, and therefore insufficient to meet the situation which has developed in this country. I am going to leave it at that.

Amendment to the amendment (Mr. Hansell) negatived.

The house divided on the amendment (Mr. Bracken) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Adamson	Desmond
Aylesworth	Diefenbaker
Barrett	Drope
Black (Yukon)	Fleming
Blair	Fraser
Boucher	Fulton
Bracken	Robinson (Bruce)
Bradshaw	Ross (St. Paul's)
Brooks	Ross (Souris)
Bruce	Senn
Cardiff	Smith (Calgary West)
Case	Stephenson
Casselman	Graydon
Charlton	Green
Church	Hackett
Cockeram	Harkness
Coyle	Harris (Danforth)
Daniel	Hatfield

Hazen
Henderson
Hodgson
Homuth
Jackman
Kidd
Lennard
Macdonnell (Muskoka-Ontario)
McGregor
McLure
McMaster
MacNicol
Manross
Menary
Merritt
Murphy
Pearkes
Stokes
Tustin
Webb
White (Hastings-Peterborough—57.

NAYS

Messrs:

Abbott
Archibald
Argue
Arsenault
Baker
Beaudry
Belzile
Benidickson
Bentley
Bertrand (Laurier)
Bertrand (Prescott)
Bertrand (Terrebonne)
Black (Chateauguay-Huntingdon)
Blackmore
Blanchette
Boivin
Bonnier
Bourget
Bowerman
Bradette
Breithaupt
Bridges
Brown
Brunelle
Bryce
Burton
Campbell
Castleden
Chevrier
Clark
Claxton
Cleaver
Cloutier
Coldwell
Coté (Matapedia-Matane)
Coté (St. Johns-Iberville-Napierville)
Coté (Verdun)
Croll
Cruickshank
Dechene
Denis
Dion (Lake St. John-Roberval)
Dionne (Beauce)
Dorion
Douglas
Dubois
Emmerson
Eudes
Fair
Farquhar
Fontaine
Fournier (Hull)
Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Gagnon
Gardiner
Gariépy
Gauthier (Nipissing)
Gauthier (Portneuf)
Gibson (Comox-Alberni)
Gibson (Hamilton West)
Gillis
Gingues
Gladstone
Glen
Golding
Gour (Russell)
Gourd (Chapleau)
Hallé
Hansell
Harris (Grey-Bruce)
Healy
Herridge
Hlynka
Howe
Ilsley
Irvine
Jaenicke
Jean
Jutras
King, Mackenzie
Kirk
Knight
Knowles
Kuhl
LaCroix
Lafontaine
Lalonde
Langlois
Lapalme
Lapointe
Laurendeau
Leader
Leger
Lesage
Little
Low
McCann
McCuaig
McCubbin
McCulloch (Pictou)
McCullough (Assiniboia)
Macdonald (Brantford City)
Macdonald (Halifax)
McDonald (Parry Sound)
McDonald (Pontiac)
McGarry
McIlraith
MacInnis
McIvor
McKay
Mackenzie
MacKinnon
MacLean
McNaught
Maloney
Marier
Marquis
Marshall
Martin
Matthews (Brandon)
Matthews (Kootenay East)
Maybank
Mayhew
Michaud
Mitchell
Mullins
Mutch
Nicholson
Nixon
Parent
Pinard
Pouliot
Power
Probe
Quelch
Raymond (Wright)
Reid
Richard (Gloucester)
Richard (Ottawa East)
Rinfret
Rose
Ross (Hamilton East)
St. Laurent
Shaw
Sinclair (Ontario)
Sinclair (Vancouver North)
Sinnott
Smith (York North)
Stuart (Charlotte)
Strum, Mrs.
Thatcher
Townley-Smith
Tremblay
Tucker
Viau
Warren
Weir
Whitman
Winkler
Winters
Wright
Wylie
Zaplitny—163.

PAIRS

(The list of pairs is furnished by the chief whips.)

Messrs:

Picard — Black (Cumberland)
Grant — Stirling

Mr. ISNOR: I was paired with the hon. member for Colchester-Hants (Mr. Stanfield). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. J. A. ROSS (Souris): Mr. Speaker, before you proceed with the motion I desire to offer a few remarks.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Speaker, I had the floor.

Mr. SPEAKER: I give the floor to the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Ross).

Mr. ROSS (Souris): The speech at the opening of this twentieth parliament on September 6 did not contain any reference whatever to floor prices. During the days from September 6 to September 19 many hon. members, some of them possessing considerable knowledge of agricultural matters, spoke on the address in reply to the governor general's speech and the amendments thereto, and therefore would not have an opportunity to speak on this matter after the passing of order in council P.C. 6122, copies of which were presented to this house on September 19, and which provided a floor price of not less than $1 a bushel during the five-year period ending July 21, 1950. The government by order in council has instructed the Canadian wheat board to offer wheat for sale for export over-

seas at prices not higher than the current export price now prevailing of $1.55 a bushel, basis No. 1 northern, Fort William, Port Arthur or Vancouver. One dollar a bushel means approximately eighty cents net to the producers on the prairies, which is considerably below cost of production for the average producer, while during the early stages of this war we asked for at least $1.25 a bushel. That was on the basis of pre-war parity. Since then, the cost of living to farmers has risen approximately twenty per cent and implements of production now cost twenty per cent more than at that time. Farm labour wages have doubled. I have no complaint about that. In the last parliament on several occasions I asked that the same consideration be given farm labourers as was given organized labour and I wish it to be clearly understood where I stand on that point. Yet, instead of increasing the floor price in keeping with the cost, the government to-day, by order in council and while parliament is in session, have reduced the floor price by another twenty per cent.

I well remember a few sessions ago the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner), speaking on the question of the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act, stated that it was his desire to see a family on every half-section of land. I think he will realize that a family on a half-section cannot produce wheat for approximately eighty cents a bushel net. More than that, this will be a very live issue for those members of the armed services now returning who wish to settle on the land.

With respect to cost, I used the chart which was prepared in the last parliament by the department of the Minister of Agriculture. Reference was made this evening to the difficulties the western farmers had in marketing their wheat during 1932. During that same year one of the minister's departmental officials, Doctor Hopkins, an able civil servant, conducted a survey throughout the western prairies, picking out individual farmers and experimental farms. As a result of those findings he prepared his chart. He proved conclusively by those findings that on a quarter-section a man with five horses, threshing hired, had a cost of $1.02 a bushel to produce wheat at eighteen bushels to the acre, which is away above the average of Canadian production. On a half-section the cost to a man with seven horses was 73·5 cents; in the case of a man with a fifteen horsepower tractor and two horses the cost was a little under that, or 66·5 cents; in the case of one section and two men with fourteen horses, the cost was 77 cents.

I do not think I should take up the time of the house in putting that chart on the record; I did so in the last parliament. But these findings by the minister's own department proved conclusively that the most economical farm to operate was the two-section farm, and the official in question investigated farms from a quarter-section up to three sections of land operated with tractors and horses.

Under mass production you can produce wheat cheaper per bushel, but certainly not on a half-section. You must have mass production. In the year prior to the declaration of war a survey was conducted throughout Saskatchewan by the professor in charge of farm management at Saskatoon university. His finding was that, taking into account the cost of production and interest, those people had to have ninety cents a bushel for wheat produced at fourteen bushels to the acre, and that was then a higher production figure than the average prevailing throughout that section of the country.

More than that, there was a chart prepared by Mr. Lattimore, a professor at Macdonald agricultural college, setting forth the acreage of farms by individuals in some of the principal countries at the outbreak of the war in 1939. In Canada the acreage was seventy-six acres on the average; the United States, fifty acres; Great Britain, 30·5; Ireland, 17; Denmark, 14·7; Norway, 14·7; Spain, 12; Sweden, 11·4; Switzerland, 11·9; France, 10; Poland, 5·7; Italy, 5·2.

I think that should be conclusive proof that the minister's desire cannot be realized with the floor price which he has suggested. During the first years of the war, when we were pleading with the government year after year to set at least on a basis of parity $1.25 a bushel for wheat in this country, the Winnipeg *Free Press*, which conducts the most partisan editorial page of any newspaper in Canada and which I have never seen taking the part of the western agriculturist, chastized, in an editorial during that time the then hon. member for Qu'Appelle, Mr. Perley, the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Fair), and the member for Souris, myself, for asking for blood money at the expense of the servicemen when we requested an initial price of $1.25 a bushel. When, later on, the government acceded and set the initial price at $1.25, according to the *Free Press* it was a different story. It was not then a case of blood money; there was no criticism of anything that this government under the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) might do in Canada.

Speaking in this house yesterday on the question of meat for overseas, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley), as reported at page 394 of *Hansard* of September 24, stated:

From the beginning of the war this country tried to do its part in the struggle, and has been most conscientious, I believe, in doing so. We have been obliged and have found it advantageous and in the interests of all concerned to make what might be called partnership arrangements with other countries, particularly Great Britain and the United States.

For many years in the past I have argued that very point with the minister and the government, pointing out that I thought the united nations should have some basis on which to trade, supplying the materials so essential for the prosecution of the war, and yet throughout those years the agricultural producer of this country received less for his products than the producer in any other of the united nations.

In this respect may I say that throughout these war years, while the agriculturists of the United States paid less for implements of production than we in Canada have paid, they on the other hand have received from thirty to fifty per cent more for their produce, especially wheat, cattle and dairy products than the Canadian producers received for his or her products. To-day in the United States wheat is sold for export overseas at a price of $2.10 a bushel at U.S.A. seaboard, and statistics show a significant increase in the wheat acreage of the United States.

Yesterday the Minister of Agriculture, speaking on meat production, is reported at page 408 of *Hansard* of September 24, 1945, as having said:

> This simply means that a farmer in the west must make a decision, and must have an argument with himself as to whether it pays best to feed barley or to sell it, and that is exactly the position in which we wanted him. The reason is that the farmers of eastern Canada, from lake Huron to the Atlantic, cannot grow sufficient grain with which to feed their live stock. They must get it from western Canada. If we should create conditions in the west under which all the grain was to be kept there, these live stock men in the east would have to go without their barley, and the extent to which they would get out of hog production would reduce production in this country very much more than would be the case if a number of farmers on the western plains decided to sell a certain quantity of barley rather than to feed it.

That statement is an absolute contradiction of statements I have heard the Minister of Agriculture make during the last session in this same chamber. But in answering questions the Minister of Agriculture said that it is more economical to feed grain to live stock on the same farm upon which the grain is grown and produced than to transport the same grain—

Mr. GARDINER: I said that last night, but only slightly better.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I will admit that the Minister of Agriculture is a very fine speaker and quite a rabble-rouser, and I enjoy listening to him in the chamber, but when one reads his statements the following day they do not always analyse the same as they appear when one is listening to his fine flow of words.

Mr. GARDINER: Which may be because I do not read my speeches.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I have listened to speeches delivered by the Minister of Agriculture in this house during the past session when he read every word. He will admit, I think, that with the most efficient feeders on the farms in Canada to-day it requires at least five pounds of grain to make one pound of pork; and if you can feed that efficiently I think you will readily realize the saving in transportation and man-power in this country if your stock is fed on the same farm on which the grain is produced.

During the war years Alberta made great strides in hog production until 1944, when they produced more hogs than any other province in Canada. They also grew the grain feed on these same farms. A great deal has been accomplished along these lines in each of the prairie provinces; but in the past year in my native province of Manitoba hog production has gone back considerably over forty per cent. There is a very great increase in beef cattle, as I have mentioned before in this house, and the producers cannot properly market their live beef cattle. At the present time the price for these cattle is off three cents a pound or three dollars a hundredweight, and as yet the Minister of Agriculture or the government has not allowed us even to ship beef cattle to the markets in the United States, even under permit or otherwise. As I have pointed out before, he has been requested by responsible officials in this country at least to allow them, in the case of heavy runs on the stockyards, a permit by which they might export cattle; and the difference in price, which is often fifty per cent higher than in Canada, might be pooled for the producers on the same basis as was barley and oats exported from this country and the difference in price pooled for them.

During the earlier years of the war, industry, organized labour and others, operated on a cost-plus basis, but not agriculture; this floor price of $1 a bushel for wheat is definitely the first deflation move by the government on agricultural products of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Senn), that the motion be amended by adding the following words at the end of the said address:

We respectfully submit to Your Excellency that, pending the establishment of a more stable and equitable price structure for Canadian farm products based on parity of income for farmers, immediate consideration should be given to establishing for a period of years floor prices for all basic agricultural products at levels not less than ninety per cent of parity.

Some hon. members may wonder why we are saying, "at levels not less than ninety per cent of parity". As I have argued ever since coming here, in 1940 at the declaration of war, our neighbours to the south attempted to create a parity price for their agricultural producers, based on a given period, thereby assuring them that no matter what happened in the future they would not let the price go below ninety per cent of parity, and that they would strive to keep those prices at parity or better at all times. Therefore that is why we have set that figure in the amendment.

The Minister of Agriculture, in speaking last night, said that 1944 was an abnormally big year of agricultural production in Canada, and that this year with our greatly decreased production that was all we could expect over a period of years in this country. I remember questioning the minister in this house on February 18, 1944, when the United States had asked their people to increase their wheat acreage. I took some time to go over the situation then and pointed out that I thought our people should be asked to increase their acreage of grains of all kinds, and more especially as the people in the United States were doing so. Had that been done, the Minister of Agriculture would not have been able to give as gloomy a picture of our grains on hand in Canada to-day as he did last night.

I shall not take the time to repeat all the remarks I made at that time and the answers which he gave me, but I wish to emphasize this matter at this particular time. Some hon. members on the government side have pointed out that in their opinion there was no urgency about this matter. Let me say to the Minister of Agriculture—and he probably knows what I am about to say because he keeps in touch with his people—I was privileged to be home last week. I was there when the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) announced this order in council. I can tell the house that my neighbours were a disappointed lot of people. They had expected more than that from this government. These people who find great difficulties in marketing their live stock to-day are not given any assurance of over $1, basis Fort William for wheat, which means practically eighty cents to them. Many of them claim that they are going to quit farming as soon as their crop is off this fall. That is the urgency of the situation. More than that, before many days have passed, when we discuss some of the other minister's estimates and difficulties that already prevail to-day with respect to the rehabilitation of our servicemen, and especially those young men who want to settle on farms under the Veterans Land Act, if the government can assure them nothing more than this for the future years they will not be very eager about settling on the land.

The only limit to our realization of to-morrow will be our doubts of to-day. Let us move forward with a strong and active faith.

Mr. JEAN FRANCOIS POULIOT (Temiscouata): Mr. Speaker, in the first place I offer you all my good wishes. I am sure that you will follow the tradition of your illustrious predecessor who is now Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Glen), and of other great Speakers whose presence in this house is still remembered by all.

I welcome all new members, and it has been a pride for me to be a member of the house, as it is now. I have been a member of parliament for twenty-one years, and I have never seen such a large number of bright colleagues as those who have already shown their ability in this debate. I wish the best to all of them on all sides of the house. I am sure that so long as we are working together we shall do our best for the community.

However, I wish to express my regret that two of my colleagues have not returned. One of them was as perfect a deskmate as the one I have now. I refer to the Hon. Cyrus MacMillan, who did more for the airmen than did anybody else. I express my deep regret that he has not come back. I would say the same of Mr. Crete, who represented in the last parliament the constituency of St. Maurice-Lafleche. He was a man of courage, and it is only because of the strength of his convictions that he did not get the reward to which he was entitled. I pay that tribute to those two gentlemen who are still remembered by hon. members who sat here during the last parliament. Besides that, I can tell my colleagues that I shall be only too pleased to cooperate with them, whenever I can.

It is a very good thing that the government has been reelected. Now the war is over, and there is nothing like the good old Liberal party to govern this country. It is my earnest hope that in the very near future some hon. members from the other side will follow the great example that has been given them by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Gibson), whose predecessor was a very great man.

Mr. CASSELMAN: What about yourself? You did the same thing.

Mr. FAIR: And the hon. member for Temiscouata, too.

Mr. POULIOT: Thank you. But now I will tell something to my genial friend, who has just said a word. It would be this, that another fervent hope of mine is that now that the war is over the demarcation line between Liberal-minded members and Conservative-minded members will be clearer and more distinct. The mark should be seen by all. Liberal members should stand together for the defence of Liberal principles—and the others may do whatever they wish.

I understand that during the war, because there were Conservatives as well as members of the Liberal, C.C.F., and Social Credit parties in the army, the government could have accepted some suggestions with political background from its opponents. But now there is no reason for that.

My intention was to leave the floor to new members who have shown ability, and who have spoken just as well as have the older members. But now the question is obvious: Are we to sit for a post-war session? Is the war ended, or is it not? I have read in the press that Germany capitulated in May; that Hitler is dead; that Mussolini is dead, and that Japan capitulated a month ago. Are we to continue the war in this country, now that the war is finished in Europe and in Asia?

I am just back from home. Do you know, sir, that there are twenty-six military provosts at Rivière du Loup, my home town, to look after a handful of deserters, men who came from the farms and who should never have been in the army.

I can speak as I do because my county did exceptionally well during the war. Six thousand boys from there enlisted in the three branches of the services. Every time victory loans have been oversubscribed, and sometimes doubled. War organizations have done well. But now that the war is over, we see those provosts disturbing the peace. They are not elderly men, nor are they returned men. They are youngsters of about eighteen years, looking just as young as Baby-face Nelson. They drive their jeeps at a speed of about sixty miles an hour even at night, with their headlight and searchlights burning. Other drivers have to risk going into the ditch when those youngsters come along. They disturb everybody by searching every house to find delinquents.

There are plenty of complaints about those men; and now that the war is over, the general impression is that those people should not infest any constituency, and especially in view of the approaching victory loan. My people are ready to do in connection with the next victory loan, the same as they have already done. It is their hope that the government will pay no attention to the suggestions and insinuations which have come from hon. members opposite, because we realize that they are made with the intention of depreciating the government in the eyes and in the minds of the people.

The reason why Mr. Arthur Meighen is not any more popular in Quebec is precisely because he kept the war going in this country after it was over on the battlefield. I hope, sir, that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), for whom I have great regard and admiration, will see to it that the government takes the necessary steps to stop this, at the earliest possible opportunity, so that people in my constituency who have done their duty may breathe in peace and shall not be disturbed by those youngsters who, I suggest, should not be permitted to stay there any longer.

I have every confidence in the Prime Minister so long as he takes advice from his supporters, not one only but all of them, and so long as he pays no attention to any suggestions that may come from the opposition. Sometimes the C.C.F. are not bad. I hope the Social Crediters will be good in the future and they will be better if they cross the floor like the hon. member for Comox-Alberni. I tell the Prime Minister to be careful of all suggestions with a political lining that are made by the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) and others. I had only to mention their speeches in my county to be sure of winning. I know the hon. member; I know also that if he wishes to do well he can, and I hope he will do better in the future.

On motion of Mr. Quelch the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the house adjourned at 11.04 p.m.

Wednesday, September 26, 1945.

The house met at three o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

REFERENCE TO REMARKS OF MR. POULIOT IN DEBATE ON SEPTEMBER 25

Mr. J. L. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. On page 465 of *Hansard* the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) is reported as inferring that the member for Comox-Alberni had joined the Liberal party. I should like to correct any false impression that this house may have had from his remark.

An hon. MEMBER: What are you doing where you are?

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): In sharing a desk with a member of the Liberal party on this side of the house I am following the course adopted by my independent predecessor, Mr. A. W. Neill. I believe that I can better represent the people of Comox-Alberni if I am able to hear the proceedings of this house, something that was not always possible in my former location. I am and I shall continue to be an independent.

WHEAT

INTERIM INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT —PRICE CEILING FOR EXPORT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce what is the present status of the interim international wheat agreement. If it is in operation, are the proposals of the government to place a price ceiling on wheat for export in accord with that agreement? If it is not in operation, what are the reasons therefor?

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I think I can best answer the hon. member's question by stating that for the past eight months the Canadian government has been doing its utmost to reach some agreement with the other wheat exporting nations of the world. A conference was recently held in London at which there were discussions, but the conference broke up without any decision being arrived at because of disagreement among the nations participating.

MEAT RATIONING

STRIKE OF RETAIL MEAT DEALERS IN MONTREAL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. FRED ROSE (Cartier): Will the Minister of Finance inform the house what action the government is contemplating in view of the serious situation in Montreal which has arisen through a strike of the retail meat dealers?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): As the hon. gentleman knows, meat rationing was put into effect for reasons which I think commend themselves to the judgment of this house and of the great majority of the people of Canada. The question in Montreal is whether law and order will be enforced or whether gangs will be permitted to prevent the people of Montreal from getting their food. The enforcement of law and order in the city of Montreal is primarily the responsibility of the local authorities of that city, and the people of that city have every right to expect that the local authorities will assume and discharge that responsibility.

I may add that we do not intend to permit a local disturbance of this kind to prevent us from going ahead with the task to which we have set our hand, and that is the rationing of meat and continuing the rationing of meat for so long as that is required.

Mr. HOMUTH: It is a federal law, not a local law.

Mr. ILSLEY: There has been no violation of the meat rationing regulations in Montreal, so far as I know. The violation has been of the provisions of the law relating to the maintenance of peace and order. It is not connected with the rationing regulations at all. If it were a violation of the regulations, we would of course institute prosecutions.

Mr. HOMUTH: You never did before.

RESEARCH ENTERPRISES

INQUIRY AS TO CONTINUATION OF RESEARCH

On the orders of the day:

Mr. DONALD M. FLEMING (Eglinton): May I ask the Minister of Reconstruction if he has any plans in view for the reconversion of the plant and facilities of Research Enterprises Limited, at Leaside, and for continuation of the type of research carried on at that plant?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I do not see any urgency in the question. I would ask that the hon. member put the question on the order paper.

Mr. FLEMING: But, Mr. Speaker—I have the proof of the urgency right here in my hand—about fifty telegrams.

Mr. MACKENZIE: The Speaker is on his feet.

Mr. HOMUTH: But—

Mr. MACKENZIE: You have to sit down; the Speaker is on his feet.

Mr. HOMUTH: I never stood up.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Not for anything.

Mr. J. H. HARRIS (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to ask the Minister of Reconstruction if the several thousand employees of Research Enterprises may be given some immediate consideration, as this is a matter of urgency, with regard to the reconversion of Research Enterprises into a plant of a kind that will ensure the employees of some work in the not too far distant future.

Mr. SPEAKER: If I understand the question aright, it is a repetition of the one just asked by the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Fleming), which I have ruled out of order.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

STRIKE AT FORD MOTOR PLANT, WINDSOR

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Labour if he has any further report to make to the house on the progress being made in the settlement of the labour dispute at the Ford Motor plant at Windsor.

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): Through the good offices of the Secretary of State, the member for Essex East (Mr. Martin), and the mayor of Windsor, it has been indicated to me that the unions involved desire that efforts be made for the conciliation of the dispute. After consultation with the Minister of Labour for the province of Ontario—for I would point out to the house that this is a provincial dispute at the moment, not a federal dispute—a wire has been dispatched to both the company and the union stating that both ministers have agreed to meet with them on any date convenient to them in order to bring the parties together and get the wheels moving again in the Ford plant at Windsor.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

INQUIRY AS TO APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. J. BROOKS (Royal): May I ask the Minister of Veterans Affairs if it is the intention of the government to set up a special committee on veterans affairs at this session of parliament, and if so, at what time we may expect the committee to be set up?

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): The reply is in the affirmative. The intention is at once to set up such a committee, and I shall be asking the various parties and groups in this house for their selections of names for that committee, probably in a day or two.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE IN REPLY

The house resumed from Tuesday, September 25, consideration of the motion of Mr. W. M. Benidickson for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Ross (Souris).

Mr. VICTOR QUELCH (Acadia): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to take any further part in this debate, but now that the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Ross) has moved an amendment dealing with a subject which is of very great interest to western Canada I feel obliged to make a few comments upon it. His amendment reads as follows:

> We respectfully submit to Your Excellency that, pending the establishment of a more stable and equitable price structure for Canadian farm products based on parity of income for farmers, immediate consideration should be given to establishing for a period of years floor prices for all basic agricultural products at levels not less than ninety per cent of parity.

This amendment is perhaps not worded just as clearly as it might have been, but my interpretation is that it definitely endorses the principle of a parity income for farmers, and with that objective we are absolutely in accord. It also submits that in the maintaining of floor prices not less than ninety per cent of to-day's parity should be established. I take that as the meaning which the hon. member for Souris had in mind in moving his amendment. If that is the meaning, the amendment will receive the full support of this group. I should like to point out that we have on various occasions in this house taken a stand in support of that very objective, as I shall shortly show.

In this house and throughout the country there has in the past been a good deal of misunderstanding as to just exactly what is meant by parity prices. It has been quite a common thing to base parity on the prices over a given period, 1926 to 1929, and some have based it upon the 1913 to 1914 period. But the important thing to note is that in neither of these periods did the income of the farmers represent a parity income. Therefore if we are using the period 1926 to 1929, we can use it only as a temporary expedient to keep

us going until such time as we have definitely established the principle of parity income. Of course, by parity income I mean that the income of the farmers should bear the same relation to the national income as the farm population bears to the national population.

We in this party have had on the order paper of this house for a number of years a resolution to that effect. I should like to read it to show that the amendment now before the house is in line with what we have long been advocating regarding parity income. The motion standing in the name of the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Johnston), and dated September 6, reads as follows:

Whereas agriculture has seldom received its fair share of the national income of Canada;

And whereas the cost of producing all agricultural products varies considerably from year to year;

Therefore be it resolved, that, in the opinion of this house and in the interest of the nation as a whole, the government be requested to set the prices of agricultural products at such a level that it will guarantee to the farmers of Canada at such yearly percentage of the national income as will have the same relation to the national income as the agricultural population bears to the national population of Canada.

We have had such a resolution on the order paper for several years. The only years within the past century during which prices for agricultural products did maintain a parity of income for the farmer were 1915 to 1919. That basis is seldom mentioned in relation to parity prices. In support of that I should like to quote from a pamphlet which I have in my hand, issued by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture and called "What Share of the National Income does the Farmer Get?" On the back page we find a table setting out agriculture's share of the national income. It shows that in 1926 the farmers' income represented 17.8 per cent of the national income; in 1929, 14.6 per cent; in 1930, 9.6 per cent; in 1931, 6.3 per cent; in 1932, 5 per cent. By 1940 it had gradually crept back to 11 per cent. The average between 1926 and 1929 was 16.6 per cent, and from 1930 to 1940, 9.4 per cent. If we turn to page 13 we find a graph which shows the relationship of the farmers' income to the national income. It appears that from 1915 to 1919 the farmers' income represented approximately one-third of the national income, and at that time the farmers constituted one-third of the population; therefore I think it is quite correct to say that during the period from 1915 to 1919 the farmers, representing one-third of the population and obtaining one-third of the national income, received in reality a parity price.

The amendment is aimed at establishing that parity. We all realize that a parity of that kind cannot be brought about overnight. Therefore in the meantime we would establish a floor of at least 90 per cent of existing parity.

I have heard it argued by some hon. members and by some people outside this house that the farmers are not entitled to that type of parity for the reason that a farmer does not need to spend the same amount of time and money in training himself for his job as is required in some other vocations, and that, therefore, it would not be fair to compare the income of the farmer with the income of, we will say, the lawyer or the doctor. If that were true I would say that the farmer more than compensates for the difference by the extra long hours of labour which he puts in, and which are just about twice as many as those of men in any other profession. While labourers generally work from six to eight hours a day, the length of the farmer's work is from ten to sixteen hours a day. Therefore I maintain that he certainly makes up for any lack of training or any less time he has spent in training, by the extra hours of labour he puts in, not for one, two or three years, but during his life until such time as he is too old to work. I said, "if that statement were true," but I am not prepared to admit that it is true. I believe it takes longer to train an efficient farmer than to train a man in any other occupation. The farmer to-day must be skilled in many trades, skilled in combustion engines and power machinery; he must understand their maintenance and how to repair them. He must be a good blacksmith. He must also be skilled in knowledge of plant life and animal life and all that they entail. He must be a general animal doctor, and as the hon. member for Edmonton East (Mr. Ashby) said the other day, must act at times as a maternity nurse. He must also be a competent salesman. Many men who prove themselves to be good farmers as far as the work they do is concerned, fall down on the job of selling their products. In that case they are doing their work, very frequently, for almost nothing. I think all of us who are married will agree that a farmer needs to become a skilled diplomat in handling or humouring an overworked wife. Finally, I would say that he must find ways and means of carrying on in the face of adversity. Anyone who farmed during the thirties knows how at times it seemed an almost impossible task to carry on from one year to another. We persisted, however, in the hope that the next year would be different and that we would be able to "make a go of it."

Coming for a while to a discussion of the question of wheat, I wish to speak of the policy which was brought down in this house by the

Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon). In placing the new policy before the house the minister explained that, owing to crop failures in various parts of the world, the only two countries which would have a large surplus for disposal were Canada and the United States, and that, therefore, they would be in a position to demand a higher price. He also drew the attention of the house to the fact that the wheat will be sold largely to our allies, who are in no position to pay a high price for that wheat; they will have great difficulty in finding the means of payment. Therefore he urged that it was our moral obligation to make that wheat available to these nations at a price not higher than the present one.

We in this group are absolutely in accord with that. Consistently during the war we have advocated Canada's participation in such measures as mutual aid, the billion dollar gift, and UNRRA. We have always emphasized that all the united nations should be willing to pool their production for common use against the enemy, and that so long as the united nations were reducing their standard of living to barely sufficient to maintain the people in a state of decency, there should be no question of inter-allied debts being considered; the contribution should be made as a moral obligation, and no debts should be formed. Unfortunately, as we know, that policy has not been carried out, and the difficulty of inter-allied debts is already coming to the front, as it did after the last war. I am convinced that eventually those debts will be, if not repudiated, put off indefinitely and not paid, because after the last war no nation, with the exception of Finland, was able to pay the debts it incurred, and I do not doubt for a minute that no nation will be able to pay the debts of this war in view of the fact that they are far heavier than they were following the last war.

But the point I wish to make is this. While we agree that the policy enunciated in this regard is a fair one, we insist that when Canada makes that sacrifice and that contribution it should be a sacrifice of the Canadian people and not of any one class of society alone. Why should agriculture be asked to stand the full cost of that sacrifice? Surely the logical thing to do is to pay the farmers the price that can be obtained, sell the commodity to the people who need it, at the current price, and make up the difference between the two figures out of the general revenue fund or any other source which the government sees fit to use. We may differ as to the way that should be done, but that is not the point in question now.

The minister has tried to excuse his proposals on the ground that the government policy will compensate the farmers by guaranteeing a floor price of $1 a bushel for the next five years. But the mere fact that the minister says that it will be compensating them implies that the price may fall below that figure. On the other hand, the government does not know for certain whether the price will fall below or whether it will be above that amount. It may not call for any sacrifice at all. But certainly the government are not in a position to make a guarantee for the next five years, because they do not know whether they will be in power for the next five years; they might go out of power next year, in which event the farmers might be called upon to make the sacrifice for nothing.

But there is another reason why we are opposed to the farmers having to make that sacrifice. It is that we say that the farmers are being called upon to make a double sacrifice. For ten long years the farmers of the country produced at very low prices, and day by day, year by year, they were making considerable sacrifices. Therefore to-day the farmers should be guaranteed a fair price, a maximum price in order to compensate them for the losses they suffered in those ten years, without being asked at the same time to make similar sacrifices in the future as well.

I have already said that high prices are required to-day to compensate the farmers for the losses they suffered during the 1930's. I have no intention of going into what happened in those years, because most of us are quite familiar with the history of those times. It will be recalled that pre-war prices were dominated by export prices. I never could see the justification for that, because before the war, with the exception of wheat, the largest percentage of production was consumed in Canada. I could never see why that small percentage, from five to ten per cent, which was exported should dominate the price of the other ninety-five per cent consumed in Canada; yet that was the case, with the exception of wheat, apples and one or two other commodities.

I recall that wheat in 1932 fell to 19½ cents a bushel, and from 1932 to 1934 it averaged around thirty to forty cents. Unfortunately however, the government were not merely content with wrecking agriculture by allowing prices to fall to those very low levels. They were not content with wrecking agriculture by making farmers accept world market prices. They further penalized agriculture by their fiscal policy. It will be remembered that in those years we were competing with world markets, with Australia and the Argentine. It

will be recalled by many hon. members that Australia depreciated her currency twenty-five per cent below sterling, while at the same time in Canada we appreciated the dollar twenty per cent above the pound sterling, with the result that Australia had an advantage of some forty-six per cent over Canada. In other words, when Australia shipped wheat to Liverpool and obtained $100 in return, when that money was converted into Australian funds the farmer there received $125; but when we shipped wheat to Liverpool and the money obtained for it was translated into Canadian funds we found that our farmer received only $80 instead of $100. Thereby our farmers were penalized to the extent of forty six per cent owing to the government's fiscal policy.

I recall that Professor Upgren estimates that when the cost of that policy to western farmers from 1931 to 1936 was worked out it averaged $47 million a year. If you add to that the penalties imposed as a result of tariff policies you have another $32 million, making a total loss of $79 million a year to the farmers as a result of government fiscal policies, and that in addition to the general policy of trying to force export prices upon agricultural products consumed in Canada.

It will be remembered that these low prices continued for several years even after the declaration of war. They continued to the end of 1941. I listened to one hon. member recalling how a delegation came from Saskatchewan protesting against low prices, and shortly after that the price was raised from seventy cents a bushel to ninety cents. Unfortunately, however, just about the time the government increased the price of agricultural products, they made a drastic increase in the income tax.

What happened as a result of these low prices? Since no industry can continue to produce at a price below cost of production, the farmers were forced heavily into debt; up to the time prices were raised, the farmers were still going into debt, and when prices were raised the income tax was drastically increased so that the farmers who were trying to pay off their debts found that their debt payments were increased by approximately thirty-five per cent or more owing to the income tax. By bringing about an increase in the tax at that time the government increased the farmers' debt payments by about thirty-five per cent, and that is not helping the farmers to remedy the situation that came about in those pre-war years.

I am of the opinion that farmers should be entitled to exactly the same type of consideration in regard to losses as some of the other businesses in Canada. Take, for instance, the chartered banks. What is the situation in regard to the chartered banks? They are allowed to set aside annually a certain amount of undisclosed money placed in what one might call a hidden or secret or inner reserve, and the excuse for that action is that the money is set aside to meet possible losses in the future. As a consequence, they pay no income tax on that amount. The reason given is that banking is a very risky business; bankers do not know what may happen in the future and therefore they must build up a reserve to take care of possible losses. I doubt very much whether banking is anything like as risky as farming and, if bankers are allowed to create an inner reserve without paying a tax on it, why should farmers not be allowed to set aside a certain amount of money in a reserve to take care of possible losses in the future.

Again, what do farmers' debts consist of largely? They consist of unpaid expenditures. If a bank is allowed to accumulate money to pay a possible loss in the future, expenditures it cannot meet, there is every justification for the farmer being allowed to pay debts represented by unpaid expenditures without having to pay taxes upon that money. I think there is a real and legitimate claim on the part of farmers for better treatment in that regard, and I am not quite satisfied that the bankers are justified in the claim they make, that the inner reserves are used for the purpose of meeting possible losses. I maintain that those reserves have been used in the past to guarantee profits. Why do I say that? Because during the depression years in the 1930's, as we know, the banks suffered heavy losses. That was emphasized during the hearings of the banking committee last year. If the banks suffered heavy losses during the thirties, evidently they would not be able to pay profits, and yet they paid an average dividend of around eleven per cent right through the depression years. If they were suffering losses during all those years, how could they pay a profit? Evidently the hidden reserves were used not merely to pay their losses but to guarantee a profit to shareholders. I suggest, therefore, that the farmmers have undoubtedly a far better claim to exemption from income tax on the payment of debts, at least those incurred prior to 1942, than the banks have for exemption in respect of money set aside in reserve.

To-day one might well ask what the future of western agriculture is to be if the pre-war policies of this government come back into operation. I would say, if that is to be the case, then agriculture faces a very dark future,

and not only agriculture but those men who come back from overseas and take up land. They will be entering into a very hazardous occupation, and no matter how good the new Veterans' Land Act may be, if these veterans in the future are to have to produce at less than cost of production they will go into bankruptcy. That will happen no matter how hard they work or how good a deal they receive under the Veterans' Land Act.

If in the future as in the past the cost of production on large farms is in any way to govern prices for the whole of agriculture, then it must be quite evident that many are bound to go bankrupt. Every small farmer will become bankrupt, because the figures are already on record to prove that it is possible to produce grain considerably cheaper on a large farm of two sections or more than on a half-section, and if we are to base prices on cost of production on the large farm then, the small farmers are bound to go into bankruptcy. What will happen then is that the small farmer will become the hired help of the larger farmer or will drift into the city to swell the relief rolls, as has happened to a great extent during pre-war years. Does anybody consider it desirable that western Canada should become merely an area of large mechanized farms? If that happens it means that community life, the small villages, will go. If the idea is merely to show how efficiently we can produce wheat, and if we are to sacrifice everything else to that, then perhaps it might be excusable, but I think most of us will recognize that human rights are more important than material rights, and that it is desirable from every point of view to maintain the small community.

I believe that the principle of parity of income for farmers should be adopted. As I said at the beginning, I realize that such a policy cannot be put into operation overnight. Until such time as that policy can be put into operation the very least that we can do is to guarantee a price of at least ninety per cent of existing parity. I believe it is fair to say ninety per cent and not one hundred per cent, because we realize that there must be a certain error in computation and it cannot be estimated immediately what the parity will be. That may take several months, so that initially a fair price of ninety per cent could be established and the remainder paid later on when the full facts are available.

When we consider agriculture it is well to remember that when agriculture has prospered in Canada the whole of Canada has prospered, and when agriculture has gone bankrupt it has dragged down with it various other industries throughout the dominion.

I look upon the policy that the minister brought down—and I say this in all kindliness —as the first step to a deflationary policy; and the farmers throughout the west are afraid of that very thing. I remember Hitler said in his book "Mein Kampf", and he used to repeat it time and time again, that if you wanted to bring in a policy to which you knew the people were opposed, never try to bring in the whole policy at once, just bring it in little by little and then the opposition will never think that any one individual step is of sufficient importance to fight. I think that is exactly what the government is trying to do here; they are bringing about reduction step by step and hoping the farmers will consider no one step of sufficient importance to fight.

Mr. W. A. TUCKER (Rosthern): Mr. Speaker, I should first of all like to congratulate you on your appointment to your present high office, and also the mover and the seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne; and with that I would particularly associate those hon. members who have made such splendid contributions to this debate. This is the third parliament in which I have had the honour of sitting, and I cannot recall any opening session in which such splendid speeches were made by new members of the house.

If the house will permit me, I should also like to express a word of congratulation to the Assistant Clerk of the house as a former colleague from Saskatchewan, and commend him for the outstanding manner in which he has carried out his duties thus far.

The amendment moved last evening on behalf of the Progressive Conservative party, as found in *Hansard* at page 464, reads as follows:

> We respectfully submit to Your Excellency that, pending the establishment of a more stable and equitable price structure for Canadian farm products based on parity of income for farmers, immediate consideration should be given to establishing for a period of years floor prices for all basic agricultural products at levels not less than ninety per cent of parity.

I could not possibly support this amendment. Ever since I have been a member of this house we of the Liberal party, particularly those of us from western Canada, have been contending at all times and in all places that the principle of parity prices for farm products should be accepted. We considered that we had obtained the acceptance of that principle when we finally had the gov-

ernment pass the Agricultural Prices Support Act, subsection 2 of section 9 of which reads as follows:

In prescribing prices under paragraphs (a) and (c) of subsection one of this section, the board shall endeavour to ensure adequate and stable returns for agriculture by promoting orderly adjustment from war to peace conditions and shall endeavour to secure a fair relationship between the returns from agriculture and those from other occupations.

We consider that a definite acceptance on the part of this government and of the Liberal party of the principle of parity prices; there could not be a more striking acceptance of it than having it written into the law of the country. I am not alone in believing that that is what the statute meant. I find I am confirmed in that opinion by a speech made on January 18 last by the president of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture. This is what he said about the floor prices bill. I quote from page 10 of his speech:

In our opinion the floor prices bill is a more radical reform measure, and likely to be more far-reaching in its effect and ramifications, than any other piece of legislation passed in the interests of agriculture in a long time. The bill sets forth its aim as follows—

He then quotes the section of the act which I have just read to the house, and goes on to say—and it is a most significant sentence, because it is the president of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture speaking to his own organization; it is not by any stretch of the imagination a political utterance;

This, we believe, is the first official declaration by a Canadian government that farm people are entitled to a parity of economic returns with non-farm groups; and likewise, the first time it has been incorporated as a definite objective of fiscal policy.

I thought to myself last night: is this the new leadership that we are going to get from the present leader of the opposition? We fight to get the principle of parity prices accepted and written into the statutes of the country, and then we get an amendment moved on behalf of the official opposition that we shall have only ninety per cent of parity. Well, all that I can say about it, Mr. Speaker, is that those improvements were too hardly won to think of paring them down now by ten per cent or at all.

It might be said by my hon. friends that this does not apply to wheat; but when the government adopts that policy in regard to all other agricultural products and states its policy in regard to continuing the wheat board, as it has done, naturally the same principle will be applied to wheat. No other possible action could be followed in that regard. And surely in the fight to establish that definitely—if it still has to be a fight, which I do not think is necessary—it is not going to strengthen our position to suggest that we should be satisfied with ninety per cent of parity. Therefore I think that this amendment was certainly ill-timed and ill-judged.

With regard to the point as to whether or not the recognized farm leaders of this country are satisfied that this government is committed to a principle of parity prices in regard to wheat, and to a fair attitude toward the wheat board, I should like to read from the statements of the leaders of agriculture in western Canada. The first one that I should like to read from is a statement of Mr. Wesson, the head of the wheat pool in Saskatchewan. This is taken from the *Leader-Post* of September 20, in which he is reported as having said:

I believe that the decision of the government to continue to sell wheat to Great Britain and other importing countries at a price around $1.55 for 1 Northern basis lake head and Vancouver is a fair one. There is not the least doubt in my mind that under present conditions, with a feverish demand for wheat in Europe and dwindling supplies, the price could be much higher at the present time. I hope, however, that in years to come when there may be temporary unwanted surpluses that Great Britain and other countries will recognize this concession and play fair with Canada and other wheat exporting countries by continuing to pay a reasonable price for the amount of wheat they require.

I heartily concur in that expression of opinion by Mr. Wesson, who goes on to say:

The announcement that the initial payment for the next five years will not be less than $1 per bushel will be generally accepted as satisfactory so long as it is understood that the Canadian wheat board will continue to act as the sole marketing agents for Canadian wheat. However, until such time as there is a reduction in the cost of those things which enter into the cost of production, there should be no reduction in the wheat board's present initial payment of $1.25.

Again I heartily endorse these sentiments expressed by Mr. Wesson; and I think the Liberal party of western Canada will not be found wanting in the future, as in the past, in supporting the wishes of the farmers and in fighting for these things.

An hon. MEMBER: How about the Liberal government in Ottawa?

Mr. TUCKER: If my hon. friend had been here he would know that no one fought for the farmers harder or more effectively than the Liberal group from western Canada in previous houses. Now I should like to read the opinion of Mr. Plumer, chairman of the Alberta wheat pool, in regard to the matter. In the Calgary *Herald* of September 20 he is reported as having said:

The government policy of fixing wheat prices for a period of five years is a step in the right direction. A staple wheat price is important, but proper relationship of prices is even more so.

That is a statement I endorse most heartily. If there is one thing we Liberals of western Canada have urged upon the government of this country more than anything else, it is that the farmers are entitled to a fair share of the national income; and when the Agricultural Prices Support Act was written into the statutes of this country we thought we had established the efficacy of our work for all the country to see. Mr. Plumer goes on:

Prairie farmers, I believe, will generally approve of the government's policy as announced, providing there is no increase in the price of things that the farmer must buy.

Again we have the principle of parity prices, which is accepted in the statutes of this country as a direction to the board which is to administer these matters and establish those floor prices. I continue:

General reaction of the individual farmer seemed to be that the guarantee of a stated floor price for wheat over the five-year period of not less than $1 a bushel was a step in the right direction and would assure a balanced market for five years at least.

I repeat that there was no suggestion in the government announcement that under present conditions the initial, and therefore floor, price would be less than $1.25, basis lakehead or Vancouver. The only suggestion was that farmers could rest assured that no matter what happened—prices might fall; the prices of the things the farmer had to buy might decrease—the farmers could always rely upon a floor price or initial payment of $1 per bushel. As I understand the attitude of the farmers, it is fair. They want parity prices; they want their fair share of the national income, but also they want to have some idea as to what they can absolutely count on, regardless of what happens in other directions, just as other branches of economic activity want to know what they can count on. So while under present conditions the initial price is $1.25, the farmer may be assured that for the next five years, whatever happens, it will not be lower than $1 basis lakehead or Vancouver, subject to the overriding principle I have mentioned already, which has been written into the law of the land and is the accepted policy of the government.

The United Farmers of Alberta also approve. Mr. Church had this to say:

"The United Farmers of Alberta have consistently sought the establishing of floor prices on all major farm products, and will therefore welcome the announcement of the dominion government of a minimum price for wheat of one dollar a bushel basis Fort William for the next five years. There will be general satisfaction among farmers, particularly in view of the announcement that a price of $1.55 has been set for wheat bought by Britain. It must not be overlooked that the world price has been higher for some time than the $1.25 initial payment being made by the wheat board.

"The U.F.A. believes that stability in the price of farm products will be a great factor in post-war reconstruction and that even if it should require a bonusing policy to maintain that stability all Canada would benefit by it."

Here again we have an endorsation of the policy of the government already written into the statutes of this country.

In concluding my remarks on this subject I should like to say to hon. members from other parts of Canada that, as Mr. Wesson pointed out, it is appreciated in western Canada that under the present unusual conditions we could take advantage of the needs of our customers—though probably we should have to finance it ourselves—and get more from them than $1.55. But I would ask the country to note the attitude of the farmers of western Canada, as represented by their authorized leaders. They do not want to take advantage of the temporary need of their allies and friends overseas. All they ask is that the people overseas should remember, when days may be different, that the farmers of Canada took this attitude, and as the representative of a farming constituency it is an attitude of which I for one am very proud.

I do not intend to spend much time this afternoon on my hon. friends of the C.C.F. party. In all sincerity, however, as a resident of Saskatchewan, I should like to say that they held out to the people of that province the vision of a new era there. They were going to extend and broaden social services, and were going to pay the increased cost not by higher taxation but by going into business and making profits. We are waiting with a great deal of interest for the C.C.F. party to carry out the promises it made to the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. COLDWELL: Give them a little time.

Mr. TUCKER: They have been in power almost a year and a half now, and with the exception of their horse meat packing plant, their brickyard, their fish filleting plant, the woollen mill, which is not much more than started as yet, and the shoe factory, which they have only talked about so far, nothing has been done as yet that amounts to anything in carrying out their programme.

Mr. COLDWELL: What about the protective legislation the big interests are asking to have disallowed?

Mr. TUCKER: The Liberal party passed legislation to protect the farmers which those so-called big interests also petitioned or urged to have disallowed; my hon. friend should not forget that.

Mr. BENTLEY: Will the hon. gentleman permit a correction?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. BENTLEY: I want to tell the hon. member—

Mr. SPEAKER: I would remind the hon. member that when an hon. member has the floor there should be no interruption without his permission.

Mr. BENTLEY: I am asking his permission. I just want to ask the hon. member—

An hon. MEMBER: Ask your question.

Mr. TUCKER: The custom in this house is that questions may be asked but a speech should not be interjected into another member's remarks.

Mr. BENTLEY: Does the hon. member know that the horse meat packing plant at Swift Current is not owned by the Saskatchewan government but by a cooperative?

Mr. TUCKER: I knew that, but the C.C.F. were taking so much credit for it that I felt I had to refer to it. If I had not, I would probably have been corrected by some C.C.F. member. They seem to be so proud of some of the things they have done that I feel sure if I had not mentioned it I would have been corrected by five or six members.

I venture to suggest that they will not get anything in the way of profits out of these enterprises with which to expand the social services they have led the people to believe they will get. Outside of that, the only thing they have done is to expand social services at the cost of increased taxation. The Liberal party had a proud record in Saskatchewan in the extending of social services.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. TUCKER: Their record met with the approval of the people for a long time. However, my hon. friends held out a vision of a new way of handling things whereby these services would be paid for in some mysterious way rather than by having to take money out of their pockets, and the people turned temporarily from the Liberal party. But I would point out to hon. members that there are only two C.C.F. members sitting in this house from Saskatchewan who, like my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture and myself, had the support of the majority of the people voting. That does not look as though the people of Saskatchewan have swallowed completely the C.C.F. fantasies that were held out to them.

As I was going to say, the Liberal party were expanding social services in Saskatchewan as fast as the money could be obtained, so that is nothing new. What we have had now from the C.C.F. government there is an increase in the gas tax and an increase in the licence fees for farmers' trucks. I ask hon. gentlemen: is that the new era they had in mind when they held out these glowing promises to the people? This is the thought that is in the minds of the people of Saskatchewan to-day; do the C.C.F. mean what they say when they speak of the new era, when they talk about taking over businesses and making profits in order to advance the social welfare of the people, or are they just talking about it in order to catch votes?

Mr. COLDWELL: If we did not believe it we would join the Liberal party.

Mr. TUCKER: I say to my hon. friends that if we did not have a better record in Saskatchewan than they have, we would not have been returned steadily for twenty-five years. I warn my hon. friends that if they do not get going with their programme and produce some of the things they promised the people, they will not be re-elected time after time.

Mr. IRVINE: Is my hon. friend saying that the farmers of Canada are now receiving ninety per cent of parity?

Mr. TUCKER: I am sorry I did not make myself clear. I said that as I understood the accepted policy of this government it was that the agricultural prices support board, and, by inference, the wheat board also, would see to it that they did get parity at all times. The figures show that they are getting parity on these things. My hon. friend shakes his head, but I can only take the opinion of the statistical experts. That is what they say. If at any time I can be convinced that they are not getting it, I assure my hon. friend I will do all I can to see that it is restored, and I think the Liberal party will support that policy.

An hon. MEMBER: What expert says that?

Mr. ROSS (Souris): No statistics will prove that.

Mr. TUCKER: You made your speech, and I did not think it was a very prudent or good one for agriculture. Let me say to my

friends of the C.C.F. that we watched expectantly when the Regina Industries Limited plant was turned over from war production. The people said, "Here is a splendid opportunity for the C.C.F. government to take over a factory and start with a business that is ready to be taken over." Did they do that? No, they did not; they said, "We do not want to have anything to do with it." Right there the people of Saskatchewan marked down a question, "Do they believe in a single thing they are talking about?"

Let me give some advice to my hon. friends, and particularly my genial friend the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell). Let them go on with their socialistic programme where they have a chance to do it and not just talk about it in this house. Let them put their theories to the test of actual practice.

Mr. COLDWELL: I always take advice from a good lawyer.

Mr. TUCKER: There is another matter with which I should like to deal shortly, the question of foreign policy. I realize that the situation to-day is a delicate one, and I do not want to say anything that might make it more difficult. However, there are certain things I feel should be said on the floor of this free parliament. First, I do not think the council of foreign ministers representing the five great powers has any right to try to settle the future peace treaties of this world. I know it will be said that the council will just make suggestions, but the suggestions they finally make will lack only formal ratification because the smaller countries will not be able to change them very much if the council has reached agreement.

Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and the other united nations have played a sufficiently great part in winning the victory which has been ours to have the right to have some real and effective say in the settlement of the terms of peace. Further, the present policy is not working out to advantage, because I find the following which appeared in the *Daily Herald*:

> We repeat our calm conviction that the international situation is more than alarming; it is becoming desperate.

And the following is from the Manchester *Guardian:*

> Would it not be best if all were to return to the principles of the Atlantic charter which states that the powers (it was endorsed by Russia) seek no aggrandizement territorial or otherwise?

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Is that the *Herald* of Calgary or London?

Mr. TUCKER: The London *Daily Herald.* I quoted that for the benefit of my hon. friends of the C.C.F. over there. In regard to this whole question of foreign policy, I realize that there seems to be a feeling on the part of the English-speaking world that there is such a passionate desire for world peace that they are determined to let no disagreement creep into the discussions of the future settlement of world affair. Because of our reluctance to express disapproval of some of the aspects of Soviet policy, the Soviet leaders are coming to think, I am sure, that they can make demands that they otherwise would not make, that the governments of the free countries of the world will give way for them, or, if they do not give way, sufficient public opinion will develop to force them to give way.

Mr. FULTON: Apparently the hon. member holds the view that Canada should have an opportunity to have her voice heard. I should like him to explain why this government did not see that this country was represented at the conference that is now going on.

Mr. TUCKER: If my hon. friend knew what was going on, I believe he would find that great pressure was exerted to have the various nations of the British commonwealth represented at these peace discussions. But just as in past times the Soviet objected to the British commonwealth having more than one vote, I think my hon. friend will find that there was objection to the British commonwealth being represented by several votes. My hon. friend has no right to jump to conclusions. I do not think he would suggest that the British government, which I am sure would like to have Canada represented there and have her fair say, would not want that to be done. I think when the record of this thing comes to be written it will be found that the British government was anxious to have the dominions represented there on an equal basis with themselves, but they had to take the five-power conference or nothing. It is very easy for my hon. friend to suggest that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) should have gone over there, but as I read the dispatches he was asked to go over there and sit in the background and have the British representatives speak for all the nations of the commonwealth.

Mr. JACKMAN: Oh, come, come!

Mr. TUCKER: That is as I read the communications, and so far as I am concerned Canada has a right to be represented in the councils of the nations of the world in her own right as a nation, and not to be repre-

sented by anybody else. If my hon. friend wishes to have Canada speak through another nation, I believe he does not represent the thought of the Canadian people.

I was going on to say that I think the present situation is a dangerous one. It leads to claims being made that otherwise would not be made.

Mr. JACKMAN: What does Mr. Bevin say?

Mr. TUCKER: I have read the debates in the British House of Commons and know what Mr. Bevin said. I think my hon. friend cannot have read it or he would not be asking that question. The fact remains that it is a dangerous situation, and the sooner we make it very plain to the Soviets that we believe just as much in freedom and liberty now as we did when the Atlantic charter was signed, the better it will be for world peace.

That brings me to another question, and here I should like to associate myself with an hon. member of this house who is other than of British or French origin. I am glad to see him in this house representing one of the important elements of our population, the population of Ukrainian origin. He had every right to get up and show that he felt for his own flesh and blood who he fears and believes are suffering on the continent of Europe. I put it to those of English, Scotch, Irish or French origin, if according to all the news they could get, their own people on the continent of Europe were being crucified, we would, I am sure have heard more from them than what the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Hlynka) said in his most moderate speech.

What is the situation now before the Big Five conference? The west Ukraine comprises a large part of the Ukrainian population of Europe. The granting of the Soviet western boundary at the so-called Curzon line included the Ukrainians in the west Ukraine. At the Yalta conference it was claimed that these people thereby became Russian citizens. Russia claimed that it was agreed that they should be surrendered to the Soviet authorities. Mr. Churchill insisted that the Poles in that area should not be forcibly repatriated, that they should have the right not to be sent back to their homeland and that if necessary they would be granted the protection of the status of a British subject. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, when I heard that, it made me proud to belong to the British commonwealth of nations.

An hon. MEMBER: The Conservative party.

Mr. TUCKER: My hon. friend says "the Conservative party". I say that it was the people of Canada of all parties who made the great record of Canada in the past six years. Mr. Churchill, at the request of these beset Poles, said that they should have the mantle of British citizenship thrown around them, which was a great compliment to the British commonwealth at least.

But what of the Ukrainians? They were claimed to be Russians, and to-day the demand is that they be forcibly repatriated from the British and American zones in which they are to-day to the number of about one million. When attempts are made to carry out these orders, these unfortunate people, we are told, commit suicide or forcibly resist being handed over to the Soviet authorities. The Ukrainian committee in the United States has addressed a moving appeal to the president of that country to save their kith and kin in Europe from being forcibly repatriated to the Soviet. The Ukrainian committee of Canada has made a submission to our government, from which I quote two sentences:

> We have received information from Europe to the effect that the Soviet Union has demanded the repatriation of those Ukrainian refugees who came from the now Soviet occupied territories east of the Curzon line. In the name of humanity we appeal to the government of Canada to do whatever may be possible to prevent such deportations to the Soviet territories.

What is the situation of these people? We know that in the west Ukraine there were thousands of people who looked to the end of this war to bring them a free Ukraine. They wanted their freedom. They spoke for it and they worked for it. They were against being in the Soviet, and they were against communism—their preachers, their doctors, teachers, leading authors and writers—and for that reason they have been marked down, not as anti-communist but as fascist; for in Europe there is a tendency to say that if a man is against communism or in any way against being incorporated in the Soviet, he is fascist or pro-nazi. I would say to the members of this house that we do not want communism in this country—or most of us do not; we do not want to be incorporated in the Soviet Union, and we would not like it if we were called fascist for that reason. In the hearts of these Ukrainians there beats the love of liberty and the love of country just the same as in the hearts of Canadians, but they are branded as anti-Soviet, and we are told that for that reason they fear to be handed over to the Soviet authorities. They fear what is going to happen to them. Somebody might say: You do not know what is going to happen to them over there. But to use the words of Mr. Churchill, nobody knows what is happening behind the iron

curtain that divides Europe to-day, and if the Soviet authorities are not willing to let the representatives of our people and the representatives of the press come in to see what is happening over there, have we any right to doubt these people when they say they fear what is going to happen to them when they are forcibly repatriated?

And so, Mr. Speaker, I would urge this upon the government with all the feeling I possess: Do not let our Canadian troops have anything to do with forcing these people into the hands of those who they fear are going to liquidate them. Surely our great contribution to the fight for freedom was not made to have our troops in any way forcibly repatriate these people. Let them have the same protection as has been freely granted to the Polish people. I honour the representatives of Great Britain and the United States, at the Council of Foreign Ministers, who, we are told in press dispatches, are to-day resisting the demands of Mr. Molotov that these people be handed over.

Once more I see the British people and the people of the United States standing on guard for freedom and liberty, and I am sure that, our government has been making representations to the British government of approval of that policy.

I hope that this debate may be soon concluded so that we can send our own Prime Minister over there to add the voice and support of Canada to the conscience of the world in bringing to pass an era of freedom and liberty which alone will only begin to justify the tremendous sacrifices that have been made to render it possible.

Mr. P. E. WRIGHT (Melfort): Mr. Speaker, I find myself in the anomalous position of again addressing the house during this debate after having recommended in my last speech that the debate should be confined to the leaders of the four groups in this house. However that position is brought about through the fact that the recommendation of our leader, the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), that a day or days be set apart for a discussion of this particular subject which is brought up by the amendment of the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Ross), was not accepted by the government. Later I endeavoured to move the adjournment of the debate to discuss this subject, but you, Mr. Speaker, did not see fit to accept that suggestion. Consequently I find, representing an agricultural constituency, that it is my duty again to take part in this debate and to express my opinion and, through me, the opinion of the people I represent, on this latest amendment presented by the Progressive Conservative party.

I represent a constituency in Saskatchewan which is a mixed farming area. In speaking the other day, I dealt largely with this matter from the point of view of the wheat producer. Probably other members of this group are more qualified than I to speak to this subject from that particular angle, and they have already done so—the hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Bentley) yesterday and the hon. member for Wood Mountain (Mr. Argue) the day before. But as residents of a mixed farming area where at least fifty per cent of our income comes from other than wheat, namely from hogs, honey, seed, and various dairy and other agricultural products, we are vitally interested in the establishment of some reasonable floor not only under wheat but under all the country's agricultural products. We have been promised that for a long time.

The hon. member who has just spoken, the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker), stated that he has always favoured that and that the Liberal party has always favoured it. I should like to remind him of the delegations which have come to Ottawa at various times to try to establish that principle when the Liberal party had the power to establish it, as in 1940, and failed to do so. We certainly were not then getting a parity or a cost of production price; and if the hon. member for Rosthern had brought enough influence to bear on his government to have that accomplished at that time we would feel that he was much more sincere in his speech to-day.

Mr. TUCKER: I should like to ask the hon. gentleman a question. I suppose, in the first place, he is aware that the western—

Some hon. MEMBERS: What is the question?

Mr. TUCKER: I ask the hon. member: are you aware that the western Liberals fought hard to have those representations accepted; do you suggest that a group from western Canada can dictate the policies of the rest of Canada; and do you suggest that if you ever got into office you prairie members would dictate the policy of the C.C.F. party while in office in this country? Just answer those three questions, and then you may have the right to say that I am not sincere.

Mr. WRIGHT: I notice that, in the votes taken in this house on certain resolutions which were introduced by members of the opposition, the western Liberal members did not support their pleas to their own caucus by voting against their party.

Mr. TUCKER: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. TUCKER: On a question of privilege, the time I suppose my hon. friend is referring to is the vote on the second reading—

An hon. MEMBER: That is not privilege.

Mr. TUCKER: I recognize it because it was used through Saskatchewan during the last election. On the government's motion for second reading of a measure to raise the price of wheat from seventy to ninety cents a bushel, an amendment was moved that the bill be not read the second time, but some opinion was expressed favourable to dollar wheat. I just want to ask the hon. member if I did not say on the floor of the house that a vote for that amendment would have defeated the attempt to get the price increased from seventy to ninety cents, and did not his leader say that I was right?

Mr. COLDWELL: That is not my recollection.

Mr. TUCKER: I can show it to the hon. member in *Hansard,* then.

Mr. WRIGHT: The fact remains that it took a couple of delegations from western Canada to get Liberals to the point where they recognized that parity prices were something that the farmers were really in earnest about; and the recent elections in western Canada have amply demonstrated that to them. We hope they will change their attitude from now on, but evidently it has not been changed a great deal, if we are to judge from this order in council 6122 which was brought down here the other day by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon).

With regard to some of the Liberal promises, I should like to quote what the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) stated with regard to floor prices in a radio address on December 4:

> The government recognizes that farmers are anxious about their post-war prospects. They do not want to face a disastrous fall in farm prices within a year or two after the war. If, to help win the war, the farmers are asked to accept a ceiling on prices, we believe they are entitled to a floor under prices to ensure them against an agricultural depression after the war.

Order in council 6122, which states that wheat may not go below $1 a bushel before 1950, does not say, as the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) stated the other day, that this necessarily means that the floor price will be established at $1 a bushel. Nevertheless, as I said the other day, it has been the experience of agriculture that when these prices, or floors—whatever you like to call them—such as the price which was established the other day, are stated, in any year in which the production is more than the market requires the price immediately goes to that peg and stays there. That is why we are so anxious that this peg should be placed at a level which will give agriculture its cost of production, and as I put on the record the other day, $1 a bushel is not considered by western agriculture to be the cost of production at the present time.

Dealing with another matter which the Minister of Agriculture raised in his speech the other day, that of hog production in this country, he stated that it was a policy of his department to maintain a balance between the price of grain and the price of hogs, which would leave it up to the western farmer to decide which way he would obtain his income, whether he wished to obtain it through the sale of his grain or whether he wished to feed hogs. In western Canada, for a long time, we have been trying to diversify agriculture, and the Minister of Agriculture, as a western member, has stated at various times that we would never become prosperous out there until we could do that. Nevertheless this policy which he announced the other day, the policy of paying the freight from the lakehead to eastern Canada, subsidizes the production of one of the things which I believe we can produce in western Canada.

Mr. GARDINER: What is wrong with that?

Mr. WRIGHT: The feed is being sold here, subsidized by the government.

Mr. GARDINER: We are subsidizing almost everything in all parts of Canada.

Mr. WRIGHT: I will come to the matter of subsidies in a moment if the minister will hold his horses. Hog production is something which is a natural industry in western Canada.

Mr. GARDINER: In the hon. member's section.

Mr. WRIGHT: In all Saskatchewan, not only in the section I represent in the north but even in the dried-out area.

Mr. GARDINER: Where there has not been a crop for three years it is not natural at present.

Mr. WRIGHT: If a proper policy were followed in western Canada, the policy of an ever-normal granary, it would be possible even in the dried-out area to feed regularly a certain amount of live stock and so diversify produc-

tion there. But the government have never seen fit to institute a policy of maintaining an ever-normal granary in the dried-out areas of western Canada, and this should be done. Hog production is a natural industry as far as western Canada is concerned, and the subsidizing of production in eastern Canada is not a sound policy now that the war is over. We might as well argue that industry should be moved to western Canada and that the government should pay freight on all raw material necessary to transport raw materials there for production in western Canada. One is just as logical as the other.

In regard to this question of subsidies which the minister has mentioned, where do we stand? I would ask the minister a few questions in that regard and I hope he will answer them at some future time.

Mr. GARDINER: Why not answer them right now?

Mr. WRIGHT: The minister may do so if he wishes, but I hope he will do it on his own time rather than on mine. We are exporting bacon to Great Britain and I should like to know just what subsidies are being paid on that export bacon. For instance, is it our agreement with Great Britain that they pay eighty shillings per hundredweight for that bacon and the government absorb the difference between that and the 113 shillings we get at the present time?

Mr. GARDINER: Does the hon. member want the answer now? The highest price the British have indicated they were prepared to pay since 1940 for bacon and ham, was on the basis of eighty-five shillings. That was in the middle of 1941, about June, and we increased the payment—I am speaking from memory—about $3.50 per hundredweight between that and the end of that season in order to make pork products available for Great Britain rather than have them go to the United States. At the present time the amount being paid for bacon delivered at Saint John is about 113 shillings, so that one would probably be justified in saying, although I do not know that there is any way of working it out exactly, that under mutual aid we have been expected to pay about the difference between eighty-five shillings and 113 shillings.

Mr. WRIGHT: That simply shows that bacon is subsidized as far as production in Canada is concerned. We have run into certain difficulties in maintaining our production at the rate even at which we are producing to-day, which is approximately 450 million pounds for export. The minister thinks that should be a fair objective for us in the future, that we should be satisfied if we can obtain that share of the British market. The British market is concerned with two things with respect to its supplies; one is quality and the other is continuity of supply. Those are the two factors in which the British people are most interested and yet, when they look to Canada, they find that, through a policy instituted by this government, we have practically cut our production by thirty-five per cent in one year, and it is still falling. I believe that Great Britain will hesitate about giving us as large a share of its market as we would like to have. The people there are looking to Denmark. During the war years, when our pork production has been decreasing, Denmark, although in the war area, has actually been increasing her supplies and getting ready for the British market. This is what has happened in Denmark. Actually, production fodder was sufficient for a considerable increase in the number of pigs during 1943, and at the end of 1944 the number of pigs reached roughly 2,000,000, or double the number in June, 1942. As soon as shipping tonnage is available for imports of fodder and fertilizer, Denmark could in a very short time resume exports of bacon, butter and eggs on a large scale. There is no doubt that Denmark could then play an important part in preventing starvation in other parts of the continent.

While we have been decreasing production Denmark has been increasing hers and getting ready to go into the British market, and the policy followed by this government is one which we suggested over a year ago would inevitably lead to a decline in production. It has not been a good policy for Canada, it has nor is the policy which the minister suggested yesterday of maintaining so close a balance between the price of grain and the price of hogs in western Canada a sound policy for the production of these commodities in this country.

I come now to the amendment which has been moved by the hon. member for Souris. The hon. gentleman is a practical farmer and I have had a great deal of pleasure in working with him in this house and on committees. Very often I have felt justified in supporting certain things which he has said in the house. I am afraid, however, that I cannot agree with him on this amendment. I do not think the amendment was written by himself. More probably it was written by certain groups within the Progressive Conservative party, which by the way embraces approximately twenty per cent of members from Toronto and district. They probably wrote the amendment rather than himself.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): They had nothing to do with it.

Mr. WRIGHT: I am surprised that he introduced an amendment which suggested that the farmers of Canada should be satisfied with ninety per cent of their cost of production.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The hon. member cannot find any wording in the amendment which says that they should be satisfied. I clearly pointed that out and I said that our idea would be that, in the period of dislocation following the war, no matter what happened the price should never go below ninety per cent. With regard to the statement in reference to the group of Toronto members, I can vouch that no member from Toronto ever saw that amendment until it was presented to the house last night.

Mr. WRIGHT: Let me read the words of the actual amendment. This is what it says:

. . . immediate consideration should be given to establishing for a period of years floor prices for all basic agricultural products at levels not less than ninety per cent of parity.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Not less.

Mr. WRIGHT: For a period of years.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Not less.

Mr. WRIGHT: The hon. member knows as well as I, and the other hon. members from agricultural constituencies, do, and he so stated in this house, that once you set a floor price, every time there is a small surplus prices go down to that floor price immediately, and stay here. The hon. member now suggests that for a period of years we in agriculture should be satisfied with ninety per cent of our cost of production.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Mr. Speaker, again I must interrupt. I know the hon. member does not want to misrepresent the facts. He was very fair at the beginning of his remarks. He has heard me repeatedly session after session argue with the government about the policy of parity. He is acquainted with what the government said to organized labour, and he distinctly knows the stand we have taken in the past.

Mr. WRIGHT: That is why I am so surprised that the present amendment should be brought in by the hon. member, because he states we should get not less than ninety per cent. For a period of years we of this group have always maintained that agriculture should receive its cost of production. That has been clearly expressed by all agricultural organizations in Canada in their published statements and in their representations to the government. Let me quote from the address of the president of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture delivered at Quebec in 1944. This is what he said:

The purpose of such a floor would be to support and stabilize farm prices in order to maintain a proper balance between farm incomes and those of other groups; and secondly, to assure to farm people a satisfactory level of purchasing power which at long last is becoming recognized as basic in national well-being. The value and success of such floors will depend upon how and at what level they are set. This is a matter which will require the careful and constant watchfulness of every branch of our industry.

That is why I am going to move, seconded by the hon. member for North Battleford (Mr. Townley-Smith) that all the words of the amendment after the word "address" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

We respectfully submit to Your Excellency that immediate consideration should be given to the establishing of floor prices for all basic agricultural products at parity with other services and products.

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, my first words will be to join with other hon. members in congratulating you on the high honour that has been bestowed upon you. I trust and hope that in the years to come the manner in which you discharge your responsibilities will add lustre to the record of those who have preceded you and whose distinguished service is a matter of knowledge to us all.

I also wish to congratulate not only the mover and the seconder, but the other hon. and gallant members from all parts of the house whose contribution to the debate has been of such a high order. It indicates that these young and able men will contribute in peace as they have so gallantly in war.

This afternoon I intend to discuss the amendment and the subamendment, but before doing so there are certain general references I should like to make. In the speech from the throne tribute is paid to our men who have served in the armed forces. Coming as I do from the prairies that have contributed so much to the naval forces of this dominion, I once more ask the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) that consideration be given to the diminution or remission of sentences imposed, both penitentiary and gaol, upon some of those naval personnel following the Halifax riots. In making that request I am not unaware of the fact that suffering and damage were caused to the people of Halifax. But, sir, these young men, and I refer to three who came from my own province, were on active service for more than two and a half or three years. They are not

criminals in the ordinarily accepted meaning of that term. Misguided, ill-guided and free as they were that day from discipline, and admitting that they committed wrong, I would say justice has been done in the period that they have served, and that the people of Canada as a whole would ask that mercy now be tempered with justice.

While I am on this subject I ask the consideration of the government for the numbers of our young men who to-day are undergoing penal servitude as a result of the imposition of sentences by courts martial both abroad and in Canada. Now that the war is over, although we have not been able to find out that it is officially over in Canada although it is as far as hostilities are concerned, the Minister of Justice or the law officers of the crown should review the proceedings in connection with those sentences, to the end that mercy be tempered with the justice that has already been meted out to them.

In this connection, when I refer to Halifax, I would point to the kind of sentences being imposed upon men who during the period of war evaded service but to-day are returning to their homes. I point to one example from my own province, that of a man who was called up in February, 1942, and who absented himself on August 24 of the same year, remaining at large until May 7, 1945. He was then brought before the courts and sentenced to six months imprisonment, for the offence of having refused to serve in the armed forces of this country and having deserted for a period of two and a half years. They gave him six months; he was let out at the end of one month, and to-day he has an honourable discharge because, while he was incarcerated, they found that he was unfit for service. I place that case alongside the cases of these young men, in whose behalf I make the plea to the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General (Mr. Jean) that the time has come to temper justice with mercy.

As I think of these young members who served during the war and whose contribution so far to the debates of this house has been so great, I think of the years during the war when to all intents and purposes representative government and parliamentary democracy as far as legislation was concerned had abdicated in Canada. I believe the return of these men and the quality of their contribution will assure at least one thing, that parliamentary legislative authority will be restored. We in this parliament will demand the end of government by order in council, which to-day remains unabated. We will demand the immediate removal of unnecessary boards. In that connection I think of the war information board, which in my opinion no longer can justify its existence. I speak with the support of Liberal newspapers all across this dominion when I say that too often during the period of the war that board, performing a good service, at the same time was performing a service of propaganda on behalf of the government. I say too, sir, the time has come to remove from orders in council, regulations and statutes of this parliament the denial of the right of the individual to recourse to the courts. I could refer to numbers of these regulations in that regard. I am not going to review them to-day; I will take them up on a later occasion, taking time at the moment only to set out the principle in which I believe. Only recently we find the courts of Ontario, referring to the operations of one board, saying:

> The power of the board was not in any way circumscribed; no limitations were imposed on its exercise, and no standards were set up for the board's guidance. It had a free hand, and was a law unto itself. It might determine its own policy, and expendiency was its only guide.

I believe the time has come to remove from statutes, from orders in council and from regulations any power given to any board to set itself above the courts of this land, although caprice, ignorance or deliberate discrimination has been the reason for the judgments rendered. We have heard much about controllers. Well, the war is over now. Let us bring some of these controllers before a committee of this parliament and ascertain from them why certain of their orders and decisions were made. Let us take the regulations and bring them before a committee of this parliament. I am sure we have enough hon. members who would be willing to serve on such a committee, where the regulations could be analysed and the powers that were exercised reviewed together with the circumstances under which they were exercised. Let this parliament, through this committee, determine which of these regulations shall continue into the days of peace.

Do you realize, sir, that to-day in this country young men returning from overseas are denied their rights under the Veterans Land Act because of the regulations which have been passed pursuant to the powers contained in that statute? Let me give an example. The Veterans Land Act provides that any young man who served under certain circumstances shall be entitled to return and be rehabilitated on the soil. Then regulations were passed, one of which provides that no soldier can qualify to take land under the act unless he has a qualification certificate, and that he shall not be given a qualification

certificate unless he had at least two years of satisfactory farming experience prior to the date of his application. In other words the Veterans Land Act is emasculated by a board and by those charged with the responsibility of carrying out the will of parliament. Let me give another example. A young man, having lived on the farm all his life, enlisted at the age of eighteen and went overseas. Upon his return he is denied the right to take land under the Veterans Land Act.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Oh, no.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Oh, yes; I can give the minister other examples. This indicates one thing, that the board acts without the knowledge of parliament. This is the strongest possible confirmation of the argument I am now endeavouring to advance, that these regulations be brought before parliament so that we may ascertain how in fact they are being carried into effect.

Mr. GARDINER: I would agree that anyone who interpreted the regulations in that way ought to be brought before a committee.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I know whereof I speak; I do not make loose statements in the house.

Mr. GARDINER: Then bring them here. Anyone who gave that sort of interpretation I agree should be brought here and investigated.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I am glad I have the support of the Minister of Agriculture, at least. I say that any controls, whatever their purpose, which deny our service men the right to establish themselves in the business of their choice, should be done away with as far as these service men are concerned. As an example, a young man was a butcher before going overseas where he served for five years. He returns and establishes himself in a new town, investing whatever money he has left from his service gratuity. An official advises him—and I have the letter here—that he shall not have a slaughtering licence. He cannot engage in business unless he makes his purchases from the packers. The result is that this man who would have established and rehabilitated himself after service is denied the right that we in this parliament have asserted is his—to be rehabilitated at the earliest possible date.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Who is the letter from?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: It is from the wartime prices and trade board. When I wrote to the chairman of that board I received a reply in his absence to the effect that there was no record that this man had ever applied, and they did not know where the decision had come from. He applied as far back as August 18, and he is still unable to carry on, unable to carry on because of an interpretation of a regulation on the basis of its legal meaning rather than the spirit of it.

The time has come when a committee of this house should examine the orders that have been made under the provisions of the War Measures Act. I was surprised the other day, when the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church) endeavoured to ascertain whether the war was over, that the Minister of Justice indicated that there were certain difficulties which would flow from a decision on that matter and that the council had not as yet decided that important question.

I think it is time to review the orders still in effect under the War Measures Act under which boards are constituted. Under certain of these orders a board may bring a man before them, examine him under oath, deny him the right to have counsel, and then make the person so interrogated liable to criminal prosecution. One such case was reviewed by the court of appeal of British Columbia, and the court indicated it could do nothing about it, that the power was exercisable. Similar powers are being exercised to-day under the Excise Act. A police officer who finds he is unable to secure evidence to convict has the power, with the license of the minister, to bring an individual before an inspector of the mounted police, where he is interrogated under oath, without counsel and without protection, and on his statement there given, may be convicted.

Regulations and orders of this kind should be brought before a committee of parliament so that we may once more assert that no controller, no board, no regulation passed beyond the pale of parliament, shall control the rights and liberty of an individual in this country, while denying him recourse to the courts. There is nothing unfair in that; it is reasonable, it is just. The United States went through the war, but at no time was an individual in that country denied the right of recourse to the courts against irresponsible orders and declarations and controls, particularly those affecting the individual. I summarize by saying that the time has come to demobilize all unnecessary controls and, above all, to demobilize the powers of unregulated and uncontrolled controllers and other individuals who operate beyond the pale of parliament and sometimes beyond the control of parliament.

I pass on to the amendment that has been moved by the hon. member for Souris (Mr.

Ross). As I listened to the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker), as I heard him endeavour to argue his proposition with all his powers of advocacy before the bar, I realized that his arguments were almost insufficient to establish his failure or his inability or his refusal to support the amendment moved by the hon. member for Souris. What does the amendment cover? It indicates that to-day parity prices are not being paid to the farmer. The hon. member said that parity prices are being paid to-day, that he could only take the opinion of those who knew. An hon. member on this side of the house asked a question that was quite easy to answer when he asked, "Who said that?" But there was no reply from the hon. member for Rosthern.

Mr. TUCKER: I object to that statement, I said it was the statistical experts.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I am glad we have heard of the statistical experts. I presume those statistical experts would be the experts of the dominion bureau of statistics. I have here the latest statistics issued by the dominion bureau of statistics, being a review of agricultural business issued by the marketing service of the Department of Agriculture. This is the August issue, and it sets out the facts with unerring accuracy. It reveals that there is no parity price being paid to-day for Canadian farm products.

Mr. GARDINER: Where does it say that? Read it.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I am glad to have some curiosity indicated, and I shall endeavour to satisfy it if the minister will wait just a moment. I am referring to the *Economic Annalist,* page 50, which gives the annual and monthly index numbers for wholesale prices, living costs and production indexes computed by the dominion bureau of statistics. Usually 1926 is the period taken as 100, and that is the period taken here in the determination of these figures. I am going to give the latest available figures, and I am not picking out one at the expense of another less favourable figure. The May, 1945, index for the wholesale prices of all commodities was 103 as compared with 100 in 1926. The farm products index is given as 104·6, and field products as 94·8. This index covers the wholesale prices of grain, fruits and vegetables. Next is animal products, 121·1, which refers to the wholesale prices of animals and animal products. Then we come down to the cost of the commodities which the farmer has to buy. There are eleven factors which determine the cost of the commodities and services used by the farmer, and in May, 1945, the index figure for those eleven factors was 142·0; based on 1935-39 numbers. I will tell you what they are. The index number comprises eleven factors; farm implements, building materials, gasoline, oil and grease, feed, fertilizer, binder twine, seed and hardware, and in addition, taxes, interest and farm wage rates. In other words, on these statistics, prices for animal products in this country to-day are considerably below parity. In other words, they represent a relationship of 121·1 to 142, and so far as field products are concerned they represent a relationship of 94·8 to 142, clearly establishing this one fact, that to-day, after more than five and a half years of war, with our field product farm prices as high as they have ever been except for beef, they are still considerably below, some twenty-five per cent below in the case of animal and grain products, the parity price on the basis of the return that I have just laid before the house.

Mr. GARDINER: It does not show that.

Mr. TUCKER: If the hon. member will permit a question—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh.

Mr. TUCKER: I was asked questions when I was speaking, but the hon. gentleman does not seem to be willing to return the courtesy.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I have never consciously run away from questions, but at the moment I am answering an argument which I listened to in silence.

Mr. TUCKER: I take it that the hon. member does not want to answer my question.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: What is the question?

Mr. TUCKER: In view of the fact that the law provides that the board shall establish a parity price, is the hon. member against a 100 per cent parity price and in favour of ninety per cent parity?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That is a very proper question, and I will answer it in this way. If to-day we had a ninety per cent parity price, the price of wheat would not be fixed at $1 a bushel. It would be at $1.28.

Mr. GARDINER: It is $1.55 now.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: The hon. member for Rosthern made a speech and traversed almost everything, and I listened patiently as he took us from Russia to the horse-meat factories, but now—

Mr. GARDINER: Will my hon. friend agree that parity on wheat is $1.28?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That is ninety per cent of parity on wheat, $1.28.

Mr. GARDINER: It is $1.55 right now.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: We are talking about a floor price.

Mr. GARDINER: That is not what the farmer gets. He gets participation.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Let us get back to the terms of the resolution. There is one thing about the hon. member for Rosthern. He legalizes and rationalizes, and he said: We have an agricultural prices support act now wherein the principle of parity was accepted by parliament, and he asks: Are we going to depart from its provisions? What we want, Mr. Speaker, is not only the principle of parity accepted. What we want is the practice of the principle accepted by this government.

Mr. TUCKER: We want 100 per cent parity.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: My hon. friend speaks about what he wants, but I remember that on April 8, 1941, I moved a resolution in this house, which was as follows:

> The government should take immediate steps to create a parity of prices as between agricultural and other products in order to improve the condition of Canadian agriculture and in order that it may receive a just and fair return.

That was in 1941, four years ago.

Mr. TUCKER: And now you have come down ten per cent.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: My recollection is that the hon. member for Rosthern voted "no" to that resolution.

Mr. TUCKER: Because I wanted to keep the government in office. That was most likely to give us parity prices.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Mr. Speaker, I never say anything provocative. I maintain with the Canadian Federation of Agriculture that until the principle is accepted that the farmers are entitled to a fair exchange value of the products of the farm with non-farm products, there can be no future for agriculture. I accept the principle of parity, and the western farmer demands it. We say that until this is established as settled policy and until agreement is arrived at, if you will, the farmer should receive at the very least ninety per cent of parity price for his wheat. In other words, he should receive to-day as a basic minimum floor price at least $1.28 a bushel.

Mr. BRACKEN: Instead of one dollar.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER. As my leader says, he should receive $1.28 instead of the one dollar he receives to-day.

[Mr. Gardiner.]

I come to another matter. There is a great difference between the export price that the Canadian government will receive for its wheat and the export price that the United States will obtain. The difference is approximately thirty-five cents. In other words, if we make every allowance in favour of freight, the difference in exchange and the like, the government and people of the United States are selling their wheat for approximately thirty-five cents a bushel more than we are. This disparity has arisen and this sudden fixation of prices has something to do with the international wheat agreement of 1942. Then the nations got together, they got together not only for the present but for the period of the war and after, and they came to certain agreements. They agreed that in the interests of agriculture everywhere in the world and in conformity with the principles of the Atlantic charter, they would join together and stabilize agriculture on the North American continent.

To-day a question was asked of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon). He was asked, what about this? And he indicated that there had been a meeting recently in London. Under the agreement it was provided that there should be a meeting in August of each year and I think we are entitled to more of an explanation than the minister gave us to-day. What happened in London? Why have the United States, Canada and the other nations within the international wheat agreement decided within six months after the end of the war not to follow the principles that bound them together during the war?

Mr. MacKINNON: I know the hon. member does not want to give the wrong impression. In my answer to-day I did not say that they had come to any decision. I said they had been unable to come to any agreement and the meeting was adjourned for the time being.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Although we are not in committee, may I ask the question, when did it adjourn to?

Mr. MacKINNON: I am not sure of the exact date, but my understanding is that the adjournment is until a day shortly hereafter, at Washington.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Well, Mr. Speaker, this is the whole crux of the situation.

Mr. GARDINER: That has been going on since 1932.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: We have not information on the meeting. What happened? Who opposed it? Who refused to have any agreement between Canada and the United States upon a common price on exports?

Mr. GARDINER: That is something which has been going on since 1932.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I do not care how long it has been going on. I want to know what happened in London that determined that nations which have cooperated side by side in war cease to continue the cooperation which has characterized them during the war with regard to agricultural products. We have a right to that information. I think the Minister of Trade and Commerce should frankly place the facts before the country so that we will understand.

Before I conclude there are just one or two other observations I should like to make. Representing as I do an agricultural constituency in Saskatchewan, I should like to place several matters before the house and the country reflecting what I understand to be the point of view of the farmers.

The first is this: they demand that a reasonable price approximating to parity shall be brought into effect and assured to them as a floor price.

Second, in the matter of live stock, all over this dominion there is the demand that something be done to assure producers of live stock against the falling away of prices which has taken place during the last six or seven weeks. We gave the power in the last parliament for the government to have a board to step in and make purchases whenever the price fell. Has the board been set up? What has that board done? As the hon. member for Rosthern said, parliament incorporated the principle; we now ask the government to incorporate the practice of that act. What are they doing? What are they doing to assure that there shall not be great fluctuations in the price of live stock? Why to-day, having regard to those fluctuations, should the United States market not be made available to a degree to Canadian cattle shipments to that country? All over the Canadian farmer is asking that. The explanation given by the Minister of Agriculture in the March session, as I remember it, was that the United States did not have the killing facilities, so for that reason they did not want our cattle. Following that explanation, I took it upon myself to write to five or six different live stock agents in the United States to ask them whether the people of the United States, and in particular the buyers, would be willing to accept Canadian cattle, and the answer in every case was to this effect: "Yes, we cannot understand why the Canadian government refuses us the opportunity to buy your cattle."

Next I say that if you are going to satisfy the cattle producer, the contention of my honourable leader, made over the last two or three years, should be implemented and there should be established a board of live stock commissioners.

Recently in the province of Saskatchewan a number of farmers asked me this question: why is it, having regard to drought conditions and diminished yields, that the minister in answer to your question said that the government had until November 1 to decide whether or not to declare an emergency year? The conditions are known. You do not have to be a statistician to realize the low yields which prevails to-day in the province of Saskatchewan and the widespread failure of the crops. Why is it that the government does not now make the declaration with regard to the emergency year in order to assure those who find themselves on their farms without sufficient to carry on for the year?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but he has spoken already for over forty minutes.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go ahead.

Mr. SPEAKER: With the consent of the house.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Mr. Speaker, I shall not trespass on that courtesy except to say this, that we from western Canada are not here trying to make raids on the treasury. We are trying to assure the opportunity for Canada to be rehabilitated, to assure jobs, which cannot be done if agriculture be permitted to remain depressed in this country. We read, sir, of the difficulties of farmers in other parts of Canada, such as the failure of the apple crop in the Annapolis valley. I, coming from another part of Canada, feel that some measure of assistance, under similar legislation to the Prairie Farmers Assistance Act, should be given to those who have suffered failures in that particular part of Canada. This is a great country; it is going forward. To do something for Canada requires raising and continuing to raise the standards of agriculture. Give the farmers the opportunity of obtaining the things they are entitled to. Give them that opportunity, especially in the light of the suggestions of the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) who has done so much for the prairie provinces. The challenge to us is: build up a demand for industrial products by raising the farmer's income; build up a market for industrial products, thereby assuring jobs in industry as well as a fair standard of living for agriculture.

Mr. F. W. TOWNLEY-SMITH (North Battleford): Mr. Speaker, may I introduce myself as another new member, this time a farmer from northern Saskatchewan. Only three short weeks ago I was riding a binder on my farm in the northwest of that westerly province, and I regard with some dismay the change of circumstances, the fact that I find myself on my feet, and I also have to remark that I am somewhat unlucky to-day in that I have to follow three such eloquent speakers. That is a break of the kind I was not looking for.

First of all I wish to say a few words about my constituency. That seems to be a general practice. It is going to be very difficult to avoid repetition, and to say that my constituency is one of the best in the dominion would certainly be repetition, but it would not be true, because it happens that I was chosen by a constituency which goes a long, long way north—north of lake Athabaska. I am told as a matter of fact that the extent of this constituency is some 530 miles north and south and 150 miles east and west. In the last parliament North Battleford was represented by one of the two ladies who sat in the house. Incidentally, North Battleford is misnamed, because the city of North Battleford is not contained in the constituency, and I would suggest to whoever happens to be in charge of this particular matter either that the bounds of the constituency be changed so take in the city of North Battleford or that the name of the constituency be changed, because as it stands the name creates the utmost confusion. I understand that it is not the only case of the kind. There are other constituencies in the dominion that are misnamed.

The north part of the constituency consists principally of lakes, rivers and forests. Not very long ago the canoe and the dog team were the only means of transportation, but since the advent of the aeroplane, journeys are now made a little easier.

Principally the constituency is agricultural. The other day I listened with a great deal of interest to an hon. member to my left as he was making his soliloquy to a sow, and while I do not intend to regale the house with the marital difficulties of my live stock, still I shall have something to say about agriculture.

Coming back to my constituency, the population is varied. The Ukrainian, German, Scandinavian, British and French Canadian races are all found in the constituency, and also of course the Metis and the Indians live in that area. The occupations are as varied as the people. In the most southerly part, in an area of 100 by 150 miles, a general scheme of agriculture is followed. Cereal grains are produced in this area in great quantities. It is one of the good agricultural cereal areas of the province. Live stock production is also practised, and dairying is well established.

Further to the north, as I have said, we have a change in the situation. The terrain is different, and agriculture of the type I have described is not so easy. The areas for growing grains are much smaller, and the people who live in the northerly part must have other occupations in order to make a living. So that we find some lumbering, some fishing; the people in that area have trap lines, and fur to a considerable value is sent out in the winter. Fresh fish is also caught and marketed from the lakes in this northern area—and when I say fresh fish I mean unfrozen fish. It is caught in the winter and transported to railhead and shipped to the United States market. You will readily see that railways and roads are very important in that part of the country. I may say that they are also very short. There are few roads and scarcely any railroads.

In that particular area we have two railroads, or rather the two ends which were built, the middles having been left out. When my colleague, the member for Cariboo (Mr. Irvine) was talking about his railway difficulties, he told us that he had the middle. So that is where it went. In any event the brains of the period of 1928 seemed to have supplied his constituency and mine with one railway between us. Now we are hoping, expecting and asking that these railways be completed. At the time my colleague was speaking I was wondering how they managed to get the rolling stock to that piece of railway which did not go anywhere or come from any place. It must have been quite a trick. At any rate, the effect of having this limited mileage of railway, so far as my own particular riding is concerned, is uneconomic and it makes things very difficult for the people who live there.

In a report recently issued, an economic study on land settlement in the representative pioneer areas of northern Saskatchewan, sent out by the department of farm management of the university, we are told that the average distances from shipping points at Meadow Lake, which is an urban district of size in my riding, Loon Lake, a smaller place, and Goodsoil, are from 19 to 60 miles respectively. Sixty miles is a long way to go to a railway. It is entirely too far, and the

situation could be corrected by having these lines completed. We hope this will be done at a very early day.

Other forms of communication are also in short supply. I have in mind—besides the railways—roads, telephones, telegraphs and communications of the kind. Pioneers who go into these northerly areas have difficulty enough without having to face this particular variety, and it should be possible for any government to remedy the situation. As regards telephones, when I was travelling through that area, telephones simply were not there. Occasionally, even in villages and small towns, there were none. It may not be any concern of this federal government to erect a telephone line; still I like to call the attention of the house to the fact that the people in that part of the country have no telephones, and they should have them. It is a fact also that the railway lines that are in there are very inefficient. One train a week is probably the general order. One train a week is not enough, because it controls the other services. I have in mind postal services, and one train a week means mail once a week. Furthermore, the health services are also affected; one train a week does not give these people very much chance, if any one becomes ill, either to get the patient out or the doctor in.

Educational facilities are also in want of some adjustment, not only in this riding but in the province as a whole, and I venture to suggest in all the western provinces. I know, of course, this is a matter which is entirely in the hands of the provinces, yet since education is of such vital importance to Canada I do feel that the dominion government should also interest itself in providing some assistance to the provinces for their educational system.

Because Saskatchewan is an agricultural province and has to encounter the greatest of all hazards, the weather, it slips very easily into conditions of distress. Hon. members will recall that not very long ago this western province, owing to a series of disastrous crop failures, was in a condition of near bankruptcy. Because of the particular method employed at that time in financing the schools, the rural school districts of Saskatchewan were called upon to provide in the neighbourhood of eighty per cent of the funds required to operate the schools. The basic grant from the Department of Education at that time was $1.50 a day for two hundred days.

Owing to the crop failures I have mentioned, the ratepayers in a great number of districts found themselves without funds, indeed without food, clothing, seed and things of that nature, all of which had to be provided for them in the form of relief. We therefore find them desperately trying to operate their schools on the $300 grant. They tried that for a number of years. Within limits they actually succeeded in keeping the schools open, but it was largely through the efforts and the good-heartedness of the teachers that this was done. In fact after two, three or four of those disastrous years there was a sum in the neighbourhood of one and a half million dollars owing to teachers in salaries that could not be paid. The teachers' reaction to this was splendid. They kept on teaching; they kept the schools open. Quite a few of them had money sent to them from home to pay their board and buy their clothes. They kept the schools running and the Department of Education of that day let them do it. We now have a much better system of grants and a much more sympathetic government in Saskatchewan, with the result that the educational facilities are gradually being improved. But I should like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the ideas of the weatherman are still as unpredictable as ever, and the difficulties of getting the children to school are still very great.

As I have said, education is a vital need in this country. We have to aim to make our children good Canadians, not simply just Saskatchewanese, or good Albertans, or good Manitobans, and because of that I feel that the federal government should be prepared to extend some form of financial help to the provinces to assist them in improving their educational systems, and certainly to prevent such a break-down as I have mentioned. This will call for some change in our constitution, but if we can agree that it will do good, then there should not be any great difficulty about that.

May I say a few words in a general way about agriculture? Saskatchewan has long been known as an agricultural province; that is, the greater number of its people are engaged in that occupation, and by far the greater part of its income is derived from agricultural pursuits. Under the new C.C.F. government a number of new industries are making their belated appearance. They were detailed a short time ago by an hon. member across the way. They will undoubtedly add to the welfare of the province. However, for a long time to come agriculture will provide by far the greatest number of jobs and most of the income of the province.

While it is true that most of the people of Saskatchewan choose to make their living on farms, it is equally true that it is one of

the most hazardous of occupations, and as a result has unpredictable ups and downs not found in most other industries. Anyone who flirts with the vagaries of the weather, with the possibilities of too much heat or even frost, drought or too much moisture, of insect pests or plant diseases, is taking enormous risks with circumstances entirely beyond his control. Added to this is the questionable condition of the markets at selling time and the great chance that the whole season's operations may prove to have been conducted at a loss. Then the riskiness of farming becomes apparent.

The growing of food supplies and the feeding of the peoples of the world are of vital importance; and I feel that the farmers are among the most important people in our country. It is most unfortunate that they have not received more consideration from those whom they serve. The vital need for food is ever present. Whatever else may be in short supply, the peoples of the world must have food or they will die, so that those who till the earth, plant the seeds, feed the live stock and gather the edible seeds from plants and trees must rank as the most important of our people. I do not say that, Mr. Speaker, to belittle the efforts of those who are engaged in other industries and professions. Their labours should all fit into the general scheme of things, so that all should receive those amenities of life that make for contentment and happiness.

The most important thing so far as agriculture is concerned is to secure and maintain the proper relation or ratio between the things that the farmers produce and the things that they buy. This has been referred to several times as a parity price. I do not know whether parity price is the right term, but certainly this relation has to be secured, and as far as I know, nobody has ever made any effort to do it. We have been told this afternoon about the requirements of parity price; it has been suggested that parity price is absolutely necessary in agriculture, and that legislation has already been put upon the books to achieve that end. But my forty-two years experience on a farm have shown me that we have never had a proper relation between these prices, that no government has ever tried to bring it about. They may have put it on the books, but there is quite a difference between having legislation on the statute books and doing something about it. So far as I am aware nothing has been done about it.

Mr. GARDINER: The sum of $200 millions has been provided under this legislation.

[Mr. Townley-Smith.]

Mr. TOWNLEY-SMITH: Our prices are still all cockeyed. We also have been talking about floor prices, and it has been said these are a means of bringing about parity. I do not see that. I think you can have a floor price under a product and still not be anywhere near parity, still not have a fair relation to other prices. It does not matter very much whether you give me 50 cents or $3 a bushel for my wheat, just as long as I can buy other things in the same ratio. The price can go up or down, it does not matter as long as other prices go up or down to the same extent. That is what I have in mind when I talk about this fair relation between prices.

Canadian farmers have been asked to raise a tremendous number of hogs, principally for export to Great Britain. Many people do not know, and many farmers did not know for quite a while, that there is no guaranteed price for hogs. There still is not. We have a guaranteed price for bacon, yes; the packer is protected in that way. The price of hogs, however, may be and is whatever the packer likes to pay; there is no fixed price. Fortunately the prices of hogs have been kept reasonably high, but even at that a great number of our farmers have not considered that the price level has been maintained in relation to the hog, the price of feed and the cost of labour, and many farmers have gone out of hog production. I very much fear that this year our hog production in the western provinces will be down fifty per cent.

Some years ago I was up in the High Prairie region of the Peace river district, when a farmer came and gave me some figures as to his cost of production. I have his name and address, but I need not give those details now. That was in 1932, one of the bad years; that is a long time ago now. This man had shipped 23 hogs, averaging 218 pounds. Those of us who are in the farming business appreciate that this is just about the weight we endeavour to bring our hogs to when we are feeding them for the best market. His net return for the 23 hogs was $73.15. That is not so bad when you say it quickly, but it works out to about $3.15 each or less than two cents per pound. At the same time he shipped 24 turkeys, totalling 244 pounds, which netted him $3.17, not each, but for the lot, or a little less than 1½ cents per pound. They were sent to a packing plant in Edmonton; I also have the name of that company. Well, men who have gone through experiences of that kind take quite a long time to recover. They do not readily jump into something else and take a chance on such treatment again. I understand the price of wheat recently advanced by some nine cents a bushel, but from questions which

were asked the other day I gather that the farmer is not to get that increase for some time, if ever. I hope the purchaser of bread will not be asked to pay it.

Just as long as the proper relationship between the prices of products and commodities is not arranged we shall be in difficulties. We shall have the very rich and the very poor; we shall have shortages and surpluses; we shall have wars and rumours of wars. You see, it does not matter what price we get for our wheat as long as we pay parallel prices, but this mad scramble on the part of every individual to bolster up the price of his product or his goods or his services in order to get enough money to buy what he needs is sending everybody slightly crazy, and will only result in trouble and distress. I would appeal to the government to do something about this bolstering up and levelling off system.

Now may I say a word about the western wheat grower, arising out of the statement made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) on September 19. The lack of understanding and the complete disregard of the conditions under which Canada's export wheat is produced are again apparent in this decision to put a low floor under this product. As already demonstrated, $1 per bushel is not sufficient; it will not cover the cost of production. In support of that statement I would remind the government that not so long ago the largest delegation of farmers ever to move out of their home districts came to Ottawa and interviewed the government in this connection. The minister told us that because his government are so sorry for the nations of the world who at present are short of money, they have decided to let the western wheat growers give these people their wheat at a price which must not go higher than that of September 19. He did not say anything about the price of clothing or, indeed, any manufactured article. I take it that the prices of these commodities are to be, as usual, what the traffic will bear. His government is not sorry enough as yet to help these importing nations clothe their people, or provide them with the goods war has destroyed, at moderate prices. Well, let me say for the western farmer that when it comes to helping anyone he is second to none, and he does not have to be told to do it. But when he is singled out and made to do it; when he realizes that he is to be made to sell his products at less than the cost of production in order that the purchaser may have sufficient funds to pay exorbitant prices for manufactured imports, then he is going to have something to say. Treat us all alike, farmer and manufacturer, and we will give until it hurts; but I protest with all my being at the astounding unfairness of the government's proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

At six o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Thursday, September 27, 1945.

The house met at three o'clock.

PARLIAMENTARY ASSISTANTS

ANNOUNCEMENT WITH RESPECT TO APPOINTMENT —VETERANS AFFAIRS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, may I table an order in council under which Walter Adam Tucker, Esquire, M.P., has been appointed parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Veterans Affairs, to assist the said minister within and without parliament in such manner and to such extent as the minister may determine.

RAILWAY ACT

POWER TO PROHIBIT SOUND SIGNALS AT CROSSINGS IN OR NEAR CITIES AND TOWNS

Mr. A. R. ADAMSON (York West) moved for leave to introduce bill No. 8, to amend the Railway Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. ADAMSON: The purpose of this bill is to amend sections 308 and 419 of the Railway act.

The amendment grants power to certain municipalities contiguous to or near large cities to pass by-laws prohibiting the sounding of the statutory crossing whistle at specified grade crossings within the confines of such municipality.

The reason for this amendment is that many townships or villages situated contiguous to major metropolitan areas have now become so built up that they constitute a physical part of the neighbouring city or town.

Railways passing through these built-up areas and whistling at the crossings constitute a nuisance and are a real menace to the health and welfare of the residents of such districts.

The amendment is simple in form as it merely adds the words "township or village situated contiguous to or near such city or town" to subsection 2 of section 308 of the Railway act, and the same words to subsection 3, section 419, of the same act, the latter being the penalty clause and contingent on section 308.

Subsection 2 of section 308 will now read:

"(2) Where a municipal by-law of a city or town, or of a township or village situated contiguous to or near such city or town, prohibits such sounding of the whistle or such ringing of the bell in respect of any such crossing or crossings within the limits of such city or town, or township or village, such by-law shall, if approved by an order of the board, to the extent of such prohibition relieve the company and its employees from the duty imposed by this section."

This does not constitute a blanket order permitting all townships or villages to pass prohibitory by-laws, nor does it embrace all grade crossings in the designated municipality, as each crossing must under the terms of the act be approved by the board of transport commissioners, who must be satisfied as to the safety measures taken at each crossing where the whistle warning is to be dispensed with.

I would mention the case of St. Hilaire Village v. Canadian National Railway, where it is shown that relief can only be obtained by an amendment to the act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

ARGENTINA

PROTECTION OF RIGHTS OF CANADIAN NATIONALS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct three questions to the Prime Minister in his capacity of Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the news emanating from the Argentine, wherein a state of siege is said to have been reimposed yesterday by which most of the people's liberties have been suspended, will the Prime Minister assure the house that every possible precaution is being taken by the Canadian government through our ambassador to see that the rights of Canadian nationals who may be residing in that country are properly protected and preserved?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Secretary of State for External Affairs): The answer is yes.

Mr. GRAYDON: The Prime Minister is unusually brief, and I want to congratulate him upon it. I hope this is the beginning of similar answers of the kind.

[Mr. Adamson.]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

COUNCIL OF FOREIGN MINISTERS—CANADIAN PARTICIPATION—ADMINISTRATION OF JAPAN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): May I ask the Prime Minister in his capacity of Secretary of State for External Affairs if the Canadian government has given authority and instructions to anyone to represent Canada's point of view in London while the five power foreign ministers' meeting is in progress, and, if so, what position is Canada taking with respect to the plan for adminstration of Japan which I understand is being discussed by the foreign ministers of the larger powers?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Secretary of State for External Affairs): The Canadian government is represented in London at the present time by the acting high commissioner, Mr. Frederic Hudd. So far as I know, plans for administration of Japan are not on the agenda of the present session of the council of foreign ministers.

I might say that I have had notice of a question which the leader of the C.C.F. party intended to ask, and which relates in part to what my hon. friend has just asked. Perhaps, if—

Mr. COLDWELL: It would be perfectly all right.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: —the leader of the C.C.F. will ask his question I might supplement what I have just said to my hon. friend.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Has the government made any representation to the council of foreign ministers now conferring in London regarding Canada's right to participate in discussions concerning recommendations regarding the disposition of persons and territories the status and disposition of which is a matter of interest to the Canadian people?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In justice to my friend the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon) I should perhaps read the question which he also sent to me and which is as follows:

According to an Associated Press dispatch bearing a London date-line of yesterday, Australia's Minister of External Affairs has publicly demanded that the five power conference of foreign ministers should be either expanded to include all countries whose armed forces contributed to victory over tyranny or else it should be made clear that the present conference is merely advisory and only a prelude to a full-scale peace conference.

Will the Prime Minister indicate to the house whether or not Canada is taking a similar position to Australia in relation to the points so raised by that nation's foreign minister?

The answer I make to my hon. friend is the same as that which I would make to the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation:

The chairman of the council of foreign ministers addressed an invitation to the acting Canadian high commissioner in London on September 14th stating that that morning the council of foreign ministers had agreed to ask the government of Canada whether it wished to represent its view to the council on the question of the Yugoslav-Italian frontier and the future of the city and port of Trieste. The communication went on to invite the government of Canada to nominate a representative if it so desired, to attend a meeting of the council on the afternoon of September 17 to express the views of the Canadian government on these problems.

I understand that communications in similar terms were addressed to the representatives in London of the governments of Yugoslavia, Italy, Australia, India, New Zealand and South Africa.

The acting high commissioner in London was instructed to address the following reply to the chairman of the council of foreign ministers:

The Canadian government, while appreciating the invitation to nominate a representative to attend a meeting of the council of foreign ministers on September 17, does not desire to avail itself of the opportunity to express its views to the council at present on the question of the Yugoslav-Italian frontier and the future of the city and port of Trieste.

The Canadian government is not in a position to put forward specific solutions of the problems of the Yugoslav-Italian frontier, or for that matter of any of the other questions affecting the future territorial boundaries of Italy which are on the agenda of the council of foreign ministers. It is, however, very much concerned with the effect which the peace settlement will have on the general relationship of a democratic Italy to the community of nations. The Canadian government, therefore, hopes that adequate opportunity will be afforded to Canada and the other united nations which have played an active part in the Italian war to consider and discuss the contents of the peace treaty with Italy as a whole at the appropriate stage in its negotiation.

In addition, I might say that the acting high commissioner was instructed to express to the Secretary of State for the Dominions the gratitude of the Canadian government for the helpful and understanding attitude the United Kingdom government had taken with regard to Canadian interest in the discussions of the council of foreign ministers. He was asked to emphasize that our interest, so far as the Italian question was concerned, was not so much in the particular provisions of the treaty as in the general character of the settlement as a whole.

In this entire matter the understanding of the Canadian government, as I have already intimated to the house, is that any draft treaty that results from the discussions of the council of foreign ministers will be of a preliminary character and that there will be an opportunity for Canada, as well as for other interested united nations, to express their views at a later stage.

Mr. COLDWELL: I do not think the answer given by the Prime Minister quite covers what I have in mind. I was wondering whether any representations had been made regarding the disposition of persons and territories. The question I had particularly in mind was this: Is Canada interesting herself in the fate of many of the people who are moving around Europe at the present time, the disposition of whom will be discussed by the foreign ministers in London?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I should like to have that question stand. I will give a further answer to-morrow.

PROPOSED VISIT OF PRIME MINISTER TO UNITED KINGDOM AND EUROPE

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I should like to make a statement to the house which will serve in part as a further answer to some of the questions which have been asked on the orders of the day this afternoon. I hope the house will not object to the length of the statement, but it is important, and for that reason I have tried to anticipate and cover some of the questions I thought might be in the minds of hon. members.

In answer to a question by the hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) on Friday of last week, I said that I hoped I could find it possible at an early date to talk over questions of mutual concern with members of the United Kingdom government. I have been waiting until the address in reply to the speech from the throne has been agreed to, to inform hon. members of what I have in mind, and of my present intentions. As my plans have been made on the expectation that, at a first session, the debate on the address would not likely continue longer than three weeks from the opening of parliament, which period expires to-day, I feel I should not delay longer in making to the house the statement I had hoped to make at the conclusion of the debate.

The world is still in a very troubled state. The war is over and the victory won, but the responsibilities that rest on governments are not perceptibly lighter. We have our own task of reconstruction in Canada, but to carry it out as wisely and as well as we should wish it is essential that consultation be had from time to time with members of other governments, facing similar problems, often under more difficult circumstances.

These last months have seen many changes in Europe, brought new persons into responsible office and faced them with new problems. We in Canada are directly concerned with the solutions which they are seeking to these problems. Experience has taught us that the problems of other countries very quickly become our problems as well.

The process of peace-making is obviously going to be difficult and protracted. The task is not one of restoring the world as we knew it before the war. That world has gone. The collective task is to get the new world moving along paths that will lead to peace, happiness and the general welfare. This means finding ways in which the peoples of the world can work together in confidence and cooperation.

In the shaping of the new world order, a good start must be made in the right direction during these next critical months. Decisions that will have to be taken during the coming months may shape and determine the kind of world we are going to live in. I am not thinking primarily of the particular questions that the council of foreign ministers has been considering at its recent meetings. Questions of boundaries, of colonial administration or regional disarmament are important, but, in the last analysis, many of them are of less consequence, even to the countries whose interests they affect most immediately, than are questions of attitudes and objectives. These are, as I see it, the big questions, the worrying questions. They are hard to formulate and harder still to answer. What kind of world do we really wish to live in? What sort of effort are we ready to make to realize it? What do we and what do people in other countries mean when we agree that peace and prosperity are indivisible in this one world? How can we help each other to make our world a free world in which we can give substance to the idea for which free men died?

We should find working answers to these questions and find them without delay; for, on the answers which we in Canada and other countries give to these questions, national policies must be based. It is the answers to these general questions which will determine what we should do about defence; how we can most wisely and effectively maintain high levels of employment and promote a fairer distribution of a larger national income; and how far, as a country, we can go in attempting to assist the economic recovery of our allies and the restoration of the world trade on which our wealth and welfare have depended.

Hon. members will be aware that during the meetings in London of the council of foreign ministers the question of participation by nations of the British commonwealth, apart from the United Kingdom, has arisen on a number of occasions.

The Canadian interest in the meetings of the council of foreign ministers lay not so much in the detailed discussions of particular issues, as, for example, the demarcation of frontiers, as in an overriding concern for the peaceful settlement of outstanding differences, and for consolidating the general organization for the maintenance of international security.

It is important that Canada should not merely be consulted, but that there should be clear recognition of Canada's right to effective participation in the great decisions where questions affecting the general ordering of the future peace of the world are under consideration. During the war, for military reasons, it was necessary to acquiesce in the operation of war-time arrangements under which responsibility for major decisions on the direction of the allied war effort was concentrated in a very few hands. The continued use of methods such as were improvised to meet the urgent strain and hazards of war, whereby private settlements are arrived at between the great powers on issues of general interest, might well become a source of difficulty and even of danger. Every possible precaution should, therefore, be taken to see that in this particular the war-time pattern is not perpetuated in the framing of the peace settlement and in the united nations organization.

It is with these thoughts in mind that I have decided I should, as soon as possible, make an informal and, if necessary, an extended visit to the United Kingdom and western Europe.

Of conditions in Europe generally, I should like to obtain first-hand information from my own observation and inquiries. If I am to have the knowledge of many of the problems which are now upon the horizon, and to be able to speak regarding them with the authority I should like to possess, I feel that I should see for myself something of the changed world in which Canada must make her way and take her part.

The operations of UNRRA, the general conditions of food, clothing and shelter in

the war-devastated countries of Europe, are all of concern to Canada as a principal supplying agency under various international arrangements. Apart from the practical working of these arrangements, there is a still greater humanitarian interest which will continue to have a strong claim upon our capacity to help in the relieving of suffering and distress.

I would hope, while in Europe, to have an opportunity to visit areas occupied by Canadian soldiers, and the scenes of battles with which, through the heroic exploits of our fighting men, the name of Canada will ever be associated. I think it is important also that I should visit Canada's embassies and legations, some of which have been established since the beginning of the war, and all of which, in consequence of the war and post-war problems, have had to operate under new and difficult circumstances.

It was on August 24 that Mr. Attlee, in a personal message to myself, stated that he would greatly welcome it if I and other prime ministers of the commonwealth felt we would be able to come to London for purposes of consultation and personal discussion at the opening of the council of foreign ministers. At the same time, Mr. Attlee stated he regretted to have to raise such proposals at such short notice and that the United Kingdom government recognized the great difficulties which this might involve for me and for the other prime ministers. When Mr. Attlee's telegram was received, the present parliament had been summoned to meet on September 6, and it was, as Mr. Attlee himself recognized, not possible for me, because of the opening of the first session of a new parliament to visit London at that time. Until I had met parliament and confidence in the government had been expressed by the House of Commons, it would not have done for me to be absent from Canada. That confidence has been expressed in the votes thus far recorded in the divisions which have taken place on the amendments moved by the Progressive Conservative party, the C.C.F. party and the Social Credit party to the motion of thanks to His Excellency for His Excellency's speech addressed to both houses of parliament.

It is now, therefore, possible for me to take the house into my confidence with respect to the reasons which make it advisable that I should pay the extended visit I have referred to. Having assured Mr. Attlee that I would, at an early opportunity, be glad to talk over with him matters of mutual interest to our governments, I feel I should avail myself of the opportunity which now presents itself for this and the other purposes I have mentioned, and which, if not availed of at this first session, may not be possible in the period between the close of the present session and the next session which will come in the new year. My plans have, accordingly, been made to leave for London early in the coming week.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): I do not think this statement should be allowed to pass without some expression from the house. Hon. members have listened with a great deal of interest, and with approval, to what the Prime Minister has said, particularly his reference to the international situation and the necessity for Canada's raising her voice in that regard. As one who was present at the San Francisco conference I can say that I think we all understood that prior agreements among the five great powers were useful. There was a very general feeling that the time had arrived when other nations which had played such an important part in the winning of the war should also be heard. I am thoroughly in approval of what the Prime Minister has said this afternoon, and I can assure him of our support in that particular.

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the house listened with keen interest to what the Prime Minister has just said. Speaking as the leader of the group sitting opposite to him, may I say we wholly commend his statement. I want to assure him, too, that his party will receive the very generous co-operation of hon. members on this side while he is away.

Mr. SOLON E. LOW (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, it gave me considerable satisfaction to listen to the Prime Minister's statement this afternoon. I believe no group in the house has been more careful to keep in touch with the world situation than has the Social Credit group, realizing as we do the tragic situation in which the world finds itself to-day, and realizing too that Canada has grown to the full stature of nationhood and should take her position in the world community of nations, a position of responsibility.

I concur in the Prime Minister's determination to go to Europe to find out definitely what the situation is, and to lend his experienced hand in a serious attempt to turn chaos into order and bring about a solution of the world's problems. My congratulations are extended to him, and this group wish him godspeed, safe journey, and safe return.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, I should like to express my very warm thanks to the leaders of the different parties who

have spoken this afternoon for the approval they have so cordially given to the course which I have felt it was in the public interest for me to take at this time. I can assure hon. members I regret deeply, and shall regret even more deeply while I am away, not being able to be present with other hon. members throughout this first session of the new parliament. I can see quite clearly, however, that unless I take advantage of the opportunity afforded during this first session to take up some of the matters to which I have referred, a like opportunity may not again present itself.

May I say to the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) how obliged I am to him for his courtesy in agreeing to extend a pair to me during the time of my absence.

Mr. BRACKEN: I would only add the hope that when the Prime Minister is gone his government will bring in legislation of a type which may not tend to make us feel the necessity of effecting the pair with him.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): I should like to ask a question of the Prime Minister, arising out of his statement—one which I believe was asked at the last session. At the approaching conference will there be any discussion of the points raised by the late Mr. Curtin of Australia when he was in Ottawa? I refer to the creation of an empire council to operate after the war for the purpose of bringing about closer collaboration and co-operation with the mother country, including preferential trade, defence, and migration within the empire.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If I heard my hon. friend correctly he referred to an approaching conference. I am not aware of any conference that has been called for the purpose to which he has referred. I believe what I have said answers his question.

BUSINESS VISITS TO EUROPE

FACILITIES FOR FOOD, LODGING AND LIMITED TRANSPORTATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. K. FRASER (Peterborough West): I should like to address a question to the Prime Minister. A press dispatch from Paris appearing in the New York *Times* of yesterday quoted the American ambassador to France as saying that facilities for food, lodging and limited transportation for American business men will be provided through the United States Embassy over there on and after October 1, 1945. May I ask the Prime Minister what steps this government is taking to provide similar service to Canadians on business in France and anywhere in Europe where the army has quarters and messes?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I am afraid I shall have to ask my hon. friend to allow the question to stand and I will give an answer later on. I had no notice of the question.

MEAT RATIONING

REQUEST OF MONTREAL BUTCHERS FOR INTERVIEW WITH CABINET

On the orders of the day:

Mr. FRED ROSE (Cartier): I should like to ask the Prime Minister a question. Having been informed by telegram that representatives of Montreal butchers have requested an interview with the Prime Minister and the government to-morrow morning, may I ask whether the Prime Minister will inform the house whether the government intends to receive this delegation and discuss means whereby the strike may be ended?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): My hon. friend sent me a copy of the question. I will read to the house the telegram which I received this morning from Mr. E. Chartrand of Montreal and the reply I have sent. Mr. Chartrand's telegram reads:

1945, September 27 a.m 2 14
Montreal, Que. 26

Prime Minister Mackenzie King,
Parliament Building, Ottawa, Ont.

Montreal butchers whose stores are closed because of meat rationing would appreciate an interview with you and your tribunate—

I take that to mean cabinet.

—on Friday morning at Ottawa. Kindly indicate by wire as to time and place that is agreeable for you to meet at the legation—

I think that means "meet a delegation".

—of twenty-five.

E. Chartrand,
President.
1252 Stanley street, Montreal.

To that telegram I sent the following reply this morning:

Ottawa, September 27, 1945.

E. Chartrand, Esquire,
1252 Stanley street,
Montreal, P.Q.

A delegation of retail meat dealers of Canada has already been received by the Ministers of Agriculture and Finance with the rationing authorities and the questions raised by the meat dealers were fully discussed and certain adjustments were made in the rationing system. If the retail dealers of the organization, of which you are the president, would like to make suggestions of other adjustments to the rationing

authorities, any representations will be immediately and carefully considered. In the light of all the existing circumstances, the government considers it would be inappropriate for the cabinet to receive the delegation requested.

DIFFERENTIAL RATIONING FOR MINERS, LUMBERMEN, ETC.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. SOLON E. LOW (Peace River): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. In the light of the serious strike of southern Alberta miners, will the government give consideration to some change in the meat rationing regulations to permit of a more equitable distribution of available meat supplies—recognizing the principle of greater need on the part of those engaged in heavy work such as miners, lumbermen, etcetera?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): A great deal of consideration has been given to the question whether differential rationing, as it is called, is practicable and the decision arrived at is that it is not. The request of the miners in Alberta, at least the group referred to in the question, is that they receive double rations. Naturally if they were to receive double rations, claims would arise from many other groups in various parts of Canada. The question, in so far as lumber camps are concerned, is answered by an arrangement that is made apart from change in the number of pounds per week of meat available. That is, in remote districts where alternative food supplies are not available in large measure, the rationing authorities make available extra quantities of meat, not by way of individual quota but by way of quotas such as a restaurant or some such establishment gets, and the situation is covered in that way. But the specific request here, to allow more pounds of meat per week to certain classes in the community, is deemed to be impracticable. At the same time I may say that the rationing authorities are giving much attention to the problem of how to relieve cases of particular hardship. They have not been able to find any solution to the problem as yet, but it is receiving attention at the present time.

PROVINCIAL LEGISLATION

PETITIONS FOR DISALLOWANCE OF CERTAIN ACTS OF SASKATCHEWAN LEGISLATURE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): May I ask the Minister of Justice a question. On Tuesday I sent him a copy of a telegram which had been sent me by the attorney general of Saskatchewan. Can he give us now the information requested in that telegram?

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Minister of Justice): When the original question was put the other day I attempted to answer it from memory, and probably I should not have done so because I find there were some errors in the information I gave the house at that time. Thus I referred to the Dominion Land Mortgage Association and I am informed that it is the Dominion Mortgage and Investments Association. I also stated that information had been given to the attorney general of Saskatchewan almost as soon as the petitions had been received. When I received, later on Tuesday, the telegram addressed to me by the attorney general of Saskatchewan I immediately referred it to the deputy minister of justice and he has supplied me with this information. The petition of the Dominion Mortgage and Investments Association was received early in July. Mr. Carson, of Toronto, acting as counsel for the petitioners, saw the deputy minister of justice just about that time, and there was some discussion as to whether he wanted to add any oral representations to those contained in the petition. What was determined then was that he did not feel that it was necessary that he do so, but if we wished for further elaboration of the representations in the petition he would be available. The petition was then referred to the law officer who deals, as a matter of course, with the examination of all the provincial legislation adopted each year, and who prepares memoranda to enable recommendations to be made to council as to whether or not the legislation should be allowed to have such operation as it can legally have. In considering this legislation an effort is made by the law officers, who have considerable experience in that matter, to study everything that is pertinent to the form and purport of the legislation, whether representations or petitions come in or not. The only additional value there can be in making representations is to focus attention upon something which, in spite of their experience, the law officers might not consider pertinent or consider that it was necessary for them to study and report upon.

It was only when the other petition for disallowance came in from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company specifically requesting a hearing that the matter was dealt with in any other than the routine way. That request was received at the department on September 16. The deputy minister wrote to counsel for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and to Mr. Carson, as counsel for the other party that had made the representation, on September 18, asking them to send copies of their representations to the attorney general of

Saskatchewan, in view of the fact that it appeared they wished to be heard orally. As I say, those letters were written on September 18, and I understand that copies of the representations were supplied to the attorney general on September 20. Those letters suggested that they could be heard if they wished on October 11 and on October 15, as I stated before.

There is not going to be any trial of issues at that time. Council will of course be allowed to make such representations as they see fit to make, and those representations will be considered, together with the legislation itself, as an aid in the preparation of the recommendations that are made in every instance with respect to provincial statutes.

Mr. COLDWELL: Is it not usual to apprise the province that a petition against legislation has been left with the department, and the contents thereof? It seems to me that in an important matter of this kind the respondent province should have an opportunity to study the grounds upon which the petitioners are asking for disallowance, in case there may be some further representations or oral discussion later.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Well, I have not specially inquired as to what was the procedure; I was informed by the deputy minister that the usual procedure had been followed here, and it was merely because a specific request for a hearing had been made—

Mr. COLDWELL: That is not court procedure?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: These are not court proceedings at all. The Minister of Justice does not make a decision; he prepares an opinion to support a recommendation made to council as to whether the legislation should or should not be allowed to have such operation as it legally may have. That is done because of the requirements of the British North America Act, and is done irrespective of whether representations have been made or not.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

INAUDIBILITY OF DEBATE—REQUEST FOR INSTALLATION OF AMPLIFIERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (Macleod): I rise to a question of privilege, with respect to a matter which concerns every hon. member of this house. Since we are accustomed to following the procedure of Westminster I wish to read a few lines which appeared in this morning's press. A Canadian Press dispatch from London says:

United Kingdom members of parliament, in the rebuilt House of Commons, will have loud speakers so they can be heard.

Farther down the article says:

The 456 loud speakers—a concession to modern ways—will be incorporated inconspicuously in the seating and made proof against damage by members.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must point out to the hon. member that his question should be brief and to the point.

Mr. HANSELL: My point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, is that we cannot hear what the Prime Minister and ministers of the crown are saying. I might say to Your Honour that sometimes we cannot hear what you are saying. We can never hear what the leader of the opposition is saying. It seems that we cannot hear what anybody is saying. I doubt, Mr. Speaker, whether you can sometimes hear—you are straining your ear a little bit even now while I am speaking—what we are saying. The press gallery cannot hear; the spectators cannot bear; nobody can hear what anybody is saying.

May I now ask the Prime Minister a question? Since the British parliament leads the way—the Prime Minister is putting his hand to his ear now, which proves my point that the ministers cannot hear—would the Prime Minister give consideration soon, and before he goes away, if possible, to the matter of installing some system of amplifiers in this chamber?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I noticed that when my hon. friend addressed his question to me he dropped his voice so that I would have to strain a little in order to hear him. However, may I say that the house is possessed of its own privileges; it is not a question for the Prime Minister to settle; it is a question for hon. members themselves to settle. No doubt you, Mr. Speaker, will take the matter referred to into careful consideration.

SUGGESTED ESTABLISHMENT OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, HOUSING AND PUBLIC WELFARE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. DONALD M. FLEMING (Eglinton): I should like to ask the Prime Minister a question, of which I have sent him notice. Will the government give consideration to amending the rules of the house to provide for the establishment of a standing committee on social security, health, housing and public welfare?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I regret to say I did not receive the hon. gentleman's question. However, I will take notice of it as it appears in *Hansard* and give him a reply later on.

HOUSING

RELEASE OF BUILDING MATERIALS TO DISCHARGED SERVICE PERSONNEL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. A. KIDD (Kingston City): May I direct a question to the Minister of Reconstruction, or in his absence to the Prime Minister or the acting minister? Will the minister kindly inform the house whether immediate steps can be taken to release building materials to discharged soldiers in order to enable them to build or remodel houses or places of business for themselves and their families?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): May I say to my hon. friend that I will direct the attention of the Minister of Reconstruction to his question, and no doubt the minister will give him an answer in due course.

Mr. KIDD: I have already submitted my question in writing to the minister. Thank you very much.

TAXATION

REPORT OF ROYAL COMMISSION ON COOPERATIVES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. CHESTER S. McLURE (Queens): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. When will the report of the royal commission on taxation of cooperatives be tabled?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): The commission made its report on September 25, which was the day before yesterday, and as yet I have not had time to read that report. I intend to read it just as soon as possible, and then it will be printed and distributed.

FAMILY ALLOWANCES

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION TO WARDS OF CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. K. FRASER (Peterborough West): I should like to ask the Minister of National Health and Welfare whether consideration is being given to granting the family allowances to wards of the Children's Aid Society. I hope the minister heard me.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman should place that question on the order paper.

Mr. FRASER: But, Mr. Speaker, it would not be answered for perhaps a month or more, and this is very urgent.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not see any urgency in it. It should be placed on the order paper.

HIGHWAY TRANSPORTATION

BONDING OF UNITED STATES TRUCKS TRAVELLING FROM WINDSOR TO NIAGARA FALLS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. C. D. COYLE (Elgin): I should like to ask the Minister of National Revenue when the bonding of United States trucks travelling over highway No. 3 in Ontario, from Windsor to Niagara Falls, will cease.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no urgency in this question, I would suggest that it be placed on the order paper.

Mr. COYLE: I have had quite a few telegrams about this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have given my ruling.

WHEAT

PURCHASE AND SALE BY FOREIGN SPECULATORS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. ROSS THATCHER (Moose Jaw): I should like to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce whether any steps are being taken by the government to prevent foreign speculators from buying Canadian wheat at the $1.55 ceiling price and selling it on the world market at $1.90 or even higher.

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I am grateful to the hon. member for giving me notice of his question. The answer is that the government has been fully aware of the possibility of this danger, and, through the wheat board, has taken steps to see that Canadian wheat reaches legitimate users only.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE IN REPLY

The house resumed from Wednesday, September 26, consideration of the motion of Mr. W. Benidickson for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Ross (Souris), and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Wright.

Mr. F. W. TOWNLEY-SMITH (North Battleford): Mr. Speaker, when the house adjourned yesterday I was discussing floor prices, parity prices, and a proper percentage of the nation's income so necessary to the western farmers. I am sure all hon. members realize there will be some difficulty in establishing those parity prices. However, it can be done. It will be a job for our mathematicians and our research men, but I am convinced they can do it.

The point I wish to make here is that it will be necessary to have those prices established before we can indicate what ninety per cent would amount to. Hon. members in this group do not like the ninety per cent stipulation. We do not see any particular advantage in pussyfooting around with a part of the parity price and we would ask for the establishment of the whole of it. In our subamendment we ask for the establishment of floor prices for all basic agricultural products on a parity with other services and products. The hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker) yesterday said that his government was in favour of parity prices; hon. members will find that at page 472 of *Hansard*. He also said at page 484 of *Hansard*: We want one hundred per cent. The logical conclusion for one to arrive at would be that the hon. member for Rosthern and his fellow members will vote in favour of our subamendment. But of course, Mr. Speaker, I am only a new member.

There is a feeling prevalent in this country that the farmer to-day is well off and has lots of money in his pocket. That is true within certain limits. It is true, as a matter of fact, that the war, and the war only, has been responsible for the farmer's receiving better prices for his products; but the principal reason that he has money in his jeans to-day is that he has not been able to spend it upon the things which he really requires to buy. If he had been able to buy the machinery he requires and pay for needed repairs to his machinery and paint for his buildings and a host of other things, he would not have this money in his pocket. The farmer himself will receive a surprise, perhaps a shock, when the time comes that he is able to buy the things he requires to reequip his farmstead. As a matter of fact his wealth is superficial, not real. He has the money at the present moment but when he has bought some of these $1,700 tractors and $3,000 combines his money will rapidly disappear. I would like hon. members especially those who have just a passing knowledge of agriculture, to bear that in mind when they hear talk about the western farmer rolling in wealth at the present time. He is a pretty good fellow. He has been very patriotic and loyal and he has given willingly of his sons and daughters and of his dollars to the war effort, and now in his old age he has gone into harness again, with his womenfolk helping him, to see that the production of food is not decreased because of the exodus of so much of his help.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I would say to the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon), who made a statement on the price of western wheat the other day: Let us say to the people of devastated Europe and to the people of the low countries: Not only here is wheat but here are flour and foods of all kinds, both in bulk and otherwise; here are clothes; here are machines, boots and shoes, pots and pans, building materials of all kinds, and the prices of all of them are being held down to the level of September 19, 1945.

May I say this about world markets, to which we farmers will have to subscribe and to which we shall have to adjust ourselves. I believe that when the smoke of battle has finally blown away, every country will be compelled to produce that which it can most economically and most easily produce. Thus it may be that in certain parts of Canada which are at the present time extensively engaged in dairying, the harsh winters, the great distance from tidewater and high freight rates will not permit our farmers to compete with countries like New Zealand and Australia, with an outdoor climate that is moderate all the year round, and with their closeness to the sea. It is conceivable that some other country may find that they can produce and get their products on to the world markets more cheaply than we. That possibiliy must be faced, and we must be ready for it, even though the quality of our products is higher.

We have been accused by members in certain parts of this house of having communists as friends. They are no friends of ours, Mr. Speaker. In fact, many of them tried to prevent me from getting down here at all. However, these same communists were advocating a coalition with the Liberals, and so it would be just as logical to refer to them as friends of the Liberals.

Great changes are taking place all over the world, and there is a great change taking place in this country. The poet Tennyson saw that many years ago when he wrote:

> Ring out a slowly dying cause,
> And ancient forms of party strife;
> Ring in the nobler modes of life,
> With sweeter manners, purer laws.

Tennyson saw this thing coming. We in this group, sir, are anxious to help the government in all the legislation which they introduce in this difficult period, if they in turn will show that they are sincere by bringing down legislation that will be helpful to all classes. But there must be no indifference and no complacency. Serious situations will arise calling for careful handling, and it will tax the efforts of all hon. members of this house working together to smooth out these situations and make this great country of ours a good place for all classes to live in.

Mr. M. C. SENN (Haldimand): Mr. Speaker, it has been my custom always when addressing this august chamber to be as brief as possible, and I am going to follow that practice to-day. I had not intended to take part in this debate on the address at all, until the night before last when my colleague the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Ross) introduced an amendment which he asked me to second.

When the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) made his statement in the house on September 19 in regard to setting a floor price for wheat, it was of course not debatable but I did ask him whether the provisions of the order in council applied to winter wheat grown in the eastern provinces, and I was glad indeed to hear his statement that it was not included. One dollar a bushel may have been a fair price at one time for winter wheat, but it is not so to-day. With higher costs of production, higher costs of labour, higher taxes, and other factors that enter into production, it is not profitable to-day to produce wheat in the province of Ontario at $1 a bushel. It is true of course that our eastern crop of wheat does not loom nearly as large as the western crop; we produce only some 25,000,000 bushels in the eastern provinces. On the other hand, the sale of that wheat forms an important part of the income of many farmers in eastern Canada. Moreover, wheat production works very well with their particular crop rotation. For these reasons I should like to see a fair price established for winter wheat in eastern Canada.

Although the minister's statement was of prime importance to the wheat growers of the west, I believe it was equally important to other branches of agriculture than that of growing wheat. I think we must accept this statement as an indication of government policy respecting the farmers' price structure. I regarded it as such as soon as that statement was made, and that is the reason I seconded the amendment of the hon. member for Souris. That my fears in this respect are altogether too well grounded was amply demonstrated, I think, yesterday when the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker) spoke on behalf of the government. He said that this was the first step in implementing the provisions of Bill 168, which was passed in 1944 and was called the Agricultural Prices Support Act. He read a certain clause in the act which he said provided for adequate and stable returns for agriculture. But I am afraid that this act is not going to work out as he expected, for it has some important defects.

Unfortunately I happened to be away on the week-end in 1944 when this bill was introduced, and did not have a chance to discuss it and to express my criticisms. But so far as I can understand, it has at least two important defects. The first defect is that the provisions of the bill are only temporary in character. The title of the bill as it was brought down in the House of Commons is, "An Act for the Support of the Prices of Agricultural Products during the Transition from War to Peace." The question arises right away—and I think the farmers of the country are particularly interested in this: What is this period of transition? How long is it going to last? Is it to be one year or two years or perhaps five years; and after that period of transition is over, what is going to happen next? The farmer, more than anybody else in the country, needs permanence and stability. The great thing which has affected the prosperity of farmers in days gone by is that there have been many rapid and violent fluctuations in farm prices, and this bill is to be operative only after prices fall. The board provided in the bill will not step in until such time as it thinks prices have gone below the proper level. The farmer would like to know, I should like to know, and I think everybody in the house would like to know, to what level must prices fall before this bill becomes operative, before the board which has been set up will step in and try to do something with this revolving fund of $200 million which the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) is so glad to mention from time to time.

Just in passing I might remark that the time has arrived in at least one branch of agriculture for putting this revolving fund into effect. There has been and there exists at the present time a grave congestion of cattle on our live stock markets, and particularly in our stock-yards. This congestion has caused prices to fall, in some cases to unprofitable levels. It should be the duty of this government and of the board which is set up under this act to provide in some way for

these heavy runs, if necessary to take a certain amount of the revolving fund and remove these cattle from the market.

I know the minister made the statement the other day that farmers should be careful to market their cattle and hogs in a more orderly manner. But it is not always possible to do so. When a hog gets to a certain weight it must be marketed, or the farmer loses by reason of a lower price; it passes into another grade and he is using his feed to very little advantage. The same is true very largely of cattle, perhaps for a different reason. When cattle are well finished they should go on the market; but there are times in the fall when the farmer has to raise money, and the only way he can do so is by sending his cattle to the market. He may also be in a position where he has to get rid of these cattle or they will be kept at a loss. In passing I would recommend to the minister and his board that provision should be made now to deal with the congestion of cattle which occurs in our stock-yards and on our markets from time to time, and which could very well be handled by this board and this revolving fund. This is not the first time that this condition has occurred in the fall; as a matter of fact it happens every fall; and some permanent provision should be made by the government or by some suitable authority to see that this does not occur from time to time to the farmer's detriment by reason of its effect in lowering prices.

Farmers should know in sufficient time what prices they are going to receive for their products. They must make their plans a long time ahead. If a farmer is going to market a field of grain, that field must be ploughed, in eastern Canada at least, a year ahead, and I take it that the same is largely true in western Canada. If he is producing hogs or milk or beef cattle he has to make his plans even further ahead; and as I have already said, from time to time, after he has made his plans on the assumption that a certain price then prevailing will continue, he finds that by the time his product is ready to market the price has fallen, fluctuations in price have taken place, and the result is he does not get the returns that he should receive for his cattle and other products.

May I also point out that if reasonable floor prices were established for all classes of goods which the farmer is likely to produce, he is a good enough judge to know whether he can produce those goods at those particular prices. If he cannot produce hogs profitably, perhaps he can turn to beef, or milk, or grain, or some other article for which he is sure he will reap a reasonable reward. But I am afraid that if the price which has been set on wheat by the minister is any indication of the level of prices which are to be set for other classes of farm products, the farmer will be in greater difficulties than ever. On this phase of the matter I still think that bill 168, providing for fair prices in the manner in which the government has seen fit to present it, is unsatisfactory, and that it will not establish parity prices or fair prices to the farmer if the wheat price that has been set is to be the measuring stick by which we must measure what the government will do in all other cases.

Mr. GARDINER: This act does not come in until the War Measures Act goes out, that is, six months after the war.

Mr. SENN: The Act does not apply to wheat, but in any case, whether the bill can be of use at the present time, something should be done to see that prices do not fall unduly.

May I now refer to a certain clause in the speech from the throne relating to agricultural matters and primary industries.

> The maintenance of long-term markets for our primary industries is receiving close attention. The continuing need for foodstuffs, both at home and abroad, will ensure, for some time to come, a heavy demand for the products of our farms and fisheries.

That clause lays stress upon the value of the export market and upon the value of the home market; they are both important to the farmer. I would say however that, if anything, the home market is even more important than the foreign market particularly in eastern Canada. For a great many years, up to a short time ago, nearly ninety per cent of everything the farmer produced in Canada was consumed in Canada in one way or another. The exception to that rule was wheat, and the percentage in the case of western wheat was a good deal larger. However, during the war there were certain classes of farm products that were produced in greater quantities, and we were glad to be able to export them in greater quantities.

The minister brought down a correction of the figures he placed on *Hansard* the other day when he was speaking. I have taken those figures that were put on *Hansard* and have made a computation, and I find that for the past eight years, 1938-1945, we have exported about thirty-three per cent of our pork and about twelve per cent of our beef. If I am correctly informed, and I read the question which the leader of the C.C.F. party asked the minister, that included meat sent overseas to feed the troops while there. If those troops come back they will have to be fed here and it will mean that a smaller per-

centage of our total production will be sent overseas. In addition the minister tried to prove to us, and I believe he convinced us, that if we did not have greater grain production in the near future our production figures in cattle and hogs and other live stocks would go down and go down very rapidly.

Every one will agree, I think, that these years have been years of high production during the war. Taken altogether, production of grains in Canada and everything else on the farm has been much higher than it was prior to that time. We have had bumper crops, and those crops have helped us to maintain the supplies we so much needed. There is one thing I would suggest to the government in passing, and that is that we should if possible try to retain our British market for bacon. It is one of the best we have. If we receive a fair price for our production of bacon, it is one of the most profitable lines the farmer in Canada can follow.

When the Minister of Agriculture was speaking the other day he took credit for establishing floors by means of contracts which he had negotiated with Great Britain, and he claimed, and I think rightly, that the prices set by those contracts set the floor price of farm products in Canada, at least of bacon and beef and perhaps cheese. I would point this out, however. Those contracts were negotiated in a seller's market. The desperate need which Britain had for foodstuffs enabled the government during the difficult times when those contracts were negotiated to get better prices than they might otherwise have obtained. That is one reason why I am afraid of the announcement made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

What is the effect of that announcement, in reality, particularly as to certain markets we have? I think the effect of that announcement has been to serve notice on our customers abroad that the government of this country has embarked on a policy of deflation of farm prices. I do not think we can draw any other conclusion than that, and the result will be, I am afraid, that instead of being able to negotiate contracts in a seller's market in the future we shall have to bargain in a customer's market where the customers in different countries will be able to dictate the prices we can obtain for different classes of goods.

It is undoubtedly true, and no one will deny it, that low export prices means low domestic prices. I can recall in a good many instances in days gone by, and not so long ago either, that in certain classes of farm products we had only a surplus of five or ten per cent, and the small price we had to take for the exportable surplus had a direct bearing on the domestic price. That is not as it should be.

The next thing I would point out is this. After all, primary production is the greatest factor in creating buying power in Canada. There are four broad branches of primary production in Canada: farming, mining, fishing and lumbering. Of these I do not think anyone will deny that agriculture is the most important. It is the most important from the point of view of financial returns, and it is most important from the point of view of population. From 28 to 30 per cent of the population of Canada are farmers, but in addition to that there is a large body of people who are engaged in collecting, transporting, processing and marketing our farm products. If you take all these together it is safe to say that they form the largest consuming group in Canada. As such if the farmers of Canada are prosperous and can buy, then other classes in the community will be prosperous, because the farmers will consume to the extent of their ability and income.

I suggest therefore that the first objective of any government should be at this time to fix parity prices. There has been some discussion in the house as to what the term "parity prices" means. I do not intend to give any scientific explanation of the matter. I think a simple sentence will outline what parity really is. It is a fair relationship between farm prices and the prices of goods and services which the farmer has to buy. That is simple enough. Moreover, if the farmer is given a fair price he will produce. There is no doubt about that. He will produce to the limit of his ability. The thing he needs and the thing he should have is this. He should know that he will get a fair price, and that as time goes on, between the time he makes his plans and the time he gets his goods on the market, there is not going to be such a slump that he will be unable to carry on.

I think we all agree at the present time that farmers are enjoying a fair share of prosperity, or at least partial prosperity. The hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Townley-Smith) gave a reason or two for that. The first is that undoubtedly during the war, prices have gone up. Whether the government is going to take credit for that, or whether it is due to something over which nobody in this country has any particular control, I shall leave it to parliament itself to judge. But I do say that even with the prices that prevail, the farmer has not yet had a fair share of the national income. That is true because after price ceilings were set

up the government found it was impossible for the farmers to carry on in that way, and they introduced a system of subsidies on different kinds of farm products. I think that in the year 1944 those subsidies amounted to over a hundred million dollars.

Mr. GARDINER: That is just the direct subsidies.

Mr. SENN: Yes; there were others as well. Some were paid by the Department of Agriculture and some by the Commodity Prices Stabilization Corporation, and perhaps some in some other ways as well. I have not yet been able to find out where the division lies, and I should like to have that information. What lines of subsidies are being paid by the Department of Agriculture, and why, and what lines are being paid by the Commodity Prices Stabilization Corporation?

Mr. GARDINER: Would the hon. member like an answer now? It would take only a minute. The division is that wherever it is intended to increase production it is done in our department; wherever it is intended to cut down the cost of consumption, it is done in the other department.

Mr. SENN: I thank the minister for the explanation, but it seems to me in some cases both principles would apply. Perhaps the division has been made in a way that is suitable to the Minister of Agriculture, if not to both ministers.

The second reason why farmers have enjoyed a modicum of prosperity was outlined by the hon. member who preceded me, namely, that the farmers are finding it impossible to make the necessary repairs on their farms. If one drives through Ontario to-day—I cannot say anything about the other provinces, I do not doubt but that the same conditions prevail—one can see a woeful lack of good buildings and repairs. Because of labour shortages, and because they cannot get materials, farmers have been unable to keep their buildings, fences and machinery in proper repair. They are hoping, now that the war is over, the condition will be changed and they will be able to get more labour and materials. There is only one other thing that they need in the years following the war, namely, an income that will enable them to pay for labour and supplies.

Price ceilings were inaugurated three or four years ago. As I understand it, two main reasons were given for that step. The first was to prevent inflation. I do not think anybody will disagree with that. The second was to avoid disastrous slumps and deflation after the war. Something was said at the time about the deflation and the slump in prices that took place after the first great war. That slump did not occur until two or three years after the war was over. There is no doubt that unless something is done there will be a slump again. The government had evidently forecast that by their announcement on the price of wheat. There is no doubt in my mind at least that if floor prices are to be placed under other classes of farm products on the same basis, using the wheat price as a measuring-stick, the prices that the farmers are to receive for their live stock, dairy products, fruit and vegetables, and all down the line, will not be sufficient to establish a fair relationship between their prices and the prices of goods they have to buy.

May I summarize what I have to say in two or three sentences? The announcement of the government of a floor price for wheat indicates that the government has already embarked on a policy of deflation of farm prices, the policy of lowering prices for agricultural products. It admits that it is powerless to maintain farm prices in the future at levels which will enable agriculture to buy freely and to make the repairs which are so necessary and which have been so long delayed. It also admits that the imposition of price ceilings on agricultural products in the past cannot succeed in preventing deflation of farm prices under peace-time conditions. It further admits that it cannot set prices that will assure the farmer of fair and stable returns and a stable price structure.

I am supporting the amendment which was moved by the hon. member for Souris, because I believe that one situation should be avoided at all costs; unemployment must not be allowed to become general again if it can be avoided. If it is not to be allowed, goods of all kinds must be produced and a market must be found for them at fair prices. The surest way to accomplish this is to maintain the buying power of the primary producer, the farmer, the miner and the fisherman, at substantial levels. To do this I firmly believe that the government must reverse its present policy of deflation as indicated in the statement that the minister made on September 19.

Mr. F. S. ZAPLITNY (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I would not be rising to speak again in this debate had it not been for the introduction of the new amendment and subamendment, and another matter which came up in the house in the last few days. Before speaking to the amendment and the subamendment, I should like to refer to the other matter, which has to do with displaced and stateless persons in Europe.

I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Hlynka) and the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker) in that regard. There are two points that stand out above all the others and I should like to emphasize them while I have the opportunity in this debate. I might say in passing that both these hon. members made a very good case for what they were talking about, and I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the hon. member for Rosthern on the promotion he has received, as announced by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) to-day. I want to say all the complimentary things I can about the hon. member for Rosthern, because later on I may have something different to say.

The two points I should like to bring out are these. First, it appears evident that a great number of people are scattered throughout Europe who find themselves classified as displaced or stateless. That is, they are being shuffled around from one country to another, and there seems to be some evidence that there is a move afoot to repatriate them forcibly. Now, I believe, and I think hon. members will agree with me on this, that one of the great principles of the Atlantic charter was freedom of choice, or self-determination. In that connection I should like to read article III of the Atlantic charter.

Third, they—

That is, Mr. Churchill and the Late President Roosevelt.

—respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

That is a principle I believe we and all freedom-loving, democratically-minded people can support, and on this basis I make my appeal. I believe the present government, in every way possible, should make its influence felt on behalf of these people, so that they will have freedom of choice and a certain amount of self-determination. I realize that there are difficulties to be overcome; the task is not easy, but on the other hand I believe we should avoid the use of steam-roller tactics in dealing with human beings. Regardless of the country from which they came originally, these are human beings. We know there are people in Europe who for one reason or another do not wish to return to where they lived before the war. I do not want to go into the political implications, because this is not the place for that, but I do want to bring out the humanitarian angle and the fact that if we are to follow the spirit as well as the letter of the Atlantic charter it will be necessary for us to throw our influence on the side of freedom of choice.

The other point I want to bring out in that connection is the fact that a request, of which I am sure hon. members have received copies, has been made by various Ukrainian organizations across Canada for permission to send direct assistance to their relatives and friends in Europe. I know from personal experience that people who have relatives across the water, whether on the continent or the British isles, are very anxious about their welfare. As an example I should like to remind you of the effort organized by the Kinsmen's clubs during the war to send milk to Britain. For this purpose they established a fund, to which many people cheerfully donated. This milk was used to supplement the assistance being sent through regular channels such as the Red Cross, UNRRA and so on. In this country we have approximately 300,000 people of Ukrainian origin, practically all of whom have relatives living on the continent of Europe. Though I am Canadian born I too have relatives across the water, and I am sure hon. members will appreciate our motives when we ask for permission to send direct assistance to our relatives or those with whom we are acquainted, whose situation we understand, in order to supplement the assistance being provided through regular channels. The request is not made because we have no confidence in UNRRA or the Red Cross; it is only because we feel that in a direct personal way we can assist these bodies which are doing such great work. I hope when the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) makes his visit to Europe he will take full advantage of the opportunity to find out everything he can in regard to these displaced persons, so that when he returns the government will be in a position to make some comprehensive statement of policy to guide this house in any future action we may take in that respect.

I should like now to refer for a few moments—and I am going to be brief, because I realize that this debate has gone on for a long time—to the amendment and the sub-amendment. We are asked by the Progressive Conservative group to accept an amendment asking for ninety per cent of parity.

An hon. MEMBER: At least.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: I accept that correction; at least ninety per cent. Listening yesterday to the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) speaking to this amendment, I was impressed by the very good case he made, particularly when I realized what a poor case he started with. I rather admired the hon.

member's ability; and what I say about his case is not in any way disparaging to his effort. But he got himself into a curious position. In the first half of his speech he dealt with the removal of controls. He was pretty vehement and decisive about it, and expressed his determination that controls should be removed as quickly and to as great an extent as possible. Then, lo and behold, in the second half of his speech he asked us to accept the principle of parity prices, or at least ninety per cent of parity, which as everyone realizes would entail a great deal of price control. How are we going to remove controls on the one hand and impose or retain controls on the other? At the moment I do not quite see how this can be done. Perhaps at some future time we will have an explanation of that position.

Another question which to my surprise was not dealt with by hon. members to my right in speaking to the amendment is their position on the matter of the grain exchange. As was pointed out by my colleagues here, this question is important. We are definitely of the opinion, and have so stated repeatedly, that our wheat should be handled through the wheat board; we do not want the grain exchange to get its fingers into the pie again. On this point, however, we have not heard an expression of opinion from those to my right. When a group ask the house to vote for an amendment, in effect they ask us to endorse their stand on a certain question. Until we know what that stand is, it seems a risky matter to vote for it. I hope before the vote is taken they will take advantage of this opportunity to tell us just where they stand on the question of the grain exchange.

Another curious thing developed in connection with the amendment, and I should like to bring it to the attention of the house. After the hon. member for Souris, who incidentally is from the same province as myself, introduced his amendment, he was challenged by my colleague the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Wright) as to who had drawn up the amendment. In other words he was asked whose work it was, whose amendment it was. In the interchange that took place the hon. member for Souris replied, if I remember his words correctly, that not one of the members from the Toronto area had even seen the amendment before it was presented in the house.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): That was the accusation made by your colleague, that they had probably drafted it.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: That is quite right, and I am not quarrelling with the hon. member's statement. I am merely drawing attention to where that leads us. The fact that in the group to my right there is a fairly heavy representation from Toronto and district, and that none of them as much as saw the amendment before it was introduced in the house, brings up another question. Are they in favour of it? Whose amendment is it? Is the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) in favour of it? He has not said so.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): You will find out.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: I hope so. We are asking these questions because we want to know. It is not enough for one member of a group to move an amendment and say in effect, "This is my amendment. The other members had nothing to do with it." We expect a certain amount of team-play in the official opposition.

I should like to refer also to what was said yesterday by the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker). It is unfortunate that after the hon. member laboured so hard and so long yesterday to convince the house that this matter of parity prices is now the law of the land, even going to the extent of quoting the statute, to-day the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) should stick a pin into the balloon and explode it by telling us that this statute does not take effect for some time. However, I take it that it is the intention of the government to make it the law of the land at the first opportunity, and I would commend it to all lawabiding members here. If it is going to be the law of the land, we want to put ourselves on the right side of the law, and vote for the subamendment. That is the only way that we can actually put the principle of parity prices into practice. We understand that most hon. members believe in the principle of parity prices, but that is not enough. Our subamendment puts the matter directly to the house and asks: Are you willing to vote to put that principle into practice? It will be necessary for every hon. member, without hesitation, to place himself on record as to whether he is for or against putting parity prices into practice.

I am glad this opportunity has presented itself to get this matter squarely before the house. I believe the composition of the house is fortunate in this respect, because we are in a better position to do it to-day than we were at the time of the last parliament. I believe hon. members to my left will vote for our subamendment. The only objection I have heard raised from that quarter was as to the difficulty which might be involved in figuring out what one hundred per cent parity would be, and that therefore ninety

per cent would perhaps be more logical. But I would point out that unless one knows what parity is in the first place, he cannot take ninety per cent of it. So if they agree to vote for ninety per cent of it, I am sure they will support the subamendment.

This is one time when a subamendment can be supported by all hon. members without question. It is not only a matter of political opinion, it is something which the people of western Canada are watching with great interest. The people in Manitoba, where an election is about to take place, are going to watch very carefully the results of this recorded vote, because, by and large, it is an agricultural province. I am given to understand that the hon. member for Souris has just returned from his home province. Probably he has sounded out political feelings out there, and has decided that it is necessary to take some stand on the wheat question before this debate is permitted to fold up.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Apparently the hon. member has not read *Hansard* for the last five sessions. If he had, he would have seen my complaints each year.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: If he has taken that stand consistently, I congratulate him upon it. But I must point out that in Manitoba there has taken place a fusion—perhaps confusion is a better word—of the two old parties; and it is therefore somewhat incongruous to find that while here in Ottawa they evidently disagree on everything that comes up, as they go further west they find it possible to engage in an uneasy marriage. If they ever come to the point where they have to dissolve that marriage, I hope they will not bring their divorce bill before this house.

When I began speaking I promised I would not take much time, and I shall live up to my promise. In all sincerity I hope hon. members who have the welfare of farmers at heart will vote for the subamendment as a matter of principle.

Mr. J. A. ROSS (Souris): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member (Mr. Zaplitny) who has just taken his seat has discussed one or two points to which I shall address myself. I am glad to have this opportunity to make an answer, and also to clear up what was said yesterday by the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Wright) when he misinterpreted and misquoted our amendment.

Mr. WRIGHT: I read the amendment; I did not interpret it at all.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I shall quote what the hon. member said. When I was at cross purposes with him yesterday, this is what he said:

Let me read the words of the actual amendment. This is what it says:

The hon. member deliberately left out the first four lines of the amendment, and then continued with this part of it:

Immediate consideration should be given to establishing for a period of years floor prices for all basic agricultural products at levels not less than ninety per cent of parity.

As I have said, he left out four lines of the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLES: He read the part that counts.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): That part which he left out is as follows:

We respectfully submit to Your Excellency that, pending the establishment of a more stable and equitable price structure for Canadian farm products based on parity of income for farmers—

That is the portion he neglected to read. Then he went on to read this:

—immediate consideration should be given to establishing for a period of years floor prices for all basic agricultural products at levels not less than ninety per cent of parity.

I do not know that the hon. member wanted to do it. However, he certainly misrepresented my amendment and my position, and I think it must have been done deliberately—because he is a pretty able member.

As he said yesterday, we have sat on many committees together, and I have always thought he was one member of the C.C.F. group who would be above that sort of thing; at least, I did, until this time.

Mr. COLDWELL: Will the hon. member explain what the difference is? I should like to know, because I cannot see it.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I should also like to know when the great change of heart came over the hon. member for Melfort. Apparently it took place between the time he spoke earlier in the debate, namely, on September 20, and the occasion of his moving the subamendment yesterday. It is strange that in his remarks of September 20, around a week ago, he asked the government to continue for five years at a floor price of $1.25, and pointed out that that would be fair remuneration to the farmers for their labour and cost of production. Apparently he was satisfied, and his words, to be found at page 330 of *Hansard*, may be read by hon. members who have an interest. Probably the hon. member will be able to make an explanation some time as to why this change came over him.

Mr. COLDWELL: Let me understand the hon. member; he has accused the hon. member for Melfort of making a deliberate misrepresentation.

Mr. GRAYDON: It is up to the hon. member for Melfort to say so.

Mr. COLDWELL: And now the hon. member for Souris says that the hon. member for Melfort may explain at some other time. He has a right to explain now, if he wishes.

Mr. ROWE: No, he has not.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): The words are to be found in *Hansard.*

Mr. GRAYDON: The leader of the C.C.F. has no right to speak, and cannot claim protection. The hon. member for Melfort might do so—but not his leader.

Mr. COLDWELL: I suggest the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon) should rise when he addresses the chair.

Mr. MACKENZIE: What is this—a dog fight?

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I have been asked to quote the exact words. They are these, as reported at page 330 of *Hansard:*

> I believe that this government could have made agreements with those countries for a five-year period and at prices which would mean a better return to farmers than under this legislation. I am sure that $1.25 a bushel is the lowest floor price that should be set for wheat in Canada. That is a price which would give to the average producer a reasonable return for his labour and for the investment which he has in his farm and in his equipment.

Those are his own words.

Mr. WRIGHT: What is wrong with that?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Golding): I hope the hon. member for Souris will withdraw his statement in which he has accused the hon. member for Melfort of deliberate misrepresentation. That is not in order in debate.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I have quoted the exact words of the hon. member for Melfort on both occasions. However, I bow to Your Honour's ruling, and have no desire to say anything discourteous. I did say that I thought he, of all members, would be above doing that.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Golding): But the hon. member has charged the hon. member for Melfort with deliberately misrepresenting something. That should be withdrawn.

Mr. WRIGHT: I do not see where the quotation the hon. member for Souris has read discloses any misrepresentation at all.

[Mr. J. A. Ross.]

My statement is quite clear. I was not satisfied with the floor price of $1 a bushel and suggested that $1.25 was a much fairer floor price.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I have a lot of confidence in the ability of the hon. member, and withdraw the word "deliberately". I thought he was a fairly able member, and I have pointed out the misrepresentation as it appears in those two speeches.

An hon. MEMBER: Pretty badly balled up.

Mr. KNOWLES: Back up and start over again.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Several hon. members in the group to my left have said that they do not understand what parity is, and how the mechanics of it might operate.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Who does?

Mr. ROSS (Souris): In view of some of the statements made by the hon. member who has just taken his seat, before I can vote conscientiously for the subamendment either he or his leader will have to explain to me how under the wheat board, which they suggest should be continued, they could pay the producer at point of delivery 100 per cent of parity, operate for that crop year, export wheat to every country in the world, sell wheat to millers for domestic purposes, with all the ramifications found in connection with the wheat board, and wind up at the end of the year with the same figure as they paid the producer at the point of delivery. Can they explain what is meant by 100 per cent parity to-day? I have no faith that they can do so. I pointed out in moving my amendment that we urged a floor price of ninety per cent parity as a result of our studies in the country to the south of us, where they have made a very good job of handling the situation by giving their producers during the post-war years a guarantee of ninety per cent parity, and netted to producers thirty to fifty per cent more for their products.

We hear so much theory from the group to my left. One of them asks: If you had 100 per cent parity paid to the producer, where would the money come from? Where does the money come from to pay on the participation certificate?

As to the suggestion that my amendment was drafted by the Toronto members, let me say that we are certainly all agreed in principle, and I think the hon. member's innuendo was unbecoming. Let me tell him that I have far

more faith in the Toronto members, the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Harris), the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol)—

Mr. MacINNIS: And all points west.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I have more faith in all the Toronto members being desirous of helping the producers to procure parity than I have in the group to my left. Let me tell them that this terrible Tory government at Toronto which the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) spoke of as being one of the few left in the world to-day did more for humanity in its first year of office than the socialistic Saskatchewan government have done in one year and a half. I know how much concerned I was during the drought years to see that the children of Manitoba should have a chance to get primary education. I felt that the province, or the state should assume more responsibility in that respect, and I am glad to say that the so-called Tory government at Toronto in their first year in office undertook to pay fifty per cent of all the costs of education in the province of Ontario and they have carried that out. Contrast that with the false promises of the premier of Saskatchewan. He promised to abolish the educational tax of two per cent on the cost of living and production, but that tax has not been abolished. They have actually added in taxation to the cost of living and the cost of production in that province, and so I ask hon. members in which party they would put their faith. Until somebody can tell us how the mechanics of this thing can be worked out—

Mr. KNOWLES: Where do you stand on the grain exchange.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): My hon. friend was a member of the last parliament, and he is not so dumb either. In the last parliament the then hon. member for Qu'Appelle, Mr. Perley, and myself moved a resolution asking that the Winnipeg grain exchange be closed. That was before the government had taken action. By the way, let me say that some of my finest friends personally are members of the Winnipeg grain exchange.

Mr. KNOWLES: It is in my constituency.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Then the hon. member had better be careful. My hon. friend made the statement in the house the other day that the ramifications of the Winnipeg grain exchange had been investigated by royal commissions, and they always gave the grain exchange a clean bill of health in the handling of the wheat of this country. When the Turgeon grain commission made its investigation it reported that in its opinion the exchange could render no useful service during wartime.

I did want to clear up some of this misunderstanding, misinterpretation and misquotation on the part of certain hon. members. I do not see why there should be any misunderstanding, for the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Quelch), who is a very able farmer, apparently understood what I meant by a floor price of ninety per cent parity, as hon. members will see if they will re-read his speech. Surely hon. members who professed not to know what parity meant would not be doing that just for political expediency! But several members, including the hon. member who has just sat down, have said that they did not know what parity was, or what the figures were. There was hardly a session of the last parliament when I did not have a run-in with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) over getting parity prices for agriculture. The government took the period 1926-1929—

Mr. GARDINER: We did not take that. The farm federation took it.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I am not talking about the farm federation or about agriculture at this moment. I was going on to say that the period 1926-1929 was taken by the government as a basis for industry and organized labour, and therefore I argued that probably the same thing should be done for agriculture. If that were done, the parity price of wheat would be $1.42 a bushel, and ninety per cent of that would be $1.28 a bushel, which is three cents above the price which the hon. member for Melfort asked for on September 20, five days before he moved his subamendment.

As I pointed out the other day, the cost of living and the cost of production have risen probably twenty per cent during the war. Certainly that is true of the farmer's cost of living and the cost of his implements. So, that, if we add twenty per cent to that figure of $1.42, we get $1.70 a bushel, and ninety per cent of that would be $1.53. Therefore, if you take the same period as was taken for industry and organized labour, ninety per cent of parity either then or now would mean a higher price than the hon. member for Melfort asked for in his speech on September 20.

I have never in my life made any rash promises in either municipal or political affairs in order to gain office. I have never promised anything that I did not believe I could conscientiously carry out if elected to office, and unless the members to my left who have

moved the subamendment have some idea how it could be put into force if carried, I think it should be withdrawn. I have given a great deal of study to this question over the past few years, and I will be bold enough to say that there is a lot about it that I do not know. But I do know what is practical in this country and in the United States, and it is because the subamendment that has been moved by my hon. friends to my left is not practical that I ask the house to vote against it and to vote for the amendment which I have moved, which is practical, and which will guarantee to the farmers ninety per cent of parity at point of delivery, and we will hope for the other ten per cent after the year's operation. I think I have cleared up the various points that have arisen in the debate, and again I appeal to every member of the house to vote for something practical and workable by voting for my amendment. Then we shall have a better understanding of the mechanics of this thing after a year of operation.

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (Macleod): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to take part in this debate, and I do not now propose to participate in any discussion of these amendments or the technical means whereby, if passed, they may be put into operation. I rise to bring to the house another thought. Personally I have no particular objections to either of the amendments, because I believe each of them aims at an objective which, in general terms, is a square deal for the farmer with respect to the prices of his products. But what I wish to say is this. Our Conservative friends, through the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Ross), proposed an amendment. I am not going to read it, but it was presented on the basis of an announcement made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon). When the hon. member moved his amendment I said to myself, that amendment is reasonable; it is safe; it is sane; it attempts to attain a certain objective and I regard it as desirable. But I find there is one group in the house that evidently does not agree with me on that, for they suddenly decide to go one better than the first amendment, with the result that the house has been subjected to a discussion and drawn into a sort of political race whereby one political party is trying to outbid another.

We heard the announcement made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) this afternoon; we know that we are living in serious times. Personally I do not think that at the present time it graces this house to make motions or amendments which have a lot of political significance to them. Perhaps my friends will not agree with that view, but I have the floor and I am expressing my opinion.

I cannot see anything wrong with the amendment moved by the hon. member for Souris. He is not saying that the farmers should not get 100 per cent parity; he is simply asserting that there should be floor prices for all basic agricultural products at levels not less than ninety per cent of parity. They may go higher, and he is not saying that they should not. So that to my view the amendment is most reasonable. Turning over in my mind the reason for this going-one-better stunt, I am reminded that an election is being fought in the province of Manitoba.

Mr. MacKINNON: When?

Mr. HANSELL: It is being fought right now. Some hon. members are out there, campaigning, and I am just wondering whether this second amendment is not an attempt to initiate, here in this house, the Manitoba provincial election.

Mr. BURTON: Why, then, not ascribe the same purpose to the previous amendment?

Mr. HANSELL: Well, maybe you can. I am not suggesting that both parties have not the right to move amendments; certainly they have. What I am saying is this, is the first amendment a reasonable one? Is it aimed to reach a certain objective? Is anybody going to complain if in the process the objective is reached or the farmer gets even more than the proposed amendment claims for him? All I am saying is that the amendment is reasonable, and I think the house, particularly the opposition, would be in a much stronger position to persuade the government to act along this line if they had looked at the matter on the basis of its value and its objective. Surely there is not a single member in this house who will contend that the farmer should get one cent less than is coming to him, for that is only reasonable; it is only common sense. Surely my Conservative friends are not putting on an amendment which expresses the view that they want the farmer to get only so much and no more. No man with any common sense would do such a thing. My plea is simply that if we want to bring influence to bear on the government let us get together on something which is practicable and desirable instead of splitting forces. The hon. member for Souris has said, why all this confusion? Apparently it is because it is desired to embark on a little political huffing at one another instead of getting down to practical terms. He has said, let us get down

to practical things. Well, we will, when we leave politics out of the picture. But just as soon as you bring political sparring into the picture you can throw practical things out of the window.

Mr. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the hon. member is imputing motives and so, I think, is out of order, and I would ask you to have him withdraw those imputations.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. WRIGHT: He stated that the purpose of our amendment is political.

An hon. MEMBER: It is true.

Mr. WRIGHT: The introduction of the amendment was simply to obtain a square deal for agriculture in this country.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go ahead.

Mr. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I ask for your ruling on this matter.

An hon. MEMBER: No ruling is necessary.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to hear what the hon. member has to say before I give any ruling.

Mr. HANSELL: I am only appealing for a process of debate and of conduct in this house which will be free from political significance.

Mr. MacINNIS: Oh, such hypocrisy!

Mr. HANSELL: Does my hon. friend want to say something else?

Mr. MacINNIS: I say, switch off the hypocrisy.

Mr. HANSELL: Mr. Speaker, I am imputing no motives. I do not desire to impute any motives, but my hon. friends cannot possibly stop me from thinking what I think, and then I proceed to think out loud. It will be an interesting thing if a man cannot think out loud.

Mr. BURTON: It is, when you proceed to impute motives that are not there.

Mr. KNOWLES: Mr. Speaker, on this point of order, may I call attention to citation 297 in the second edition of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms which reads:

The imputation of bad motives—

An hon. MEMBER: This is not a bad motive.

Mr. KNOWLES: I expected that some hon. members would derive some amusement from this. However, to go on:

The imputation of bad motives, or motives different from those acknowledged—

And so on. All such imputations call for prompt interference; in other words, they call for protection from Your Honour the Speaker. I submit that for the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell) to say that either the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Ross) or the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Wright) has introduced an amendment or a subamendment from motives other than those acknowledged by the hon. members themselves, who introduced such motions, is against the rules of the house.

Mr. POULIOT: Speaking to the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I submit that if we are to interpret that rule strictly one must be a mind-reader to know what are the motives of the other fellow. Moreover, it is a very common thing during campaigns to try to promote politics; that is the reason for all campaign speeches. I do not understand how any member of parliament who has been campaigning politically to win his seat on political grounds can unclothe the old man when he gets into the house and become a new man and then consider that politics is a shame, and that it is a shame to talk politics. What does "politics" mean, Mr. Speaker? It has been defined by Aristotle, a famous Greek, who wrote a learned treatise on the subject. He told us that politics was the science of government; and in speaking as he did, the hon. member for Macleod, if he attributed any motive to the hon. gentlemen who moved the motion, insinuated that the mover and the seconder were both imbued with the science of government, which is politics. I cannot understand, therefore, how the mover could complain. It is a great tribute that has been paid him. It is a tribute to his shrewdness and he should not be ashamed of it. He may be ashamed of certain things in his party, but it so seldom happens in the C.C.F. party that members are imbued with the science of government that when the thing is said, especially by a member of the Social Credit or New Democracy party, it has more value. For all those reasons, sir, I believe it is permissible in debate and I hope you will rule accordingly.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does any other hon. member wish to speak to the point of order?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. SPEAKER: From what has been said in the house, I do not think that the expression "political sparring" should be ruled out of order. It has been used on different occasions in the house. However, I would suggest that it is the privilege of the hon. member who has used these words to modify them with a view to pleasing the hon. member who has raised the point of order.

Mr. HANSELL: I am always willing to withdraw anything that is offensive. I have never refused to withdraw anything which the Speaker has ruled that I should withdraw and I am sorry if I have hurt the feelings of my hon. friends. But, you know, sir, there is no question about it that people are watching this parliament these days and are beginning to say that in this session parties are commencing to jockey for position. That is already being said in this country. Well, let us nail that lie to the wall, if it is a lie. I simply wish to say that I believe the hon. member for Souris and his advisers around him thought their amendment through. The sincerity with which he spoke and presented his amendment indicated that he was really attempting to give the farmer a square deal. I am not going to imply by that that my C.C.F. friends do not want to give the farmers a square deal. Of course they do. I would be a fool to stand here and say that they did not and I am not saying that. But I am saying that in principle I cannot see any difference between the two amendments.

An hon. MEMBER: Ten per cent.

Mr. HANSELL: No, there is not ten per cent because we have mention of a floor price and it can go higher than that. Therefore I think it is splitting hairs, to say the least, and it tends toward dividing us when we should be united. We in this group have to vote for one amendment or the other, or both. I am going to vote for both, as far as I am concerned. Another thing, when we talk about politics, will any party guarantee that this very debate, these very amendments will not be brought into the discussion in the Manitoba election? Certainly not; they will not guarantee that. If there is any tiny little thread they can reach out for and grasp, making great political capital of it, believe me they will do so. That is politics.

Mr. POULIOT: In Manitoba and British Columbia now, but not in the house.

Mr. HANSELL: I have said enough, and I object to anything that may happen in this house at any time—I am not imputing motives now—whereby any parties try to gain political advantage by these processes. Times are serious; believe me they are. I do not agree very often with the Prime Minister, but I will agree that he has a tremendous burden upon his shoulders to-day. Let us therefore look at things in a practical manner and attempt to solve in a practical way the problems that face the country.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. SOLON E. LOW (Peace River): Just before the question is put I feel that I should say a word on the amendments now before the house. I promise, Mr. Speaker, that I shall not delay the house for more than a minute or two. Further I promise that I shall not follow at least one example already set in this debate, that of making a sneak attack on any hon. member or members who have already delivered a speech or made an interjection.

Yesterday the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Wright), speaking in support of the C.C.F. subamendment, attacked the Conservative amendment on the ground that it only guarantees ninety per cent, or calls for the guarantee of ninety per cent of the cost of production. I have looked over the hon. member's speech very carefully; I have read the amendment most carefully, and thus far I have been unable to find anywhere in the amendment or in the speech of the hon. member for Souris any reference to cost. The ninety per cent refers to parity of price, which includes profits of all corporations. Surely the hon. members of the C.C.F. are not going to argue that ninety per cent of parity, which includes all profits in addition to all costs, is less than 100 per cent of the cost of production. If they are, Mr. Speaker, then why are they constantly saying that profits are more than ten per cent? I contend that if the farmers get at least ninety per cent of parity, as called for in the Conservative amendment, they will receive thereby more than 100 per cent of the cost of production.

In neither amendment do I find so much as a hint of the procedure by which those moving the amendments would give effect to the policy which is advocated. Therefore it seems to me that both are straight resolutions of objectives, and objectives only, and I feel quite sure, that no one in any party in this house could conscientiously disagree with the idea of so ordering our Canadian affairs that farmers everywhere in Canada might be able to obtain their fair share of the national income. Of course, the Liberals and the Liberal government are in a different position from the rest of us. They have to worry about where the money is to come from. That is quite a considerable worry in the light of the many things that they have already committed themselves to do under all the restrictions of our present financial arrangement, and my sympathies are with them too.

Since we are considering a straight matter of objectives, and not methods, the Social Credit group find themselves in sympathy

with the C.C.F. objectives. We also find ourselves favourable to the objective of the Conservatives, because they are the same in the end. If, on the other hand, the C.C.F. amendment proposes any more socialism than we now suffer in Canada, then this group could not possibly vote for it, but I fail to see that there is any such suggestion. If the Conservative amendment proposes to add to the already effective burden of debt and/or taxation, then the Social Credit group could not possibly vote for it. Whether any group in this house could ever do all that we want with respect to parity of income for the farmers depends upon what method or technique they intend to apply. In my judgment there is simply no possibility that either of the parties who have moved the subamendment and the amendment now before the house can accomplish this most worthy motive without using the procedure that Social Crediters on numerous occasions have so ably, and I would say, so comprehensively placed before this parliament in times past. In the circumstances the Social Credit group will vote for the subamendment. If that fails to carry, then we shall vote for the amendment. By so doing I want it definitely understood that we are taking two opportunities of indicating our unqualified support of the principle of parity of income for all Canadians.

Mr. JEAN FRANCOIS POULIOT (Temiscouata): Mr. Speaker, I shall not speak at great length on this subamendment which reads as follows:

> We respectfully submit to Your Excellency that immediate consideration should be given to the establishing of floor prices for all basic agricultural products at parity with other services and products.

All this may be all right theoretically. I am not a statistician, and I am not a farmer, but I live among farmers and I know their troubles. I know that one of their troubles now, and perhaps the worst of all, is lack of man-power on the farms. That is the reason why they have less facilities for transportation and less facilities to cultivate the soil, to harvest, and so on. Therefore, the man-power problem is the most acute on the farm at the present time. I remember, sir, during the early days of the last parliament when a handful of hon. members defended the farmer. We tried to show the importance of the work of the farmer in the war effort. We were not numerous; we were just a small number of members of parliament, and we were looked upon as traitors. I myself was called a friend of Hitler by a Tory member just because I was defending the farmer and trying to rehabilitate him in the minds of our fellow citizens, trying to show that the farmer in cultivating his soil and working on his farm was doing his duty as a good Canadian citizen during the war. Moreover, I established clearly, as did other hon. members, that without the farmer the soldier would have gone nowhere. Well, sir, it is an elementary principle that cannot be denied by anyone. Now that we hear some speeches about leadership, my suggestion is that we should start by primary education.

Some hon. members remind me of those who know how to read by the euphonic method without knowing their alphabet. I know of a girl who works downstairs on the members' stenographic staff. She asked my stenographer where she could get the alphabet. She said: "I read well; I write well; I know my typewriter; I know shorthand, but I do not know the alphabet." It shows the way some people pretend to know so much when they know so little.

In peace time the farmer is praised; the farmer is the king of the land. Hon. members go to the parishes to address the farmers as kings. I am surprised that I did not hear anybody calling the farmer "Your Majesty", he would deserve it. I live among farmers, and I have the utmost respect for them. But how is it that all those hon. gentlemen who are so much interested in the welfare of the farmer did not vote with us when we were fighting the farmer's case? I give credit to some of the older members of the C.C.F. group, though not all of them. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wright) who moved the subamendment never supported us. We tried to show the importance to the war effort of the task being performed by the farmer. Some members of the C.C.F. group supported us, but he never did. Now that the war is over, however, again he becomes the greatest friend of the farmer. He was not a friend in need and therefore he was not a friend in deed.

Mr. WRIGHT: Can the hon. member make any quotation from any speech I made in this house during the last six sessions in which I did not support the farmers in every respect?

Mr. POULIOT: I know that, and I acknowledge it; but when it came to action, when it came time to vote to show that he was a real friend of the farmer, the hon. gentleman never did so. That is the point.

Mr. WRIGHT: On what occasion did I not vote in the way the hon. gentleman has just indicated? Just name one occasion.

Mr. POULIOT: I will do so right away. It was on the first motion I moved to exempt farmers from military service, which was

seconded by my very dear friend Mr. Lizotte, then member for Kamouraska. That was in February, 1942; we can get the record.

Mr. WRIGHT: That was the way I voted, and I still agree with it.

Mr. POULIOT: Were we right or wrong?

Mr. WRIGHT: You were wrong.

Mr. POULIOT: Now my hon. friend proves that my statement was correct.

Mr. WRIGHT: And I can prove more than that.

Mr. POULIOT: My hon. friend had the floor; I have it now. I have established clearly that the handful of members who had the courage of their convictions, who were not afraid of insults and outrage, who sometimes rose and voted against the whole house, were the real friends of the farmer because they were suffering for the farmer. That is why I endured the insults that came from Dufferin-Simcoe, when I was called a buffoon and a clown just because I was trying to defend the farmer. I wanted that to stay on record in *Hansard* to show the humiliation we suffered at the hands of the Tories while defending the farmers. That is the record. The hon. member called me a clown; I called him a fascist, and I repeat it now. All the members of the Conservative party are not of the same mind. Some of them are good old Conservatives who think Queen Victoria is still alive and Edward is still Prince of Wales. They are happy. They probably do not know that automobiles have been built and that people may speak over the radio and be heard for long distances without any wires. They are happy; they belong to the old days. Then there are other Conservatives who belong to our age. They are not unpleasant fellows; they know we have automobiles; they know all about radios and the other new inventions, but they do not believe in them. They still belong to the old days. Then there are some Liberals like the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken). He may tell me that he is a Progressive Conservative. It may be so, but I do not believe in his conversion to Conservatism, because it came too late to be true. He is a likeable gentleman, but as I said before what I fear is the clutching hand which runs the good old Conservative party and makes it not only the Tory party but the party of fascists, and I will explain later what I mean. A fascist is a man who does not see the other fellow's point of view.

[Mr. Pouliot.]

Mr. TUSTIN: You have crossed the floor many times.

Mr. POULIOT: My hon. friend is silent so much that he should give a chance to those who dare to speak. If he wants to say something, however, he is always interesting and I will listen to him with pleasure. I have described one of the elements of fascism; and for the benefit of an hon. member from British Columbia, a general who was not here during the last session, I will repeat what I said about fascists. A fascist is a man who substitutes his own will for the law of the land, who believes himself omnipotent and thinks he can run the whole show in the House of Commons. I will tell all marshals, all generals and all provost marshals that they are not so dangerous as they seem. Whether they come with wooden swords or steel blades they do not frighten me at all. I have been here for a long time, and if I feel like it I shall be here for a long time yet. No general will prevent me from coming here as long as my electors wish. I have known other generals who were very fine fellows. Some may be fine fellows, but why do they try to be so unpleasant?

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, I have defended the farmer, and other members have done the same. They have forfeited the crowning of legitimate ambitions by being true to their conscience, and they have the satisfaction of having done their duty. What did I do in those hard times? I will tell you what I personally did for twenty-three counties of Quebec. In the first place I tried to clean out the office of the mobilization board and the registrar's. The chairman of the board, a judge, had to go to Amos in Abitibi for three weeks each month for the sittings of the court. He was sent there by the chief justice, who was in Sir Robert Borden's government during the last war and who never forgave the Liberal who defeated him while he was a minister of the crown. This judge had a few days left each month to come to Quebec city to look over the files, which were piled high on his desk. I admit that he started to look honestly at the files, that he began to study them. Finally, however, after he had examined ten or twelve or perhaps twenty files, what happened? He said, "I have not time to look into them all. These boys must do their training." Many boys whose duty it was to remain on the farm were sent up for military training by that judge, who was replaced on my complaints. But in the meantime he was

responsible for grave injustices to farmers' sons and other men who were working in essential industry.

There was another fellow oppointed at that place, because he was a creditor of the first registrar. Because the registrar could not pay this man, he said, "I will appoint you to a good job, and then you will give me some delay in paying my debts to you." This man was incompetent, he was dirty, and he was an abomination. Once I handled the case for three draftees who had been called before the court, and the case really developed into a trial of this man who, it happened, was in charge of the correspondence at the office of the registrar at Quebec city. In court I asked him if 50,000 letters had been put together in one of the lockers without being sorted or placed in the files of those concerned. He replied that there had not been 50,000. Then I asked him how many there had been, whether 25,000 or 30,000, and he said no; that it would be around 15,000.

We hear a good deal about deserters. I have in mind a young man who happened to be the son of a friend of mine. This boy had been operated upon for appendicitis and had not recovered, with the result that he was under the doctor's care. An affidavit was obtained from the doctor to the effect that this boy, when called, could not go to camp and could not report to the registrar or to any other camp authorities. This letter was sent to the registrar's office and, without being sorted, was put in the locker with the other 15,000 or 50,000. The police came to take that boy as a deserter, and I had to explain the case. The medical certificate was sworn to and the letter was registered but, because of the incompetency of this man, it was not on the file. Finally I had the clerk fired, but it took two years to do it And one must stop to think of the trouble to which those people were put during two years of time because this man had been left in charge of the correspondence.

Finally, there was the second registrar. The first one was not a bad fellow, and the second one was a man who had a light tenor voice about thirty years ago. Supposedly he was a barrister from the north, and had been selling mining shares. In addition he played a good game of bridge, in fact, that was his only qualification to be registrar of Quebec district.

Once I wrote him lodging a complaint about a ruling that had been made. This man pointed out to me that there could be no appeal from the board's ruling. I agreed with him that that was the regulation, but pointed out that on the other hand, when I give the board some new information which would indicate that due attention had not been given at first to a case, and that some details had been ignored, such case should be reconsidered. I told him that it was his duty to do so, and that it was only his laziness and idleness which prevented his doing so.

On this occasion I wrote General LaFleche, who was then deputy minister of national war services, pointing out that if the interpretation given to those regulations was the correct one, then all those who make the statement that the farmer had an important role to fulfil during the war were imposters and liars. The answer I received was that the registrar was wrong, that he was a newcomer who did not know his business, and that he had been told to reconsider cases when new points were involved.

I got rid of this man. Every time I complained to him he cried like a crocodile—but that is all he was doing. He was holding a position for which he was incompetent, with the result that other men had to suffer.

There were many times when the chairman of the board did not recognize the lumber industry as essential to the war effort. I have letters in which he told young farmers what their duty was, and always concluded by saying, "You do not know that a war is on." He was speaking like Lake Centre; he was speaking like Parkdale; he was speaking like Hastings-Peterborough—"You do not know that a war is on; you are not carrying out your war effort."

As I said on occasions during the last parliament, the members of the board were ignorant; they could not distinguish a calf from a stallion, and yet they were deciding everything because they were there. Farmers could expect no justice from them. And the judge was there stating, "I have two or three sons in the army. I do my duty; your duty is to enlist." And, mark you, for a judge that was exceptional.

He thought farmers were being granted a favour when they were given a postponement. He did not know that by virtue of the regulations it was their right, and that the farmers were justified in claiming that right to stay on the farm. But many of them were sent for training. Some of those boys have been called deserters, but the truth is that they should not have been called into the army at all. What was done? By getting rid of the chairman and the clerk—possibly a grade four—in charge of the correspondence in the offices of the registrar at Quebec city, and by getting rid of the second registrar, something was

accomplished to help those twenty-three counties which constitute the district of Quebec over which that board had jurisdiction.

I turn now to the matter of amendments to the regulations. I give credit to all hon. members, but has any member of the C.C.F. group; has any member of the Social Credit group or has any member of the Progressive Conservative party—the Tory party—done anything to change the regulations so as to show the importance of the farmer's task?

It will be said, in the first place, that agriculture has been described in the mobilization regulations as a seasonal industry. I have had to write articles and memoranda, and take this matter up with the cabinet ministers and especially with my very dear friend, Mr. Lapointe. I brought this matter to the eyes of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) himself, and gained his ear in the matter. I said: "Is it not stupid to call agriculture a seasonal occupation when in my part of the country farmers work from dawn to dusk—and sometimes longer than that."

Now, sir, mark you this: Those regulations were drafted by a Quebec lawyer and a Toronto brigadier, who were reporting to an ex-minister—who is no longer in the cabinet, thank God. The purpose of those regulations was precisely to bring everyone into training. At first they disregarded completely the importance of farming, and of the work of other men who were engaged in essential industry.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Speaker, before the dinner recess I was mentioning what was done to clear up the files at the office of the registrar and the mobilization board in Quebec city. But something else was done by other members of this house. Every time a vote was called for the defence of the rights of the farmers and for the defence of the rights of all those who were engaged in industrial labour, the number of these patriotic members who voted for the defence of those rights varied from five or six to forty or fifty; and most of those who voted for their defence were Liberals, except on a very few occasions.

But something else was done, and it was done by the member for Temiscouata, with the assistance, help, guidance, support and influence of the late minister of justice, the Right Hon. Mr. Lapointe. That is, I secured amendments to the mobilization regulations, which were called at first the national resources mobilization regulations—a very long name.

At the start the draftees were called up for one month, and they were told that they would have to serve for only one month. The postponement at that time was for four months only. When the period of training was extended to four months I succeeded in having the regulations amended to provide for a postponement of six months. Afterwards, when the four months training was extended to the duration of the war I succeeded in having the postponement extended according to pleasure, until further notice. That was something. Every time Colonel Ralston tried to turn the screw to make it tighter, I turned it to the other side to make it looser.

During the last election campaign I stated over the radio from powerful stations like CKAC, *La Presse,* Montreal, and other stations in Quebec city and elsewhere that I had succeeded in securing from the Liberal government recognition of the rights and privileges of the farmer by vindicating his honour, something I never could have secured from any other party or group, and the more so because the Prime Minister had had the skill and ability and finesse to discard his three former war ministers. I stated over the radio—and that broadcast was listened to throughout the province of Quebec—that I supported the Prime Minister inasmuch as he was willing to continue his cleaning of the Liberal party and get rid of all those of the same political tendencies. Here is what was done by a member of parliament, not only for the farmers of his constituency, not only for the farmers of the district of Quebec, not only for the farmers of the province of Quebec, but for all the farmers of Canada—for the farmers of the constituency of my hon. friend the member for Melfort (Mr. Wright) who has just moved his amendment, just as much as for the farmers of Hastings-Peterborough and other places whence came untrue and unworthy denunciations of the province of Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, I am from the province of Quebec. I am a French Canadian and I am proud of it. I will tell you that I have resented deeply the insinuations and the calumnies hurled against my province by some hon. gentlemen in this house. It was unworthy of them and unworthy of this chamber, and when I think of that going on all during the long years of the war I think also of how few stood up for the defence of the rights of the farmer. Only a handful—one handful, not two handfuls, although occasionally there were

two handfuls, but that was all, and we did it because whatever might be the name of the political affiliation of those who did it we were liberal-minded. A Liberal is a man who is a lover of liberty, liberty not only for himself but for others also, and all those who defended the cause of the farmer, the cause of the labourer, the cause of the underdog did so because they were liberal at heart.

I had no political motive in defending the rights of the farmer. My idea was to defend the rights of those whom I have learned to respect since my very childhood. I remember my father's friends who came to our home to see him when I was just a little child and the respect that I was taught to have for them because they were those who fed us at all times. If it had not been for what we had done, despite the insults and humiliations that we have received from a small number of members, especially of the Tory party, and from the mover of the motion, who acknowledged the truth of my denunciation this afternoon, we would have had famine in this country, and my hon. friend the mover of this motion, who wants the farmer to sell his produce at a good price, would have starved because he would have been unable to get any help on his farm. He may thank the member for Temiscouata; he may thank the hon. member for Quebec West and South (Mr. Parent); he may thank the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Gauthier); he may thank the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Lalonde); he may thank the hon. member for Levis (Mr. Bourget); he may thank the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay (Mr. Dorion) and the former member for Gaspe and others for the fact that he has some help on his land. If that help was not denied to him it was because of the efforts put forth by these Quebec members.

How can we hear talk about national unity when we hear some members say: I am of British descent; therefore I am for conscription. They put it as a racial issue. I do not put it as a racial issue. We put it as a national issue. We wanted to defend those whose work was essential not only to the civilian population but also to the army, and not only to the army but to the united nations. We did it fearlessly; we did it with perseverance. We did it courageously in spite of the insults that we were receiving from men like the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Rowe) and others who were always insulting us and defending the farmers only in words; but when it came to action they were slackers; they ran away; they had not the courage of their convictions, if they had any. That is the position.

I will tell you more, sir, if the house is willing to listen to me. I will tell you the story of the amnesty that was ready to be granted by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) and was refused by the former Minister of National War Services. I wonder if the house is ready to listen to it? I will tell you a chapter of Canadian history which is unwritten but which is true, and which hon. members should know in order to appreciate the motives that dictate the political actions of hon. members in this parliament. Injustices have been done to farmers by these whom I have denounced, and rightly so, this afternoon. I denounced them to the department. I notified them first—I always notify them—and when I saw that they were helpless I had to denounce them, first to the deputy minister in charge and then to the minister, and ask redress in so far as they could of the wrong that had been done by these incompetent people.

Of course, many farmers who should have been kept on farms were dragged to the camps because of the stupidity of these public servants and their misunderstanding of public duty in time of war. I came here to Ottawa. I went to the supreme court, which was housing rubbish in a building, the fine corner-stone of which was laid by Her Majesty the Queen. It did not serve for the supreme court, the highest court in Canada, but for garbage. On one of the floors I met General LaFleche, and I said to him, "What I ask of you is an amnesty for all farmers of Canada from October 15 till the new year of 1943 in order to give them the opportunity to come back, to explain their case, and to be treated as though they had not been called before." That was fair, because some farmers were in the forest at the time the first notices were sent to them and they did not receive them. Therefore at the office of the registrar they were treated as incorrigible, as delinquents. The only thing to do was to give them an opportunity to show their good will. I said further, "You should also put advertising in the daily and weekly papers of Canada and broadcast over the radio to inform all those who have not yet reported to the registrar, or who have not yet filed an application for postponement to do so immediately, or not later than the 2nd or 3rd of January, 1943. Then their cases can be examined anew, just as though they had not been called before, and justice can be rendered to all of them." The Minister of Labour was in favour of that, and I am most thankful to Mr. Paul Goulet, the chief of the Selective Service, a most able man, who deserves recognition. I stated the situation to him and he thought the suggestion was

all right. What did General LaFleche say? He was about to be appointed a minister of the crown, and he was afraid of the repercussion upon himself of an amnesty to farmers throughout the country. He raised his arms and said, "What! This is a spark that would put the country on fire." I said, "You don't know your business. It is not true. It is not true at all. The farmers need an amnesty now. The lumberjacks who are working in national industry need an amnesty now. Why don't you give it to them?" "Oh," he said, "it is impossible; it is a spark that will put the country on fire." Then I left, and what I did was to go to Montreal with a very dear friend of mine who has done very well in this house, especially when he was over in that corner where there were some members who were broad-minded but unfortunately were in the army. He was in a nest of jingo imperialists, and it required quiet lot of courage for him to rise in his place in the house and vote according to his principles. I refer to Mr. L. P. Lizotte, K.C., then member for Kamouraska. He came with me to Montreal, and there we gathered the French speaking members of Montreal to discuss the situation with them and decide what we were to do about General LaFleche. We had the finest of candidates, a man who would have been elected very easily, a man who was known throughout Canada as a great and broad-minded Canadian, an able speaker and a famous lecturer, a man who now does very well for Canada outside this country by making it known very favourably. So we met together. I see, Mr. Speaker, that I am about to exhaust my forty minutes, but if it is the pleasure of the house I will continue what I have to say.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go ahead.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will require the unanimous permission of the house. I must point out that he has already spoken for over forty minutes.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Continue.

Mr. POULIOT: Thank you, sir; and through you I convey my thanks to my colleagues. I want them to know the truth, and I want you to know, Mr. Speaker—well, you know it, but I want my hon. colleagues to know that we exhausted all means to settle the conscription question favourably. Nearly all the French speaking members for Montreal were with us at the Windsor hotel. We discussed the situation and we did not reach an agreement in the first place. Afterwards we met again. I have the authorization of the members whom I name to mention their names; I am not committing any indiscretion. We met the ex-minister of public works (Mr. Cardin), and we asked him if he was ready to fight LaFlèche. He said, "Yes, provided that there is unanimity among you." All were in agreement except one. Therefore the proposal fell to the ground. I could not fight the candidate as I would have liked to.

On the other hand, we prevented the conscription of women. You remember, sir, that in the summer of 1942 women were registered for conscription, and there were some by-elections. I was ready to fight LaFlèche in Outremont, a constituency which, after an interval of five years, is now represented so ably by a new member (Mr. Rinfret). The only thing to do was to secure some kind of protest from the province of Quebec. That is why, when I saw that my hon. friend the present member for Charlevoix-Saguenay was running there as an Independent I offered my help and went there to support him in his campaign; and it is because of the victory of the present member for Charlevoix-Saguenay on December 30, 1942, that women were not conscripted in this country. That is something which few members have done. Other hon. members—and I do not except you, Mr. Speaker—were willing to do something to prevent the conscription of women; but since there was no unanimity the reasonable condition mentioned by the ex-minister of public works could not be fulfilled, and therefore the course I took had to be adopted. That is something. It was not done in Ontario; It was not done in British Columbia; it was not done in any province other than Quebec; and if the women of Manitoba, British Columbia, Ontario and anywhere else have not been conscripted it is on account of the action of Quebec members. We have looked after the women of the whole country.

I see my hon. friend the colonel laughing now. I may tell him a lot about the way camps were kept in New Brunswick, but I will not do so to-night. Let me, however, say this to him. I know he is refractory to argument. I understand his state of mind, and I remember very well that during the last war the men, who did very well, were told that when they returned to Canada they would find a Garden of Eden here. They expected that, and they were told more than that. They were told that they were the only ones than won the war and they were to get this and that from the manufacturers, from the railway men and from everybody else. The Borden government had made them undue promises which it could not fulfil.

Mr. BROOKS: What about the promises that are made now?

Mr. POULIOT: I am not speaking of the men who are returning from this war. I am speaking of those who returned from the last war, one of whom was my hon. friend from New Brunswick.

Mr. BROOKS: He did not return from any war.

Mr. POULIOT: I expected that from the hon. gentleman. We have two gentlemen with Victoria Crosses here, one of whom received his decoration during this war from the hands of the king, and I congratulate him in the same manner as I congratulated Major Paul Triquet, of Temiscouata county, who earned a similar award so nobly on the field of battle. Let me say this to the hon. gentleman. This is an award that comes from the king for gallantry on the battle field, but it does not give anyone any degree of infallibility. It did not give any degree of infallibility to the general from the province of British Columbia who sits next to my hon. friend. Let me say this to the general, who has vanished. I do not know why he has gone, but he has vanished. At any rate, I will say this for his information. There is in this building the holder of a Victoria Cross who has been snubbed by the other Victora Cross holders, and that man is in a very humiliating position. He cleans spitoons in the basement of this building and for a time was the only Victoria Cross holder in the district of Kingston. Who looked after that man? Was it my hon. friend from New Brunswick, who sits here to argue politics all the time? The hon. gentleman may have done nobly on the battlefield but I regret that he does not do so in the house. He did not look after that V.C. Who brought that man before the committee, with his honours and decorations, in order to have him rehabilitated? Was it not the member for Temiscouata? Who mentioned him to General McNaughton during the secret sitting of the house if not the member for Temiscouata? Who asked you, Mr. Speaker, to improve that man's position? You know very well, sir, because you have given him an increase in salary pending the time when his case will have been settled. The member for Temiscouata did that. My hon. friend must remember that during the secret sitting it was not he; it was not any brass hat; it was not any general or any colonel or major or corporal, but plain Jean François Pouliot who asked for a remission on behalf of that young man who saved the lives of so many people when he removed the fuse from a bomb that would have exploded in forty-five seconds and wrecked St. Paul's Cathedral, London.

My hon. friend has a fine record; I do not deny that, and personally I think he is a very fine man, provided that he does not argue too much politics. But when it comes to politics, is it impossible to argue with him? I ask my hon. friend, would he not now be proud to have taken part in the defense of the two men whom I have mentioned? I ask him now, is he ready to go with me to the Speaker's room and cooperate with me in an effort to have that V.C. appointed as personal messenger? Is he ready to do so?

Mr. BROOKS: I have no influence with the government.

Mr. POULIOT: It is not a question of the government; it is a question of the honour of a soldier, and I ask him if he has enough courage to go with a civilian to ask for an improvement in the condition of that man.

Mr. BROOKS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman is directing his remarks to me, but he has had the courtesy of the house in allowing him to extend the time of his speech and if he is going to use that time to abuse hon. members on this side I think that courtesy should be withdrawn.

Mr. POULIOT: That is enough for now. There will be a little more later on.

Mr. R. W. GLADSTONE (Wellington South): I think, Mr. Speaker, we should dispose of this debate so that the budget may be brought down in order to allow us to plan next year's business. I would urge now, therefore, an early winding up of this debate. I suggest that we get away from generalities and so much talking without legislation, and move on to the pressing matters of the country's business.

This debate commenced twenty days ago and 110 members have spoken. I wish to congratulate the new members on the high standard of their contributions to the debate.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of record for readers of *Hansard,* that this debate arises through a motion to thank His Excellency the Governor General for the speech which he delivered on the opening of parliament on September 6. Amendments to the motion to adopt the address, if carried, would constitute a vote of no confidence in the government. I am sure it would not be the desire of the people of this country that such a situation should come to pass, for the result therefrom would be an appeal to the

people in a new election. I am sure the people expect of their members of parliament; the people of every constituency expect of their member, the most earnest and faithful contribution to a solution of the pressing after-war problems that face this nation.

To the motion of thanks five amendments have been proposed. Three have been defeated and two are still before the house. I imagine it would be possible, going through the various departments, to frame five more amendments that would occupy another twenty days of debate. The procedure in the British parliament is that a few of the leaders speak on the motion to adopt the king's address and this occupies usually only two or three days. We have drifted into the practice of moving amendment after amendment, reaching the climax this year in the number of amendments and subamendments that have been proposed.

It is interesting in this connection to note the comments in Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms. In the third edition, section 226, at page 95, we read as follows:

> It is a mistake to believe that the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne allows members to raise all kinds of issues on the mere ground that they relate to the general situation of the country. In the times of Sir John A. Macdonald and Hon. Alexander McKenzie, considerable restriction was placed on that debate. Speaking on the address in the session of 1875, Sir John A. Macdonald expressed the following opinion: "The practice of discussing the speech from the throne at great length and of raising endless isues upon it was simply an obstruction to business. It was his opinion that, unless the opposition were in a position to move a vote of want of confidence in the government, which he candidly confessed they were not in a position to do on this occasion, the address should be passed without delay."

Then farther on in the same section I read:

> Speaking again on the address in 1879, Sir John A. Macdonald said: "I am glad the opposition have adopted the English modern system —a very proper one—of passing the address without amendment, and when all the various subjects alluded to in it are dealt with, when the measures proposed are before the house, they and their details can be criticized with a full knowledge and satisfactory explanation with regard to the policy of the government."

I realize that hon. members may wish to take the earliest opportunity of bringing some particular problems before the house. However, it must be noted that such problems usually come up for consideration in some form of legislation, and then comes the opportunity for a detailed consideration and for reaching conclusions.

Mr. Speaker, along with others, I wish to congratulate you on your honoured position in this parliament. I give assurance of my cooperation at all times. Your authority goes beyond the membership on the floor to the thousands of visitors in the gallery during the session. We are always delighted to see so many young people in attendance showing their interest in the affairs of government. I should like to speak a word for the ladies who attend in such large numbers. There seems to be a regulation that the officers may admit only those with heads covered. Those who arrive without hats are refused admittance until they deck themselves with boy friend's scarf or hubby's pocket-handkerchief. Surely in these days of artistic coiffures, of modern beauty parlours, we can dispense with this senseless regulation.

The chief point of my remarks in this debate to-day is that just as new methods were employed during the war, which has just terminated, so should we endeavour in this parliament to find new methods of improving our procedure. The service people have been living in a new world; they have travelled across the country, across the prairies and through the mountains in tens of thousands. In hundreds of thousand they have crossed to Great Britain and the continent. They have visited the people of other lands. They have been in charge of and dependent upon machines of destruction devised by our best engineers and scientists. They have been living in a new world, and I am sure there is no person who has served in the forces but has come back with some new thought, new ambitions and new hope. From them, I imagine, come the hope and the prayer for the fulfilment of the prophecy of old, "I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away." While clinging to the old we ought also to be receptive to changes that will promote our efficiency. These times are a challenge to us to get as quickly as possible to essential things and not to waste time on generalities. There is much in this system that we should retain; perhaps there is some of it that should be discarded or improved in places. Private members have a greater responsibility than that simply of voting, and I think as the responsibility of private members is increased we may find a decrease in that much criticized bureaucracy of which we are hearing these days. Therefore I would urge the government to endeavour to utilize the service of private members to every possible degree.

For the benefit of hon. members who have come to this house for the first time I might state that during the session of 1944 a committee was set up to consider the possibility of amending and improving the standing orders of the House of Commons. This committee

made a report, a copy of which I have in my hand. It came before parliament, and much time was given to debating the preamble which preceded the definite recommendations. There was so much tension about certain features of the preamble that the whole recommendation was talked out on that day and finally lost its place entirely.

What should have happened is that opportunity should have been given to hon. members to consider the definite amendments that were proposed in the report of the committee. To illustrate, I might quote the comment on standing order No. 37. Standing order 37 reads as follows:

No member except the Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition, or a minister moving a government order and the member speaking in reply immediately after such minister, or a member making a motion of "no confidence" in the government and a minister replying thereto, shall speak for more than forty minutes at a time in any debate.

The comment of the committee in connection with this standing order, reads as follows:

When Mr. Speaker is in the chair, a member can only speak once, but there is no limit to the times of speaking when the house is in committee. Under the present rule, a member may make two or three forty-minute speeches during a sitting of the committee which does not last longer than three hours at a time. This amendment provides for a more equitable apportionment of time and allows more members to take part in the discussions.

The proposed amendment of the committee reads:

Provided always that in the committees of the whole, supply or ways and means, no member shall speak more than once on a particular motion, clause or item under consideration, and not more than twenty minutes continuously, but his right to ask questions relating to the subject matter of the said motion, clause or item under consideration shall not be thereby restricted.

The effect of a change of this kind in standing order 37 would not necessarily mean that during a session hon. members would have less opportunity to speak. Rather I think it would result in more subjects being brought up for consideration and in the resolutions of private members having a greater opportunity of being debated, while in general there would be greater opportunity for all hon. members to participate in discussions. My suggestion is that the report of the special committee of last year should be brought to the attention of this parliament by some means or other. Many hon. members have served during the last ten years, and I am sure they have the feeling that some of the suggested changes, although perhaps not all, would be beneficial. I am also sure that after the new members have been here for two or three sessions they, too, will be in agreement with some of the proposed changes. So that I trust the government will find some means of bringing these recommendations up for consideration this year.

Another result of the reduction in the length of time a member is permitted to speak would be that it might be possible to shorten the sessions of this house. I am sure many hon. members feel that when we sit until eleven o'clock it makes a pretty long day, since I judge that most members of parliament work upwards of fourteen hours a day, taking into consideration office work, committee work, and listening to speeches in this house for six hours. Therefore I suggest that the government might consider a proposal to conclude a day's sitting at ten o'clock, instead of eleven. In doing so, we would be giving consideration to the faithful members of the press gallery, who send the news of this parliament to newspapers across the country; for when we continue our sessions until eleven o'clock, I am sure their work goes on into the small hours of morning.

There are many things I should like to mention, but I shall confine my remarks to only one or two points in order to hasten the conclusion of this debate. We are gratified to learn that during this month some fifty thousand members of the armed forces will have been returned to Canada. In this connection I should like to pay tribute to the three departments of defence, to the Department of Transport, to the management of the railways and to the railway employees for the arrangements made to look after returning troops. I have come in contact with a number of men who have returned, and they all speak enthusiastically of the consideration they have received on arriving at Halifax or Quebec. It has been a delight to them to be placed in comfortable sleeping cars, and to be served such splendid meals. I am sure we are all glad that such excellent arrangements have been made for the reception of the men and women of our armed services as they return to Canada.

This country has been prosperous during the last five years. Leaving out of the picture the sorrow that has come to many homes, I am sure most of our people are enjoying such prosperity as they had not known for many years previously. As a result, the number of marriages has increased and many new homes have been set up, which is a matter of gratification to all of us. The effects of the family allowance are already being felt. Testimony is coming in to indicate that the sale of milk,

for example, has increased. From some of our schoolteachers I have heard that they have noticed their children wearing better suits and dresses, and many children wearing sweaters where they had none before. But in addition to money the children of our country need direction. We must give thanks to many public-spirited people who give leadership in sports and who in other ways are influences for good, but many people are endeavouring to make money out of influences that are questionable. We must stop the commercialization that lowers the moral stamina of our young people. I believe the nerve-wracking pictures our children see at the cinema and on magazine covers have a bad effect. One newsdealer said to me, "I can sell good detective stories without requiring the books to have covers which encourage children to flourish revolvers or daggers."

Mr. Speaker, we must move to protect Canadian homes against the undermining influence of those who seek to make money, regardless of the harm they do to the rising generation. We should feel alarm at the increasing number of divorce cases. I can understand how ill-mated persons just cannot live together. In such cases I favour one divorce, but not a second or a third.

The great offenders, so far as example is concerned, and so far as their influence on the sanctity of our homes is concerned, are the moving-picture actors and actresses. Canada can well afford to be generous to such people in the matter of holidays. Through our customs branch, in the event of their having second divorces, their films should be barred for one year; and for a third divorce a holiday of two years should be imposed. For the sake of our children, Canada must discourage the growing tendency to break up our homes.

We have provided old age pensions at seventy years, and we are now proposing to increase the payments and to modify the requirements. We give benefits to the blind at forty years. Investigators in connection with old age pensions and mothers allowances find many pitiful cases of persons suffering infirmities, and bed-ridden without hope. I suggest that these people should be made eligible at the age of forty years for the benefits of old age pensions.

Canada has gone a considerable distance toward providing more security for our people. However, there is still one great need. Many people have the benefits of superannuation and pension, and among these would be included such groups as civil servants, railway employees, bankers and many others. But all too often we find that the man who has toiled throughout his best days in a factory is turned out, with no provision for his later years, when he reaches that time in life when his earning power has been depleted. In addition to these, we know of those terrible cases where homes carrying small mortgages are threatened when sickness overtakes members of the families in those homes. Possibly a home must be mortgaged in order to provide proper medical and hospital care for a mother and child afflicted. Very often the result is that that home is never again properly established. Therefore one matter which requires our earnest consideration is that of working out some provision to give security to the homes of so-called common people on those occasions when they require medical and hospital treatment.

I wonder how many Canadians realize the complex considerations of government, those considerations which enter into our dealings with other nations and which have to do with our internal operations. Many things must be purchased from other nations while, on the other hand, we have many other things in surplus quantities which we desire to sell to those nations. We must pay in money that has a recognized value in goods. And so, when the need is created we have a further problem of exchange. Without that exchange problem, with our country operating independently, we might organize our own internal money system pretty much to suit ourselves. We might go on printing money and issuing bonds to an extent where such issues might become voluminous. Then, possibly some group holding radical views might assume power and would scrap all those assets, in order to start over again.

This would not be the method of the people in a free and fairly organized democracy. So I say that our government has many complex problems to deal with. It is reasonably easy and simple to make suggestions calling for expenditures of large sums of money, but it is an altogether different matter to keep everything in balance so as to be fair to all groups in the country and to keep our economy on a solvent basis.

We have been most fortunate in our Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley). I am sure all groups in the house will recognize his success in preventing soaring prices during war time. He has our congratulations, and he has our sympathy to-day as he continues his struggle against inflation which he feels, and we feel, would bring such terrible suffering to those with moderate, fixed incomes.

We can also be grateful that during the war we have had in charge of our munitions programme one who had a first-class engineering training, one with exceptional executive ability, and who possesses a spirit of confidence and optimism. That spirit of optimism was never better displayed by the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) than on the occasion when he was torpedoed in mid-Atlantic. I am sure he will continue to display that spirit of confidence in the house, and in his work as Minister of Reconstruction, despite the attempted torpedoings which may come his way from many of those who would criticize unduly.

In conclusion, may I pay tribute to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). I am sure that even among his opponents there is an undercurrent of very warm feeling for the wonderful service he has rendered during the trying days of the war. I believe, too, that most people in Canada have a great deal of confidence in him and in his ability to render service in many ways to other nations of the world as, in joint effort, they attempt to ensure that war shall not come again.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, we have before us an amendment and a subamendment. I wish that the members of the house could all support the subamendment, because I believe it places very simply before parliament what many of us feel should be done, namely, the giving of direct instructions to the government to consider immediately the bringing in of parity prices for farm products.

We have moved that subamendment because we do not like the language of the amendment. I still feel that there is in it phraseology which does cause some misunderstanding. We were told by a former leader of the opposition in this house, the Right Hon. R. B. Bennett, on many occasions and at some length, that the written word always prevails. If you take the written word of the amendment it does give rise to the interpretation that was placed upon it by my hon. friend the member for Melfort (Mr. Wright).

As I say, I wish the house could support the subamendment, which is simple, which does not suggest ninety per cent of parity but suggests parity itself. But if the house does not do that, I believe that the amendment offers something better than the principle which is being followed by the government, and if our subamendment is not carried we shall support the amendment.

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am rising to speak on the subject of the wheat price policy announced a week or so ago by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) on behalf of the government.

During the course of this debate there has been a good deal of misunderstanding, if not misrepresentation, with respect to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Ross) and with respect to our general position on agricultural prices. I should like to take this opportunity of making clear our position on both.

Before I proceed further, may I take this opportunity of complimenting the leader of the C.C.F. party to my left upon helping to clarify to a small extent the intent of his party which moved an amendment to the amendment because I do not read the same meaning into his party's amendment as evidently he intends should be read.

All I wish to do to-night is to make clear exactly where we stand with respect to the wheat price policy announced by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and perhaps at the same time make clear where we stand on the general question of parity or a square deal for agriculture.

It is three weeks now since parliament convened. At the opening of the session there was read to us a speech from the throne, which is supposed to outline the government's policy for the session and for the near future. That speech from the throne contains no reference to a change of policy with respect to wheat prices. Two weeks later, on September 19, the Minister of Trade and Commerce on behalf of the government announced this new policy, a new policy which has two effects: (1) it prevents the price of wheat to the farmer from rising, as he indicated it otherwise would likely do in the near future; and (2) it may let prices drop lower than the present floor price or the initial price of wheat.

Let me say in this connection, Mr. Speaker, that this party brought in its amendment in no sense of small politics. We happen to be the official opposition. I hope I shall never say anything in this house that will be critical personally of any hon. member opposite. I respect them all. I know the load they are carrying.

But we all have our responsibilities, and I know the members of the government will expect us to carry them out. When we see policies like this announced and we think there is a weakness in them, it is our duty to point out the other side. There was no opportunity to discuss this question in the debate on the

address because we had not then been advised of this change of policy. As I said, it was brought in two weeks after the speech from the throne was made. If this policy had been included in the speech from the throne, it, too, would have been included in the amendment which it was my privilege to move. The implication of this new policy is too far-reaching, too filled with ill-consequence to let it go without discussion or without protest. In my remarks to-night I propose to deal with the facts of the situation as we see them.

The question before us now is this. The hon. member for Souris (Mr. Ross) has moved an amendment to the government's new policy of reducing the floor price of wheat from $1.25 a bushel, which is now the initial price for wheat, to $1 a bushel. His motion was in protest against that reduction.

Mr. MacKINNON: There is no reduction.

Mr. BRACKEN: The hon. member's motion was in protest against that reduction to $1, and in its place his amendment proposed giving ninety per cent of parity, which would mean a floor price of $1.28 a bushel instead of the $1 a bushel which the government has now announced. It is a protest against that reduction and suggests a sound policy of arriving at what would be good practice. Instead of the policy announced by the Minister of Trade and Commerce the amendment proposes to increase the present price from $1.25 to $1.28. As I go along I will explain the details, since the figures are not in the amendment itself.

First let me review the policy announced by the Minister of Trade and Commerce a week ago. The intention was to prevent wheat prices from going up beyond $1.55, and, second, to lower the present floor price, which is now $1.25, to $1—not immediately but for the next five years. I may be asked what is wrong with that policy?

In the first place it asks the wheat growers of Canada to assume a burden that the nation should bear. On a free market, wheat prices would now go up and normally the farmers would get the benefit. But this puts a ceiling price on wheat. The government says: We are going to sell wheat at $1.55 and not higher. They do not let the price go up. Then the government suggests a different floor price policy, which may lead to an unwarranted degree of deflation. When the government brings in a policy saying, we guarantee a floor price of $1 for the next five years, that either means something or means nothing. If it means nothing the government should not have brought it in; and if it means something it means that the government is fearful that the price of wheat will some time in the next five years drop to $1 a bushel or less. This country cannot face the possibility of wheat dropping to $1 a bushel or less in the next five years. At a price now of $1.55 that would mean a drop of one-third. If wheat is to drop a third, cheese to drop a third, hogs to drop a third, fruit to drop a third, where is the high national income going to come from?

Let me refer briefly to the remarks of the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker) and the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Wright), and I know these hon. gentlemen will realize that there is nothing personal in what I have to say. But I shall have to be critical of some of their statements. I think the hon. member for Rosthern left the impression, I hope not intentionally, that our policy means that we stand for only ninety per cent of the cost of production, ninety per cent of parity, on the price of wheat and other agricultural products. This resolution does not bear that interpretation; that is not our policy, and I want to make that fact clear to-night. We stand no more for having agricultural prices at ninety per cent of parity than they stand for having agricultural prices at sixty-two per cent of parity, because that is all that their policy of $1 a bushel is. The government talk about floor prices in this policy of $1 a bushel. That is only sixty-two per cent of parity. We say it should not be sixty-two per cent; it should be at least ninety per cent, and it should not go below that. Ninety per cent is $1.28, and the government's announced policy is $1.

I now want to say a word about the procedure in bringing this policy to the attention of the house. It does not get one very far to criticize procedure; yet it must be said that it was not good procedure for a democratic assembly. What happened? We met here on September 6 and the government brought down the speech from the throne, which is supposed to announce government policy. But before the speech from the throne has been discussed for two weeks the government brings in a new government policy—a policy not mentioned in the speech from the throne—a policy to be passed as a war-time measure in days of peace, a policy determined upon by the government behind closed doors while the house was in session. That seems to be the normal way of doing things under the present procedure. Then it was brought in here one day without notice, brought in here in a manner which denied members the right to discuss it. It is for that reason that

this amendment was brought forward one evening when many hon. members thought there might be a vote on this debate.

Let us examine in a little more detail what this policy is. I have under my hand *Hansard* No. 10, and I shall read at page 289 from the remarks of the minister when he brought in this policy. He said:

I wish to make a brief statement on wheat prices.

The second world war has concluded with Canadian wheat producers in a particularly strong marketing position.

He means that prices are going up.

Not only has the general disruption and bad weather reduced production in the war areas, but the Australian and north African crop failures and a small crop in Argentina have left Canada and the United States as the only countries at present having substantial export surpluses of wheat. This has coincided with the release of pent-up demands in the liberated areas.

In these extraordinary circumstances, Canadian wheat might well command for a limited period very much higher prices in the world market.

Do hon. members get that point?

In these extraordinary circumstances, Canadian wheat might well command for a limited period very much higher prices in the world market.

Wheat has been selling recently at $1.55. Even conservative estimaters predict that it will go to $1.90, and some, even higher. These are the conditions under which this crop in a free market is being sold, and the government comes along now and says: We are going to sell this, because we are controlling it, at $1.55, and it cannot go higher. The minister continues:

It is in the interest of Canada and of Canadian wheat growers that the importing countries should continue to obtain Canadian wheat at prices not in excess of those prevailing at the end of hostilities.

He says it is in the interest of Canada, and he goes on:

Accordingly the government, by order in council, has instructed the Canadian wheat board to offer wheat for sale for export overseas at prices not higher than the current export price of $1.55 per bushel.

At the moment I am trying to get the facts before the house. For a dozen years before the war farmers were getting prices much below parity. Everyone will admit that. The last two or three years we have been getting fairly good prices, and now, when the outlook is that they will go higher, we are denied the right to accept higher prices, "in the interest of Canada". Then he goes on:

In asking Canadian producers to forgo such benefits as might be realized in the short run through higher export prices, the government realizes the paramount need for- -

Listen to this:

—relative stability of income to wheat producers.

Are the farmers going to get stability of income by a lowering of the present floor price from $1.25 to $1. And because the government are doing that it thinks it has to give a quid pro quo, and what is it?

Toward this end, the government undertakes that in the five-year period ending July 31, 1950, producers will receive not less than $1 per bushel basis No. 1 northern, in store Fort William/Port Arthur or Vancouver on the authorized deliveries for each crop year.

Not for all their wheat, but for the authorized deliveries, whatever that is; a part of the crop. Then he goes on. Listen to this:

By providing a long-term floor price of not less than $1 the government will protect producers against the consequences of any sharp reversal in the world wheat position during the next five-year period.

If that means anything, it suggests that they are afraid that the level will be down there or lower. This country cannot contemplate a condition of letting wheat go down to $1 or lower in the next five years; with the burden which this government has put upon the people—and many of us support most of those expenditures—that burden cannot be borne if the national income is to be lowered to anything like the degree which is here contemplated as a possibility. Further:

The government, in adopting this policy of a maximum price for overseas shipments for the present and a floor price for five years, is asking the producers, in their own interests, to forgo exceptional short-run advantages in favour of a long-run stability of income.

What kind of stability of income will wheat at $1 a bushel bring to the farmers? If that sort of deflation is to take place in our whole economy, there is no chance in God's world of this government collecting enough taxes from the Canadian people to carry the services they are proposing for the people of the country. The statement goes on:

Any further increase in wheat prices now would aggravate the problems of economic and political readjustment of the liberated areas to Canada's detriment in future trade with those areas.

I agree with that. I compliment the government on that policy, but I do not compliment it on the policy of leaving the burden on the wheat growers. Then it goes on:

There is a moral obligation not to take advantage of our recent allies in their time of compelling need.

A moral obligation on whom? On the 250,000 farmers or on this nation? Then the minister states:

I wish to lay on the table copies of order in council P.C. 6122.

I should like to refer to that order in council for a moment. This is the order in council which the minister tabled on the very day on which it was passed. I will refer to one clause:

That as a further means of stabilizing wheat prices—

Mark these words "stabilizing wheat prices"

—by a floor price of $1.

That as a further means of stabilizing wheat prices during the post-war period it is the intention that steps shall be taken to ensure that producers will not at any time up to July 31, 1950, receive less than $1 per bushel . . .

Mr. Speaker, stabilizing wheat by such an action as that is all eyewash. It will not stop a deflation which this country cannot afford if it is to carry the services the government has undertaken to assume.

Perhaps at this point I should deal with the remarks made by the hon member for Melfort (Mr. Wright). I listened with interest to what the hon. gentleman had to say in the first part of his address and I was prepared to compliment him on the nature of it, but I must say I was surprised and disappointed when he came to the last part of that speech. I will not say that the hon. member deliberately misrepresented our position or what was in the amendment, but what he said had the effect of misrepresenting it. Here is what the hon. gentleman said, as reported on page 480 of *Hansard,* and I quote:

I am surprised that he introduced an amendment which suggested that the farmers of Canada should be satisfied with ninety per cent of their cost of production.

That is not in this amendment, and when that fact was brought to the hon. gentleman's attention he made this statement:

Mr. Wright: Let me read the words of the actual amendment.

And this is what he read; he read only part of the amendment:

. . . immediate consideration should be given to establishing for a period of years floor prices for all basic agricultural products at levels not less than ninety per cent of parity.

As I say, he read part of the amendment. I propose to put on the record the other part so that the house and the Canadian people can read them both together. Here is the first part:

We respectfully submit to Your Excellency that,—

I hope hon. members will listen to this.

—pending the establishment of a more stable and equitable price structure for Canadian farm products based on parity of income for farmers,—

Pending that time.

—immediate consideration should be given . . .

[Mr. Bracken.]

Immediate consideration should be given to the advisability of establishing for a period of years floor prices—not parity prices but floor prices, the thing the minister was talking about—for all basic agricultural products at levels not less than ninety per cent of parity.

The hon. member then went on to say, further down on page 480:

The hon. member now suggests that for a period of years we in agriculture should be satisfied with ninety per cent of our cost of production.

That is not in the resolution and the hon. member for Souris never said that. He was talking about floor prices, the same thing the minister was talking about when he brought in the government's dollar floor price plan. After some discussion on the floor of the house the member for Melfort said this:

That is why I am so surprised that the present amendment should be brought in by the hon. member, because he states we should get not less than ninety per cent.

Mr. Speaker, that is the chief reason why I am speaking to-night. I do not think hon. members wanted to misrepresent our position and I do not want to misrepresent it. I want the house to know what it is. We do not expect to upset the government's policy, but when we see a weakness in that policy we must try to present that weakness; and we hope we can present a united front in trying to get the government to raise the figure from $1 to at least $1.28. Then the hon. member for Melfort moved his resolution:

We respectfully submit to Your Excellency that immediate consideration should be given to the establishing of floor prices for all basic agricultural products at parity with other services and products.

If that means anything in connection with wheat it means that he wanted it established at $1.42, because that is what parity is. I wish to compare that statement of the hon. member for Melfort with the statement he made a few days earlier in the debate. Here are his words as reported on page 330 of *Hansard*:

I am sure that $1.25 a bushel is the lowest floor price that should be set for wheat in Canada. That is a price which would give to the average producer—

I hope that all hon. members are listening to this. I was going to say it pains me as much to read it as I am sure it will pain you in the C.C.F. group to hear it.

That is a price which would give to the average producer a reasonable return for his labour and for the investment which he has in his farm and in his equipment.

The hon. member who moved this amendment, which means, if it means anything, that $1.42 is the floor price, stated only three

or four days before that that $1.25 would give to the average farmer a reasonable return for his labour and for the investment which he has in his farm and in his equipment.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: On a question of privilege—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Sit down.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who is speaking—and I do not often rise in defence of the C.C.F.—made the statement that the hon. member for Melfort deliberately misrepresented—

Mr. BRACKEN: I did not.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Sit down.

Mr. GREEN: Sit down.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Don't be foolish; he said no such thing.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: On a question of privilege, I ask that it be read back.

Mr. CASSELMAN: That will be more publicity for you.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): He distinctly covered that and it is the opposite.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I have listened to the hon. member and I could not detect any question of privilege.

Mr. BRACKEN: Mr. Speaker, I have been critical of the statements made by the hon. member for Melfort—

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: You made it.

Mr. BRACKEN: —but I am sure he will not charge me with saying that I deliberately misrepresented him.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: You made it.

Mr. ROWE: Why are you his champion?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Never mind.

Mr. FRASER: You are trying to misrepresent.

Mr. BRACKEN: I have one other reference to the statement made by the hon. member for Melfort who moved the amendment to the amendment, and then I shall be through with that part of it. To-day in the discussion on a point of order, he said: "All I want is a square deal for farmers." A few days ago he said that $1.25 would be in effect a square deal. His amendment means $1.42, and it means more than that. He is saying that he wants a floor price and he is going to make the parity price—$1.42—a floor price. Then, under our system, where we have floor prices and ceiling prices, presumably in a time like this when wheat is bringing $1.55 he would get the difference between $1.42 and $1.55, which would be more than a parity.

I am sorry that I have had to take so much time in dealing with his remarks, but I am sure the house will realize that his statement did leave a wrong impression with respect to what our amendment means, and with respect to what we meant it to mean.

I have commented on the way in which the matter of floor prices was brought forward, and I have reviewed the pertinent features of the policy announced by the government. I should now like to examine for a little while more clearly the two main features of this policy. Let me first deal with the prevention of prices going up and then with that of adopting a floor price policy of $1, in place of what is now a floor price policy of $1.25.

There is one other weakness in the statement. It was not the minister's business to do it, but the statement does not cover all agricultural products. Our amendment was meant to establish the parity principle in the floor price for all agricultural products. In a system where you have floor prices and ceiling prices we contend that the floor price should never be less than ninety per cent of parity for all basic agricultural products.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: What is parity?

Mr. BRACKEN: If the hon. member will hold his patience for a little while he will learn. I would suggest that if he represents an agricultural community it is about time that he knew what it was.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I got elected again.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. BRACKEN: We wanted the house to have an opportunity of approving the principle that as long as we have floor prices and ceiling prices, the principle of making floor price should not be lower than ninety per cent of parity.

The reason the government gives for the first of these two policies, is, as has been mentioned before, that it will prevent prices from going up and thereby help to restore the economy of other nations. I do not disagree with that; I only disagree with the policy of asking one section of the Canadian people to bear that burden. What is the reason given for adopting a floor price of $1. The following words appear in the order in council. I ask the house to listen while I quote them: "to protect producers against any sharp reversal of the world wheat position." If that means anything it means that it is expected there is a considerable chance that wheat will go down

below that figure. For a dozen years before the war we had wheat below $1 a bushel. I am sure there is nobody in this house or in Canada who wants to contemplate a condition in this country with wheat and other agricultural products that low. The government says it is a world responsibility to help other nations to reestablish their economy. With that we all agree, but we do not agree that a section of the Canadian people should bear the burden. Then, as a quid pro quo for preventing prices from going up the government offers this as something worth while. And instead of increasing the present floor price it actually lowers it by twenty per cent, from $1.25 to $1.

In effect what the government is saying to the Canadian farmer is that you lose both ways. Prices will not be allowed to go up, but prices may be allowed to go down to as low as $1. That policy is extremely inadequate and unsatisfactory. It is a sop with no substance either to the farmers or to this nation. That policy is, in my judgment, unsatisfactory, because it will not give a fair deal to growers with $1.42 being parity to-day. You are not likely to get parity if you are going to let the price go down to as low as $1 and stop it at $1.55.

I do not need to tell hon. members the condition of agriculture during the last few years when nearly one-third of our people on farms frequently got only one-sixth of the nation's income and sometimes only one-tenth. This policy will not enable farmers to buy the products of industry. I do not need to tell the house that sometimes in the past the Canadian farmers have received only $400,000,000 in a year. Last year they received $1,700,000,000. They can buy the products of industry if we keep up the prices of agricultural products; they cannot if we do not. This policy will not enable agriculture to help maintain employment. If farmers cannot buy the products of industry, then industry cannot employ people. In the past six years, because nature smiled upon us and because for the last two or three years we have had good prices, the farmers of this country received $6,600,000,000. In the six years prior to that they received only $3,300,000,000; I am using round figures in both cases. With $6,600,000,000 they are able to buy the products of industry and help keep our economy functioning in a healthy manner. But this sort of policy—a $1 floor price—will not enable agriculture to maintain a high national income. I need not tell hon. members that prior to the war the farmers of this country, on the average, if they allowed themselves any interest on their capital, in some years made only $1 a day, and in no year made more than $3. Even if they did not allow themselves any interest on capital invested the income for the whole farm family was only from $2 to $4 a day.

This sort of policy—low floor prices—will not enable agriculture to keep up production. The price incentive will, as it did during the war. During the last five years an average of seven million tons more of cereals were produced than during the five years immediately before the war. That was partly because nature was good to us, but the principal cause was reasonably fair prices.

Last but not least, this policy does not tend to create confidence on the part of our people. On the other hand it creates lack of confidence in the whole government programme of reconstruction. If they suggest the possibility of wheat going down by one-third, to $1, what are our hog producers going to think; what are our cheese producers going to think; what are our fruit producers going to think; and if agriculture goes down, where is the hope of employment and where is the hope of a high national income? I do not know what the national income is to-day, but a short time ago some people estimated it at around $9,000 million. If that is to be reduced by one-third, to $6,000 million, and this government asks the Canadian people to pay taxes three or four times as high as before the war, they will never be paid. A reduced national income of that kind cannot carry such taxes, and the government's programme will fail.

From what I have said hon. members will gather what I conceive shall be the objective of a policy of this kind. First of all, it should be equity for producers. We ask no more than that; but we ask that much. Another objective should be stability for the industry. You cannot have stability with prices ranging from $1.55 to $1, any more than a wage-earner of this country can have stability if his wages jump around—$155 now and $100 later. If farmers have low incomes they cannot pay the farm wages now demanded. And a high national income is necessary to a high national production.

I had intended to say a good deal more, Mr. Speaker, but I am reminded by one who is close to me that there may not be many conversions after the first three-quarters of an hour. I am not expecting to make many conversions; all I am trying to do is to make our position clear. In connection with this question of parity; in deciding what is a fair relationship between the prices received by farmers and the prices paid by farmers, one of the best guides to-day is the parity principle. By this we mean that the prices for

what the farmer has to sell should bear a fair relationship to the prices for what he has to buy, and should rise or fall approximately at the same rate as the prices of the goods and services he has to buy. That is equity, nothing more or less. This approximate equality has been taken in the United States from a period when agriculture and the rest of the economy was in reasonable balance. The United States uses the years 1910-14 as the base period. Sufficient data is not available in Canada to make these earlier years a scientific base period. I make the suggestion that the committee on agriculture and colonization or a special committee appointed for the purpose should give some study to the selection of a proper scientific base period for Canada. Pending such action, however, I have taken the period 1926-29 as the most suitable period that can be selected in Canada, at least for certain crops. In the case of wheat the average price of No. 1 northern, Fort William, was $1.34 a bushel for the three months of heavy delivery in the years 1926-29. This spring the official indexes show that the prices of things farmers buy, including production, living, taxes, interest and wages, have risen an average of six per cent above the basic period 1926 to 1929. A fair or parity price for wheat would therefore be six per cent higher than the base period, or $1.42 a bushel.

We believe in the parity principle. In the United States they took a period before the war which they considered to be one in which there was a healthy relationship between the prices of agricultural products and the prices the farmers had to pay, and they use that as the base period. If later the prices the farmer has to pay go up they would see that the prices the farmer received would go up also, and that if the prices the farmer had to pay went down, then the prices of their products would go down also. That is what they regard as the parity price principle. That is the policy we adopted at Winnipeg. But I go further than that. They took that base period only because it was the best thing they could have as a guide. A base period is not always the best guide. That kind of parity does not always give a fair deal to farmers. So that we have adopted the policy that farmers should have their cost of production, and should have on top of that, incomes equal to the average of the incomes of other gainfully employed workers in other occupations.

We believe that the parity principle, using the 1926-29 base for most products, could very well be the basis of setting floor prices for the basic farm products. In order to avoid wide fluctuation in prices, we believe that until a rigid parity price structure is brought about we should keep floor prices as high as we reasonably can. That is why we ask that the floor price be raised above the government's announced figure.

Then, to skip a good deal of what I had intended to say, may I leave this word with the house. It is clearly evident that what farmers have received in the past is far below parity, at least until the last two or three years. In 1940 and 1941, even after adding the participation payments, they received thirty-eight cents a bushel below parity. In 1942 they received thirty cents less than parity. It is extremely unlikely that the participation payments for 1943 and 1944 will, with the final returns, reach parity.

I am not going to keep the house any longer. As I resume my seat, I wish to say that we stand only for equity for agriculture. Prior to the last several years the price policy of this country was one of letting prices go as low as they chose or as high as they chose. Now, and particularly since this war, the policy of this government—and I have not objected to it—has been to put on a ceiling price beyond which they will not let prices go, and establish a floor down here below which they cannot go. They set it at $1.25 for wheat, and it is that to-day. But with the government's policy it may be $1 in the future. I believe we shall have greater stability in this country the more we can bring those two figures closer together by raising the floor price and not much stability when the price range is from $1 to $1.55.

When this amendment was prepared, as I have said, it was hoped that all hon. members on this side of the house might feel that they could support it. I would not expect that it would gain the support of hon. members on the other side of the house, because I can quite understand that when the government determines upon a policy it is not likely to accept the ideas of the opposition. So that, to speak frankly, we were not expecting hon. members opposite to support us.

Our position has been—and to some exteut it has been misrepresented—that we want the parity principle established. We do not differ in that respect, on this side of the house. And we want the government's floor price policy of $1 raised to $1.28.

But I do not want hon. members behind me to be misrepresented to their disadvantage. Therefore, I am going to say to my supporters that, having established where we stand on this matter and having brought forward a policy which is sane and fair and, I am sure, appeals to all hon. members as a policy

that cannot be misunderstood—I am going to say to hon. members behind me that I shall not object if they choose to support the amendment to the amendment as well as the amendment itself.

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I did not expect to take part a second time in the debate, before a vote was taken on the address in reply. But in view of the discussion which has taken place during the last two days, and particularly in view of the speech to which we have just listened, I think it is necessary that I should say something with regard to the agricultural policy of the government, and more particularly with regard to the relation of that policy to parity prices.

We have been discussing parity prices in this house ever since I came to it ten years ago. I do not think a session has passed when we have not had a very full discussion of the matter; and I must say that there has been great difficulty in establishing what most speakers who have used the term "parity" believe parity to be.

As a matter of fact, last night when the hon. member for North Battleford (Mr. Townley-Smith) was speaking, I was almost tempted when I interjected some remarks, and when he said that the prices were all cock-eyed, to ask whether he would use that term as synonymous with the term "parity", as it is often used.

Hon. members often try to establish what parity is, and I am pleased that to-night the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) has placed before us what he believes parity to be. He believes parity to be the average of farm prices between 1926 and 1929.

The average price of wheat, as he said, was during that period $1.42. If we wish at this time to accept that definition of parity, every farm product in Canada, or sold in Canada, with the exception of wheat and eggs, has been above parity for some years and is in fact above parity at the present time. I might say that even wheat is above parity to-day. Based upon the definition which is admitted as being the definition of parity for farm products in this farming country, eggs is the only product below. It is true that last night we had a speech from the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) in which he attempted to place an entirely different interpretation upon parity. But since we must have some definition if we are to get anywhere in discussing a question of this kind, then I prefer to accept the definition of his leader, where he has accepted $1.42 a bushel for wheat as being the parity price for that commodity. Let me repeat that on that basis every farm product in Canada is and has been selling for a very considerable length of time above parity prices, with, of course, the exception of eggs.

Now, in making that statement at the beginning I wish to go back over some of the leader of the opposition as they relate the price levels which have been reviewed by to agriculture. Going back to the period upon which he bases his parity figures, the period of 1926-29, we find that farm income in the first of those years was $957,000,000; in the second of those years it was $934,000,000; in the third of those years it was $1,063,000,000, and in the fourth it was $926,000,000—and I hear a friend behind me say, "Four years of Liberal rule." Those are the last four years in which the farmers in the Dominion of Canada enjoyed any such returns for their farm products, either in terms of unit prices for different farm products or in terms of total income to farmers until the Liberals were again in office.

These are the figures for the next period of years: 1931, $445,000,000; 1932, $383,000,000; 1933, $396,000,000; 1934, $485,000,000, and 1935, $511,000,000. This is the full five years of Conservative administration. That was the period of lowest farm income in the Dominion of Canada that we have experienced in the lifetime of the members of this house. Somebody behind me has just asked: Who was in power then? I have to admit that the Conservative party was in power, but I am not going to lay the blame on them for the conditions which existed in agriculture in that five-year period. The only thing I blame them for in connection with that five-year period is that they came before the people of this country in 1930 and declared that they were going to remove unemployment, that they were going to increase the returns to the producers of farm products; yes, that they were going to do these things or perish in the attempt. What I say to-night is that the Conservative party, when they were face to face with the problem in 1930, talked very much as the Conservative party is talking to-night in this house. They spoke in glowing terms of what they were going to do, but at the end of five years in office the people of Canada almost wiped them out of existence and from that time down to the present they have been attempting to get back into their former stride.

Since that period, even before the war our returns for farm products were gradually going up. In 1936 the returns were $578,000,000; in 1937, $645,000,000; in 1938, $664,000,000, and in 1939, $722,000,000. In other words the returns rose from $511,000,000 in the last year

of Conservative rule to $722,000,000 in the last year of Liberal rule before the war. I am going to admit, Mr. Speaker, that the change was not entirely due to what happened in the Dominion of Canada. After all we sometimes take ourselves too seriously in this country when we speak about a nation of 11,000,000 people wagging the whole world. We do not wag the whole world; we are not capable of doing so either in economics or in any other sense. But we are all influenced by what is going on in the world, and one of the reasons why we had such a difficult time from 1930 to 1935 was that on the European continent people were acting as a result of experiences which they had had during the years preceding, a period in which we farmers in Canada and in other nations were attempting to impose upon the peoples of the world a policy which did not suit those people who believed in free intercourse, understanding and confidence among the nations of the world.

We, in attempting to carry out that policy in part of that period, insisted that we should be able to place our farm products, particularly wheat, on the markets of the world at any prices that we cared to dictate. During that period we attempted to set up offices on the other side of the ocean and gave the impression we wished to tell people in Britain and elsewhere what they had to pay for our wheat. Well, whether we have great influence on world economics or not, the fact remains that when the world is in the throes of influences of that kind every country is likely to do the wrong thing if it is not careful about the steps it is taking, and we as wheat growers joined with those of other nations in bringing about those conditions throughout the world. I am not speaking of any government but of the line of thought of our people. We were trying to lift ourselves by our own boot-straps, trying to convince ourselves that we could live unto ourselves, that we could sell all the commodities we could produce to our own people, or make demands on others. The result was a change of government in 1930. When I sat and listened to the arguments here to-night to the effect that the Canadian market is the greatest market we have for farm products I could not help hearing an echo of that same kind of policy. Undoubtedly the Canadian market is the best market for a greater part of our farm products. But if we are not able to sell our surpluses, and if they are thrown on to the Canadian market, they will bring about a condition which is not in the interests of the farmers of this country and never could be.

Therefore to-night, when hon. members speak of increased wheat prices in order to build up an argument which might appeal to farmers and take a similar position with respect to other prices, I just recall our experiences during that earlier period. During that first five-year-period for which I have placed farm income on the record we sold on the average 309,000,000 bushels of wheat a year, but in the five-year periods following that we have never been able to sell that much wheat to the other nations. Why? Because of the policies adopted by other countries which persuaded their peoples to undertake the production of wheat themselves or to substitute other products for wheat. The result has been that we have never, even in wartime, been able to get back to the position where we were marketing as much wheat on the continent, through Britain, as we did in the five years preceding 1930.

The policy announced the other day has that fact in mind. I recite the experiences of that period in order to emphasize the importance of the policy upon which we have entered. Someone asked at the beginning of this discussion about wheat: Who asked for this? Who suggested to the government that we have a policy of this kind? Well, I have here—I am not going to take time to read them, although I could read them—all the annual statements of the Canadian farm federation for every year since 1942. That of 1942 reads like this:

> All of the member bodies of this federation from western Canada are on record to the effect that the basic price for the coming year should be not less than one dollar per bushel, basis No. 1 northern at lakehead or seaboard terminals.

In the year 1943 they made an even stronger statement than that. They go on to say that they still advocate the policy of 1942 of establishing a floor of not less than $1 a bushel for wheat. In 1943, later in the season, this government took action with regard to wheat, and in taking that action we set the floor at $1.25 a bushel. It is true, as was stated by the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Ross) the other day, that someone had suggested in this house on one or two occasions that the price ought to be $1.25 a bushel, but the only official resolution passed on that point by farm organizations in this country asked for a floor price of not less than $1 a bushel as the basis on which to set wheat prices.

As hon. members will remember, a delegation of 400 western farmers came to the city of Ottawa in January, 1942, and presented that proposal to the government. On that occasion we said that we were not prepared to continue

the wheat acreage reduction payments which we were making in western Canada, amounting to some millions of dollars, and also pay $1 a bushel as the initial payment on wheat. After the discussions with them we retained the wheat acreage reduction payments and we payed ninety cents a bushel as the initial payment.

That remained until 1943, when the initial payment was raised to $1.25 a bushel. I have here on record the statement made by the people of the farm federation following that announcement. They complimented the government upon the action we had taken in making the payment $1.25 a bushel. The only occasion upon which they have used $1.25 a bushel as the floor price in connection with their resolutions was in the present year, when they asked this government to retain the initial payment of $1.25 a bushel for the year 1945-46; and this government has done so. In other words, not only have we met the wishes of the farm organizations in Canada with regard to a fair price for wheat, but we exceeded them in 1943. When we exceeded them they asked us to continue that advance payment during the following year.

I recall those resolutions only to call the attention of the house to the fact that, while certain hon. members are raising the question as to whether the farmers will be satisfied with this price, farm organizations declared their belief in it before we undertook it, and farm organizations right across the three prairie provinces, as the hon. member for Rosthern indicated last night, expressed themselves as satisfied with the policy which has been adopted by the government.

Mr. BURTON: Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister of Agriculture is getting slightly mixed. He referred to what the hon. member for "Humboldt" said. I did not speak last night.

Mr. GARDINER: I meant the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker). I was paying the hon. member for Humboldt a compliment he did not deserve. I am glad the hon. member for Humboldt called my attention to it, because I would not want to mislead the people or this house into believing the hon member on this side represents any other seat than Rosthern.

I was saying a moment ago that they had reasons for passing these resolutions in the farm organizations. Those reasons took them right back to the period of time that I reviewed a few moments ago. Someone said—I think it was the hon. member for Souris—this afternoon in reply to an hon. member of the C.C.F. group that there had been an experience with the policy of attempting to make high payments the floor price in connection with wheat. That experience was during the very period of time of which I spoke at the beginning of my speech, when prices of wheat were high. We started in western Canada with a floor price of $1 a bushel under the pool. The farmers were then handling their own pooling of wheat. We held the price at $1 too long. Then we reduced it year by year until finally, I think, we got it down to some seventy cents a bushel. But every year we were reducing it from $1 a bushel down, the wheat pools were taking a loss, and in the end they lost $30 millions and had to come to the government at Ottawa and to the three governments in western Canada in order to get their position taken care of by using the finances of the people of this country.

In every discussion I have had with farm leaders in western Canada, when held in places where we can sit down and talk with regard to them without an audience and base our talks on the experiences in the past, they have called attention to the fact which was called attention to this afternoon by the hon. member for Souris, namely, that it is dangerous to have the initial payment higher than is necessary in order to pay the operating costs of the farmers who produce the wheat. They all agree that we should depend upon participation for our profits. I make that statement in order to repeat that the men who passed these resolutions know the wheat business better than anybody else in Canada. The pools are composed of producers growers of the wheat, and they marketed in the province of Saskatchewan, which produces more than 50 per cent of the wheat grown in Canada every year. The men who market that great volume of wheat have realized from experience the difficulty of setting floors which are too high in connection with the product that they handle, because they know we must have the marketing of agricultural products established on a sound economic basis as well as upon a basis which will give us the highest possible returns for our products. They have suggested, in all their resolutions passed with regard to this matter down to the year 1945, that the basic price or initial payment be not less than $1 a bushel.

Having that before us, the government was placed in a position of having to discuss this question recently in the light of the facts as they now exist throughout the world. Wheat has been gradually going up, but wheat is not the only thing which has been gradually going up.

This government embarked in 1941 upon a policy of attempting to maintain ceiling prices not only upon those things we have to sell but upon those things we have to buy, and I think I can say without fear of contradiction that the majority of men and women from one end of this country to the other, no matter which party in this house they voted for, believe that that policy, as it has worked out from 1941 to the present time, was in the interests of Canada. Under that policy there was one product upon which no ceiling was set, and that was wheat. Ceilings were set on beef, pork, cheese, butter, and every other processed farm product, but not on wheat, although a ceiling was set on other grain. One reason why a ceiling was not set upon wheat was the fact that wheat was then at seventy-eight cents a bushel. Members from the western part of Canada took the position at that time, as we take it now, that you cannot set up in this country an economy based upon seventy-eight cent wheat, and in taking that position and maintaining it and working for it we established the position that there would not be a ceiling set on wheat at that particular time, and not until it passed parity of $1.42.

What is the result of that? The leader of the opposition has said to-night that in his opinion some of the things which have been suggested in the policy that has been announced are good of themselves but, he says—and I agree with him in this—two hundred and fifty thousand farmers, the producers of wheat in western Canada, should not be called upon to bear the burden of utilizing our wheat in order to assist people in other parts of the world, but that all the people of Canada must do that. As I say, I agree with him on that. What did we do, Mr. Speaker? Back in 1941 we said that every person in Canada—it does not make any difference whether he is a banker on St. James street, a farmer in western Canada, or a labourer in the Ford plant—as long as the controls remain upon prices in Canada, can buy his bread based on seventy-eight cent wheat, and no higher. Well, may I say to my hon. friends that when we raised the guaranteed floor on wheat to $1.25 a bushel we said to every farmer in Canada, you are going to be guaranteed $1.25 a bushel for your wheat delivered at Fort William. At the same time we said to every man, woman and child in the Dominion of Canada, you are going to buy your bread based upon the price of seventy-eight cents for wheat and you are going to buy it there as long as controls last.

I call the attention of the house to the fact that that is placing the burden exactly where it belongs. It puts the burden on the treasury of Canada and through the treasury of Canada upon all the taxpayers of the country, whether farmers, or others.

That is not a new policy. That policy has been in existence since 1941. Well, now, on the other farm products, what was done? The price of meat in 1941, in the four-week period which was established as the basis of price control, the price at which meats sold to consumers was higher than it was in the period of 1926-29. The price of many of the other farm products was higher than it was in the period of 1926-29. What did this government do? We established these higher than 1926 or parity levels as the ceilings I should say, when saying that, that the price of live cattle, the price of hogs, the price of other natural products from the farm, unprocessed, was not so high, on some of them at least, as the average price from 1926 to 1929. The government therefore did this. We set a ceiling upon meat; we set a ceiling upon dairy products; we set a ceiling upon the processed products of different kinds. But we said to the farmer, we are going to allow the prices of the commodities that you sell unprocessed to rise up to the levels provided for under the ceilings that are set on meat and other processed products.

And so from 1941, through that year and the next, these primary farm products and some others, cattle, hogs, cheese, butter, went gradually upward until they all passed the average prices of 1926-29, which is parity, or we added subsidies to make them higher.

The other night the leader of the opposition said that we had not increased the price of hogs in the year, 1944 over 1945, other than to add a $3 premium and a $2 premium to the prices which had been paid after prices on grain had been raised up to the levels I spoke of a few moments ago. I corrected that statement in my speech the other day, and I refer to it again only in order to say this, that the only reason why we stopped with seventy-five cents in raising the price of bacon at Saint John in the winter of 1943-44 was the fact that when we added the seventy-five cents we brought the price of that product up to the ceiling as established in 1941, and so we said that rather than break through the ceiling price upon pork we would submit to a policy of putting a premium on high-grade hogs of $3 and $2 and maintaining the price of hogs at a level which did not break the ceiling on pork as it was established in 1941.

There is one thing I cannot understand about the position taken by the leader of the opposition. I opened my remarks the other night with regard to what he had said in the first address with a statement I am going to read again. He says that the reduction in hog production and the going down of production of bacon in 1945 as compared with 1944 is due chiefly to the government's policy of keeping hog prices so far out of line with feed prices as to discourage hog production. Well, to-night he is arguing for the policy of having grain prices higher, while at the same time wheat is the only product which down to the present moment has not had a ceiling upon it; and wheat, as he stated in his previous address, influences the cost of feeds and therefore would influence the cost of producing these bacon products to every farmer in the dominion who produces them.

What I wish to say is this. We cannot argue both ways on these questions. Feed enters into the production of every live stock product we have; when we argue for a ceiling price in one breath—and every member of the official opposition agrees that ceiling prices have been a good thing—we have to admit that these ceiling prices must be held at certain levels throughout certain periods of time; and when they are held on one product they must be held on others if we are to deal equitably with the people of this country.

In dealing with that matter this afternoon the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Senn) raised the question of subsidies, and I made some reference to the fact that we have subsidies on most farm products. We have them put on in two or three different ways, and this brings me back again to the suggestion that all the people of Canada ought to be made to pay, when we bring down policies which result in the giving away of farm products or any other products from this country to the people of some other countries, and not simply one class of the people.

Prices of farm products were not raised in the markets in the manner described by someone this afternoon. We were told that we had to take care, in dealing with this particular question, that we did not create a situation whereby we would lose our markets through raising our prices in the markets of the other countries of the world. I think that statement was made by the leader of the opposition to-night.

It was not the other countries of the world that made these prices. The other countries of the world have been getting assistance under mutual aid, which resulted in our being able to pay our farmers higher returns, and that mutual aid came out of the public treasury, a charge on all the people of the country, making it possible for us to pay about the difference between eighty-five shillings and one hundred and thirteen shillings on bacon to farmers through the packing plants for the hogs that were marketed off their farms. A similar condition exists in connection with cheese, in connection with canned milk, in connection with every product that was provided to Britain and other allied countries under the mutual aid arrangement.

Therefore what I want to emphasize in that connection is that in anything we do with regard to ranges of prices on wheat we are not interfering with something which had been established in some other country in recent years during the war. We are dealing with a condition under which this country, under the able leadership of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley), raised funds with which we paid for Canadian products, and then we sent those products to other countries, taking back from our allies what they could afford to pay under the conditions then existing, and charging the rest of it up to the billion dollars of mutual aid which this government provided in order to help our allies during the war.

It might be said and they have said it—I do not need to say it; our allies have said it—that Canada has done a worth-while job in that regard in carrying that policy through during the last three or four years of the war, and we believe that by carrying that policy through we have created a situation which will make it possible for us to market the commodities we produce in this country in countries which believe that they owe something to us because of the service we gave in their period of greatest trial. That is what the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) had in mind when he said in this house the other day that we as a government must give consideration to the effects which any price that may be established for our products at the present time, particularly products we are selling in great volume, have upon the economy of the other allied nations alongside of whom we fought. It is in order that we may maintain the proud position which we hold among the allied nations to-day, of having done everything possible to give service in every way in order to assist in the winning of the war. When we have come to the end of it, it is not our intention to do things which might cause us to destroy the good feeling which we established then.

Let me now touch on the position as it relates to the war period and as it relates

to the period before the war and to the future. We have been struggling with this wheat question not only ever since the war started but since 1932, when the government of the day sent a delegation from Ottawa, which took with them representatives from the three western provinces, to discuss our wheat problem at that time. It was the problem of a great carryover of wheat which we desired to sell in the European markets. At that time there was set up an organization which has been discussing our wheat problems ever since. As I said here the other day, when this wheat question was being discussed by someone, we have not succeeded in getting any definite arrangements entered into by the five great wheat-producing countries of the world in their relationship with the great consuming countries of the world. We have had these people together; we have been discussing their problems and our problems. That has all been helpful, but when it came down to getting definite arrangements as to what the price and the acreage were to be we have always been confronted with some difficulties which have usually resulted in lack of agreement—I would not say in disagreement, but in lack of agreement.

I wish to say to the house to-night that if it is ever possible at any time to lay the records of those discussions, which have been held in camera, before the people of the world, and at the same time before the Canadian people, it will be found that in every case the advances made by this country toward the other countries were in a line which, if they had been agreed to, would have satisfied the demands of farm organizations from one end of Canada to the other. One of those demands has been written down by the farm federation on many occasions. They have said, "What we want is a stabilized price for wheat." They said, "We want it stabilized over a period of years." They have said on occasions, "We want a $1 price established." I remember on one occasion that they were saying in one breath they wanted a price established at $1 and in the other criticizing the government at Ottawa because the government would not sign a proposed agreement presented by this commiittee. I went so far as to say this to them: "If you want us to sign the agreement, which is before us at the present time, with the nations of the world, which you have said in one resolution you want, and you want us to accept the price which is in that agreement as the basic price for wheat, then it is lower than $1 a bushel, and the other countries of the world will not agree to its being higher." That was just prior to the war.

Since the war, these discussions have been changed from London to Washington and they have been going on there. What I wish to say to the house is that policies similar to those which have been advocated by the farmers of western Canada with regard to wheat have been submitted to that organization year by year. What the Minister of Trade and Commerce meant the other day when he answered a question from the other side of the house, and when he stated that these countries recently meeting in London had not agreed, was that they had not agreed to a policy which I am sure would have met with the approval of all the farm organizations in Canada.

When that agreement was not reached this government announced its policy in the house the other day. That policy gives us five more years in which to carry on negotiations. That is why the farm organizations, without any coaching on our part, have gone to the press in their own cities of Calgary, Regina and Winnipeg, and said that they are satisfied with the policy that has been announced. Some of them told us clearly that they want us to go ahead and negotiate other steps and arrangements, but there is no way that you can proceed to negotiate steps and arrangements with governments at the present time and hope for any settlement in time to deal with the next crop, let us say, or probably the next crop or two. You cannot depend upon having absolute settlements made among the great number of nations that are involved in this wheat question, while world conditions are what they are.

Therefore what we have said to the people of this country is, that for the present we have asked the wheat board to sell wheat at not higher than $1.55 a bushel. That was the price the market would have paid for our wheat on the last occasion in which we were dealing with the British government just before the policy was announced. Therefore we have said that we are going to sell wheat to the overseas people—we do not say to anyone else—at $1.55 a bushel for the time being. Then we have said that for the next year, down to the end of July, 1946, the initial payment is exactly what it was asked to be by the farm organizations down to that period of time, namely, $1.25 a bushel. Then we have said that in the meantime we are going to carry on with the same policies in relation to wheat and other farm products as we have been carrying on with from 1941 down to the present. And we say—we have not said this in so many words, but I am sure that every member of the government will agree with me when I say it—there is not any intention on the part of the members of

this government, or of any one associated with it, to lower the initial payment on wheat below $1.25 a bushel as long as the wheat of this country can be disposed of anywhere at $1.25 a bushel. We are carrying out the policy at the moment just as the circumstances warrant our carrying it out, namely, guaranteeing a floor price of $1.25 a bushel for this year, no matter what happens, and going on with our negotiations with other people as to what the price ought to be, and saying that for the time being, while we are selling wheat overseas to the countries that need our food, we are going to charge them only $1.55 a bushel for it.

I agree with the leader of the opposition that to the extent that we might have got more we are asking the 250,000 farmers who grow wheat to carry that part of the burden for the time being. And we are asked, what are they getting in return for it? We are saying to them that, no matter what happens during the next five years, we are going to see to it that you never have to take less than $1 a bushel for your wheat, basis Fort William. What does that mean? It means that it does not make any difference where wheat goes on the market, if it goes down to fifty cents a bushel we are going to take the money from all the people of Canada to pay the difference between fifty cents and $1. All we are suggesting to the 250,000 farmers is that, while it is $1.55 or more, and while we have ceiling prices on other commodities in Canada, we are going to ask them to permit us to sell whatever wheat we do sell to our overseas allies at $1.55 a bushel during that time. But at the same time we say to them by inference, if not in words, there will not be any ceiling price on your wheat any longer than ceiling prices remain on other commodities in this country. We did not say there was a ceiling of $1.55 for five years. We said there would never be a floor of less than $1 a bushel for five years; but we have said that as long as wheat is $1.55 or more, and as long as there are ceiling prices on other products in this country, since wheat has gone above parity, to $1.55 instead of $1.42, we are prepared to place a ceiling of $1.55 a bushel on what wheat is sold to our allies.

To-day on the orders of the day someone asked whether the government was giving attention to the possibility that someone might start to sell wheat outside this country, into the United States, at higher prices. In reply to that question I say that all the wheat in Canada is delivered to the wheat board, and the wheat board is the only seller of wheat. That board has everything to say, in consultation with the government, as to where wheat is to be sold and at what price it is to be sold; and I can guarantee that there will not be any wheat sold into the United States or anywhere else, other than overseas, while this arrangement exists, at prices which are lower than market prices in those countries, taking into consideration shipping and exchange costs and the duty upon products entering those countries, which has always been done. That position is entirely safeguarded. In other words, we think we are playing the game fairly with the countries with which we are dealing, rather than going back to the "catch as catch can" policies which antagonized our customers in the thirties.

How are we dealing with them? It is true that mutual aid came to an end, but if we want to sell farm products or any other Canadian products to many of these countries at the present time we must be prepared to help finance the sale of such products. At the present time it is not just to say to this house, or to try to leave the impression with the 250,000 farmers of this country, that we are doing something which is not fair to them. We are utilizing all the economic strength of this country, putting it on the lowest plane possible, to try in the first place to benefit all the people in Canada to the greatest extent possible. Keeping that in mind at all times, we are also endeavouring to assist those people who will be wanting our products in future to consume those products at the present time. That does not apply to anything with greater importance than wheat, bacon, beef and all the other products about which we have talked so much in the last few days.

I now come to a question which has been in the minds of most of those who have been speaking, and for a moment or two I shall deal with the legislation of which there has been some criticism; that is, the bill brought in last session to place floor prices under farm products. I wish to emphasize what I said this afternoon in reply to a question, or an interruption of another speech, that this act is not yet operative. The act was passed last session, and everyone who was in the house at that time understood the terms upon which it was passed. This measure was designed to place what we were pleased to call floor prices under farm products. One can read sections of it and give other interpretations to them, perhaps, but if hon. members will read *Hansard* to see what was said when this bill was introduced in the house they will find that it says this. We proposed to establish a temporary board. We would appoint the permanent chairman and would take two officials out of the Department of

Agriculture and set them up at once to do a job. We may be asked, what was that job. We said the job was to determine the relationship between farm prices as they have been since we established ceilings upon prices in Canada, and the prices of other products farmers had to buy; to study that relationship and get it into the form of figures which might be called parity prices or anything you like. In any event they were to establish the relationship which existed between the ceiling prices as fixed during that period, from 1941 down to the end of the war, and have those facts available for the permanent board which was to be appointed when the War Measures Act went out of existence, to take over the administration of this act. Then we said to the board, in section 9 (1) (a), that they were:

to prescribe from time to time, with the approval of the governor in council, prices at which the board may purchase agricultural products in the market.

Then in paragraph (c) they were directed:

to pay to the producers of an agricultural product directly or through such agent as the board may determine the difference between a price prescribed by the board with the approval of the governor in council for such product and the average price, as determined by the board, at which such product is sold in the market during the specified period if such average price is below such prescribed price.

Then in subsection 2, which has been read to the house already by one or two hon. members, there is this provision:

In prescribing prices under paragraphs (a) and (c) of subsection 1 of this section, the board shall endeavour to ensure adequate and stable returns for agriculture by promoting orderly adjustment from war to peace conditions and shall endeavour to secure a fair relationship between the returns from agriculture and those from other occupations.

If I had time I could read again what was read last night by the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker), who stated that the president of the farm federation, in speaking of this legislation at the last annual meeting, had declared that for the first time this act gave Canadian farmers an opportunity to enjoy stable prices, and went on to term the prices provided for under this act as parity prices. And I agree with them. Our hon. friends of the C.C.F. party want prices established for the next period of years. Someone has asked how long that period is to be. If they read *Hansard* they will find that last year someone suggested it should be four years. We refused to make the period four years, on the ground that it might be ten years. It is whatever period is necessary in order to reestablish agriculture in this country on a sound financial basis at the end of this war. Therefore I say to hon. members to-night that if they want to vote for 100 per cent parity prices all they need do is vote for the policies of the government. Anyone sitting on the other side of the house who, in moving a resolution for floor prices based upon parity, is trying to make the people of this country believe they are moving for something which is not already provided for in the policies of this government, is trying to mislead the voters of this country.

May I say to hon. gentlemen opposite that I agree entirely with the statement made this afternoon by the hon. member for MacLeod (Mr. Hansell), that to indulge in that sort of thing with all the facts before the house is purely and simply playing politics; and I say that knowing that my hon. friends on the other side—

Mr. ROWE: You should know.

Mr. GARDINER: I should know, as my hon. friend says, and I think I do know. And since I do know I want to repeat that that is playing politics, and playing it with a vengeance, by trying to mislead the people.

Mr. GARDINER: What I wish to say is this, that every man who votes against this amendment to-night is voting for parity prices as set up under legislation which the government has already placed upon the statute books. Anyone who votes for the motion to-night is voting for an arrangement of long-term agreements between the countries that use our wheat overseas, particularly Great Britain, and the people and government of Canada—long-term agreements which will establish a stabilized price for our wheat, just as agreements we have had in the last five years have established fair prices and stabilized prices for other farm products of Canada.

Every man who sells hogs knows there never has been a more stabilized price structure for hogs in this country than there has been during the last three years, and particularly the last two. Everyone in Canada knows that, despite what our friends across the way may say, Canada Packers and other packing plants have men out in the province of Ontario at the present time offering over twelve cents a pound for well prepared and well finished beef cattle. That is a higher price than could have been obtained under any policy other than that of the government during recent years. That policy has been one of stabilization.

Mr. ROWE: It is seventeen cents in the United States.

Mr. GARDINER: My hon. friend says it is seventeen cents in the United States. Well, if he went down there to get a shave it would cost him a dollar—and other things in proportion. If he went down there to get a drink it would cost him far more than he pays for it in this country.

We in the Dominion of Canada have controlled prices both on things we produce and on things we consume, and on a very much lower level than they have in the United States. But as long as the level applies right across the board on consumed products as well as on produced products, nobody will be hurt.

In other words, we have stopped our prices from spiralling, and right now we are stopping them from deflating. The leader of the opposition does not need to worry, so long as this government is in power; and apparently the people of Canada did not worry so long as it was in power. They do not need to worry about deflation—or about inflation, either. We have taken care of inflation during the latter part of the war. We will take care of inflation in the years immediately following the war. And when the time comes when deflation begins to bother us, we have the legislation on the statute books to carry us through. We have agreements made with respect to our farm products to safeguard our farm policy against any of the evils of deflation.

The house divided on the amendment to the amendment (Mr. Wright), which was negatived on the following division.

YEAS

Messrs:

Adamson
Archibald
Argue
Ashby
Barrett
Bentley
Black (Yukon)
Blackmore
Blair
Boucher
Bowerman
Bracken
Bradshaw
Brooks
Bryce
Burton
Campbell
Cardiff
Case
Casselman
Castleden
Charlton
Church
Coldwell
Coyle
Daniel
Diefenbaker
Dorion
Fair
Ferguson
Fleming
Fraser
Fulton
Gagnon
Graydon
Green
Hamel
Hansell
Harkness
Harris (Danforth)
Hazen
Herridge
Hlynka
Hodgson
Homuth
Irvine
Jackman
Jaenicke
Jaques
Kidd
Knight
Knowles
Kuhl
Lacombe
Lennard
Lockhart
Low
McCuaig
McCullough (Assiniboia)
McGregor
MacInnis
McKay
McLure
McMaster
MacNicol
Marshall
Matthews (Kootenay East)
Menary
Merritt
Nicholson
Pearkes
Probe
Quelch
Raymond (Beauharnois-Laprairie)
Robinson (Bruce)
Rose
Ross (St. Paul's)
Rowe
Senn
Shaw
Smith (Calgary West)
Stephenson
Strum, Mrs.
Thatcher
Townley-Smith
Tustin
Webb
Wright
Wylie
Zaplitny—90.

NAYS

Messrs:

Arsenault
Baker
Beaudoin
Beaudry
Belzile
Benidickson
Bertrand (Laurier)
Bertrand (Prescott)
Bertrand (Terrebonne)
Black (Chateauguay-Huntingdon)
Blanchette
Boivin
Bonnier
Bourget
Bradette
Breithaupt
Bridges
Brunelle
Chevrier
Clark
Claxton
Cloutier
Coté (Matapedia-Matane)
Coté (St. Johns-Iberville-Napierville)
Coté (Verdun)
Cruickshank
Dechene
Denis
Dion (Lake St. John-Roberval)
Dionne (Beauce)
Douglas
Dubois
Emmerson
Eudes
Farquhar
Fontaine
Fournier (Hull)
Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Gardiner
Gariépy
Gauthier (Nipissing)
Gauthier (Portneuf)
Gibson (Comox-Alberni)
Gibson (Hamilton West)
Gingues
Gladstone
Glen
Golding
Gour (Russell)
Gourd (Chapleau)
Hallé
Harris (Grey-Bruce)
Healy
Ilsley
Jean
Jutras
King, Mackenzie
Kirk
LaCroix
Lafontaine
Lalonde
Langlois
Lapalme
Lapointe
Laurendeau
Leader
Leger
Lesage
Little
McCann
Macdonald (Brantford City)
Macdonald (Halifax)
McDonald (Parry Sound)
McDonald (Pontiac)
McGarry
McIlraith
McIvor
Mackenzie
MacKinnon
MacLean
McNaught
Marier
Marquis
Martin
Matthews (Brandon)
Maybank
Mayhew
Michaud
Mitchell
Mullins
Mutch
Nixon
Parent
Picard
Pinard
Pouliot
Power
Raymond (Wright)
Reid
Richard (Gloucester)
Richard (Ottawa East)
Rinfret
St. Laurent

Sinclair (Ontario)
Sinclair (Vancouver North)
Sinnott
Smith (York North)
Stuart (Charlotte)
Tremblay
Tucker
Viau
Warren
Weir
Whitman
Winkler
Winters—116.

PAIRS

(The list of pairs is furnished by the chief whips.)

Ross (Hamilton East) — Cockeram
Maloney — Black (Cumberland)
Isnor — Stanfield
Howe — Bruce
Grant — Stirling

Mr. ABBOTT: I was paired with the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Hackett). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is on the amendment, Mr. Ross (Souris).

Some hon. MEMBERS: On division.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

The house divided on the amendment (Mr. Ross, Souris), which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Adamson
Archibald
Argue
Ashby
Barrett
Bentley
Black (Yukon)
Blackmore
Blair
Boucher
Bowerman
Bracken
Bradshaw
Brooks
Bryce
Burton
Campbell
Cardiff
Case
Casselman
Castleden
Charlton
Church
Coldwell
Coyle
Daniel
Diefenbaker
Dorion
Fair
Ferguson
Fleming
Fraser
Fulton
Gagnon
Graydon
Green
Hamel
Hansell
Harkness
Harris (Danforth)
Hazen
Herridge
Hlynka
Hodgson
Homuth
Irvine
Jackman
Jaenicke
Jaques
Kidd
Knight
Knowles
Kuhl
Lacombe
Lennard
Lockhart
Low
McCuaig
McCullough (Assiniboia)
Macdonnell (Muskoka-Ontario)
McGregor
MacInnis
McKay
McLure
McMaster
MacNicol
Marshall
Matthews (Kootenay East)
Menary
Merritt
Nicholson
Pearkes
Probe
Quelch
Raymond (Beauharnois-Laprairie)
Robinson (Bruce)
Ross (St. Paul's)
Ross (Souris)
Rowe
Senn
Shaw
Smith (Calgary West)
Stephenson
Strum, Mrs.
Thatcher
Townley-Smith
Tustin
Webb
Wright
Wylie
Zaplitny—91.

NAYS

Messrs:

Arsenault
Baker
Beaudoin
Beaudry
Belzile
Benidickson
Bertrand (Laurier)
Bertrand (Prescott)
Bertrand (Terrebonne)
Black (Chateauguay-Huntingdon)
Blanchette
Boivin
Bonnier
Bourget
Bradette
Breithaupt
Bridges
Brunelle
Chevrier
Clark
Claxton
Cloutier
Coté (Matapedia-Matane)
Coté (St. Johns-Iberville-Napierville)
Coté (Verdun)
Cruickshank
Dechene
Denis
Dion (Lake St. John-Roberval)
Dionne (Beauce)
Douglas
Dubois
Emmerson
Eudes
Farquhar
Fontaine
Fournier (Hull)
Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Gardiner
Gariépy
Gauthier (Nipissing)
Gauthier (Portneuf)
Gibson (Comox-Alberni)
Gibson (Hamilton West)
Gingues
Gladstone
Glen
Golding
Gour (Russell)
Gourd (Chapleau)
Hallé
Harris (Grey-Bruce)
Healy
Ilsley
Jean
Jutras
King, Mackenzie
Kirk
LaCroix
Lafontaine
Lalonde
Langlois
Lapalme
Lapointe
Laurendeau
Leader
Leger
Lesage
Little
McCann
Macdonald (Brantford City)
Macdonald (Halifax)
McDonald (Parry Sound)
McDonald (Pontiac)
McGarry
McIlraith
McIvor
Mackenzie
MacKinnon
MacLean
McNaught
Marier
Marquis
Martin
Matthews (Brandon)
Maybank
Mayhew
Michaud
Mitchell
Mullins
Mutch
Nixon
Parent
Picard
Pinard
Pouliot
Power
Raymond (Wright)
Reid
Richard (Gloucester)
Richard (Ottawa East)
Rinfret
St. Laurent
Sinclair (Ontario)
Sinclair (Vancouver North)
Sinnott
Smith (York North)
Stuart (Charlotte)
Tremblay
Tucker
Viau
Warren
Weir
Whitman
Winkler
Winters—116.

PAIRS

(The list of pairs is furnished by the chief whips.)

Ross (Hamilton East)	Cockeram
Maloney	Black (Cumberland)
Isnor	Stanfield
Howe	Bruce
Grant	Stirling

Main motion (Mr. Benidickson) agreed to on division.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That the said address be engrossed and presented to His Excellency the Governor General by such members of this house as are of the honourable the privy council.

Motion agreed to.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER

ELECTION OF MR. WILLIAM ROSS MACDONALD, MEMBER FOR BRANTFORD CITY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there is one matter of procedure which should be dealt with immediately. The rules of the house provide that as soon as possible after the address has been agreed to a deputy speaker of the house should be appointed, also the committees of supply and way and means established. Through the courtesy of hon. gentlemen opposite the committees of supply and ways and means have already been set up. That was done in order to oblige the government in getting through interim supply.

It will not take me more than a minute or two to read to the house the rule which governs in the matter of the appointment of the Deputy Speaker and to propose an hon. member for that position. Standing order 56 respecting the Deputy Speaker reads as follows:

(1) A chairman of committees of the house, who shall also be Deputy Speaker of the house, shall be elected at the commencement of every parliament, as soon as an address has been agreed on in answer to His Excellency's speech; and the member so elected shall, if in his place in the house, take the chair of all committees of the whole, including the committees of supply and ways and means, in accordance with the

[Mr. Speaker.]

rules and usages which regulate the duties of a similar officer, generally designated the chairman of the committees of ways and means, in the House of Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

(2) The member elected to serve as Deputy Speaker and chairman of committees shall be required to possess the full and practical knowledge of the language which is not that of the Speaker for the time being.

Mr. Speaker, I would draw attention to the fact that the hon. member to be appointed

[Mr. Speaker.]

to the position of Deputy Speaker must be possessed of the language which is not that of Your Honour, he will therefore be chosen from among the English speaking members of the house. It is desirable that whoever holds the position of Deputy Speaker should possess qualities of mind and temperament similar to your own. He should be courteous, impartial, judicial, possessed of a sense of humour, conciliatory in manner and able to command the confidence and respect of the house in the position which he holds.

The hon. member whose name I should like to put forward is Mr. Ross Macdonald, K.C., of Brantford, Ontario. Mr. Ross Macdonald has been a member of this House of Commons for the last ten years. He was elected to parliament in 1935, 1940 and 1945. He was also a candidate at two previous elections. Mr. Macdonald is a war veteran of the first great war, a graduate of the university of Toronto and of Osgoode Hall, a distinguished member of the legal profession, and may I say, what is important to hon. members of this house, he is wholly familiar with its rules and its procedure and on many occasions in the last parliament, when asked to do so by the Speaker of the house, occupied the chair of the Deputy Speaker, and on occasions the chair of the Speaker of this house. Possessing all the qualities and virtues he does, I hope the house will join unanimously in electing Mr. Macdonald as Deputy Speaker of the house.

I move:

That William Ross Macdonald, Esquire, member for the electoral district of Brantford City, be appointed chairman of the committees of the whole house.

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, there may not be many occasions in this house when I can support and agree with the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) in the moves he makes. I am glad to say that this is an occasion when I can. It is not my privilege to be personally acquainted with the hon. gentleman who has been nominated to be Deputy Speaker; but on this subject I accept the words of the Prime Minister.

May I say for the members of this party that we extend our sincerest congratulations to the hon. member who has been chosen for that position and that we are sure that he will fill it with distinction to himself and credit to his party. I want to assure him that he will have the utmost cooperation from those of us who sit on this side of the house.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): May I join in those congratulations, particularly because I remember the very happy associations that we had with the hon. gentleman who is named Deputy Speaker when we went to Great Britain in 1941. At that time we appreciated the fact that he was the chairman of the delegation and carried himself with distinction to himself and with honour to Canada. I am quite sure that he will fill the position of Deputy Speaker in the same manner in this house. May I also say that the Prime Minister omitted one qualification which I know that the hon. member has. He has not any ancestors; he is married and he has a family.

Mr. SOLON E. LOW (Peace River): The members of my group have something on me in this respect. I have not had an opportunity of meeting the Prime Minister's nominee. But we are happy to join the Prime Minister in his nomination and to offer our congratulations to the hon. member for Brantford City.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would suggest to the hon. member who has just been elected Deputy Speaker of this house that he should rise and make a graceful bow to all hon. gentlemen who have joined in his election to the important position he now holds.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the house adjourned at 11.40 p.m.

Friday, September 28, 1945

The house met at three o'clock.

PARLIAMENTARY ASSISTANTS

ANNOUNCEMENT WITH RESPECT TO APPOINTMENT —DEPARTMENT OF RECONSTRUCTION

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister, who will not be present this afternoon, has asked me to table copy of order in council which I shall read:

His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the Right Honourable W. L. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister, is pleased to appoint and doth hereby appoint George James McIlraith, Esq., M.P., parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Reconstruction, to assist the said minister within and without parliament in such manner and to such extent as the said minister may determine.

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE

PARTICIPATION OF CANADA—DELEGATION TO PARIS MEETING

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I table copies of order in council P.C. 6103 providing for the participation of Canada in the Twenty-seventh session of the international labour organization conference opening in Paris on October 15, 1945; also copies of P.C. 6162 appointing the Canadian delegation.

I think perhaps the house would be interested to know those who are going to Paris, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I shall read the names.

The government delegates are: Mr. Gray Turgeon, Vancouver, B.C. and Mr. Alfred Rive, Department of External Affairs; alternate, Mr. V. C. Phelan, Department of Labour. Secretary to the government delegates is Mr. T. L. Carter, Department of External Affairs.

The provincial government representatives accompanying the government delegation—at the expense, of course, of the provincial governments concerned—are: Hon. Antonio Barrette, Minister of Labour, Quebec; Mr. Jean-Pierre Despres, Department of Labour, Quebec; Hon. Charles Daley, Minister of Labour, Toronto; Hon. C. C. Williams, Minister of Labour, Regina.

The employers' delegate is Mr. Harry Taylor, personnel manager of Canadian National Carbon Company and member of the industrial relations committee of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, Toronto. The technical adviser to the employers' delegate is Mr. Allan Ross, of Ross-Meagher, Ltd., Ottawa.

The workers' delegate is Mr. J. Arthur D'Aoust, vice-president, Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, and vice-president of the International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, Montreal. Technical advisers to the workers' delegate are Mr. Birt Showler, vice-president, Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, and president of Vancouver, New Westminster and district trades and labour council, Vancouver; Mr. Norman H. Dowd, executive secretary of Canadian Congress of Labour, Ottawa; and Mr. Alfred Charpentier, president, of the Canadian and Catholic Confederation of Labour, Montreal.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

VISIT OF PRIME MINISTER TO UNITED KINGDOM AND EUROPE—ACTING PRIME MINISTER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): I had two or three questions to direct to the Prime Minister, but perhaps the Acting Prime Minister will answer them. Will he tell the house who will be Acting Prime Minister during the Prime Minister's absence overseas? Who will be the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs, and who will lead the House of Commons? Will the Acting Prime Minister also tell the house whether it is the intention of the Prime Minister to appoint additional parliamentary assistants prior to his departure overseas?

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): On behalf of the Acting Prime Minister I should like to reply to the hon. member. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) will be Acting Prime Minister during the absence of the Prime Minister overseas. The hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) will be Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs. The Minister of Veterans Affairs will be acting President of the Council, and the last mentioned gentleman will endeavour to assist and cooperate with his hon. friends the leaders of the various parties, in the direction of the activities of this house.

SUGGESTED ESTABLISHMENT OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, HOUSING AND PUBLIC WELFARE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Acting Prime Minister): The hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Fleming) yesterday or the day before asked whether the government would give consideration to amending the rules of the house to provide for the establishment of a standing committee on social security, health, housing and public welfare. The answer is this. The government will have to give careful consideration to the question as to whether it is advisable to increase the number of standing committees, at least for the present session. As the hon. member indicates in his question, an amendment to the rules of the house would be necessary for this purpose. The subjects which the proposed committee would deal with are all subjects which could probably be considered appropriately by the standing committee on industrial relations.

[Mr. Mitchell.]

The hon. member for Eglinton also asked me the other day when the report of the national housing administration would be made to parliament. I am informed by the officials of that administration that they expect to have the report completed and in a position to be tabled by the end of next week.

Mr. ADAMSON: As a supplementary question, is it not the intention of the government to reestablish the two special committees that sat in the last house, the reconstruction committee and the social security committee?

Mr. ILSLEY: It is my understanding that those special committees are not to be reestablished.

DIVISIONS—MEMBERS PRESENT WHEN QUESTION PUT AND NOT VOTING—PAIRS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. STANLEY KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. Citation 68 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, second edition, reads as follows:

> If a member who has heard the question put does not vote, and the attention of the Speaker is directed to the fact, the latter will call upon him to declare on which side he votes; and his name will be recorded accordingly.

I understand that this citation can be invoked only at the time a vote is being taken, so I cannot now ask that anything be done about hon. members who refrained from voting last night. That is not my question of privilege. However, I do feel that if we as members of this house are to cooperate with Your Honour in insisting upon the observance of the rule that all hon. members in their places when the question is put should vote, I should call attention to the fact that a practice is developing which should be corrected.

The situation last evening was this. We realized that some pairing arrangements between government supporters and members of the official opposition had been made, but as far as those of us in this group were concerned we did not know what those arrangements were. When we noted certain hon. members to our right refraining from voting on the amendment to the amendment, we could only assume that they were paired. Later we discovered that this was not the case.

An hon. MEMBER: They were paired.

Mr. KNOWLES: Oh, no; the pairs are not listed in *Hansard*. I refer to the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Ross) and the hon. mem-

ber for Muskoka-Ontario (Mr. Macdonnell), who did not vote on the amendment to the amendment and who, as far as the record shows, were not paired. Had I known at the time that they were not paired, I would have called Your Honour's attention to this citation and asked you to have them declare on which side they were voting. As I have said already, it seems to me that if we are to co-operate with Your Honour in insisting upon the observance of what I believe to be a very good rule, namely, that every member present should vote, you might direct the attention of the chief whips to the matter and suggest that either one of two things be done; that when pairing arrangements are made, all the whips be advised of those arrangements, or that any member who is sitting in the house and is paired should indicate that fact after the vote has been taken.

Mr. MACKENZIE: On the point raised by my hon. friend, in the first place there is no such rule in this house. We discussed this matter very thoroughly in the committee that was appointed a year ago to look into certain amendments and changes to the rules of this house. This rule applies in some other parliaments, but it does not apply in this house. There was a far more flagrant breach of the rules of this house last evening, in that some hon. gentlemen came in and took their seats while the vote was being taken. In regard to pairs, parliament knows no pairs.

Mr. KNOWLES: May I ask the minister if he has read citation 69, which says:

The practice has not been changed in Canada where every member who has heard the question put is bound to vote.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Yes, and we studied that point last year very thoroughly. In the light of all the precedents, usages, customs and conventions of this assembly for many years, it is not the rule of this house.

Mr. KNOWLES: Show me where that is so.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Now that the question of voting has come up I think on a point of privilege I might refer to something which occurred last evening, so that hon. members will not think that in voting I broke a pair I had with the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. McCulloch). I was under the impression that this pair began to-day, and accordingly voted last evening. Apparently the hon. member for Pictou believed the pair began yesterday or the day before. If there has been any misunderstanding I rise simply to say that it was inadvertent, and a mistake on my part. I thought it only fair to say this for the benefit of hon. members opposite, and also that the hon. member for Pictou might understand the circumstances.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): With all due deference to what the minister has said, Mr. Speaker, I should like your ruling on this point, because I quite understand that I was obeying the rules of this house last evening. We had an experience of this nature in the last parliament, and the Speaker of that day certainly indicated that a member was not forced to vote if he had not made up his mind as to which way he should cast his vote. For future reference I should like to have your ruling in the matter.

Mr. IRVINE: Before you give your ruling, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Veterans Affairs if he recalls a time some years ago when this very question was brought up. I cannot give the date at the moment; I did not know this matter would be discussed or I should have looked it up. I remember very well, however, that a few of us in this corner were compelled to vote under this very rule. So, unless it has been changed, that certainly was the rule under the Speaker of that day.

Mr. REID: Perhaps I may be allowed to say a word in order to keep the record clear. The hon. member who just spoke did not intimate to the house that on the occasion to which he refers the members who had not voted were named to the Speaker, whereas last evening no one was named as not having voted.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would say to the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Ross) that in England members are compelled by the rules to vote, but in this house there is no rule obliging a member to vote. In answer to the hon. members who have questioned the practice of pairing in the house, may I draw their attention to paragraph 95 at page 49 of Beauchesne, third edition, where we find this:

Although there is no standing order in this regard, either here or in the English parliament, it is customary in both places for a member who has to be absent to agree with another member that he also shall be absent at the same time. Thus these members are "paired" and a vote is neutralized on each side of the question.

There can be no parliamentary recognition of this practice (pairing), although it has never been expressly condemned; and it is therefore conducted privately by individual members, or arranged by the gentlemen known as the "whips" who are entrusted by their political parties with the office of collecting their respective forces on a division.

So I may say that pairing is not recognized officially by our House of Commons.

Mr. COLDWELL: Mr. Speaker, just to complete the record: If a rule is not observed, it should be taken out of the book of rules. At paragraph 69, page 25 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, we find this:

> Under ancient custom, refusal to vote was considered a serious parliamentary offence, but the practice was changed in 1906 by the British house adopting a standing order whereby a member is not obliged to vote. That standing order does not apply to the Canadian Commons. The practice has not been changed in Canada where every member who has heard the question put is bound to vote.

And as I understand it, if an hon. member calls your Honour's attention to the fact that a member has been in his seat and has not voted, he is bound to declare himself one way or the other.

Mr. MACKENZIE: May I interrupt the hon. member?—just to help him. Since the rule was published there has been a decision by a Speaker of this House of Commons to the contrary effect. I am sorry I have not the reference with me, but that is the fact.

Mr. COLDWELL: Does that alter the rule?—because we have so many decisions. Sometimes decisions have to be made for the convenience of business in the house. It seems to me that if we have rules we should abide by them. Indeed, it seems to me no Speaker's ruling should supersede a written rule under a standing order adopted by the House of Commons.

Mr. MACKENZIE: These are just marginal comments; they are not binding rules. Only the words in the standing orders are binding.

Mr. MacINNIS: They are cited in the house.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Yes.

Mr. MacINNIS: Then what value has a written citation? Can it be cited one day and have value, and cited the next day and have no value at all?

Mr. ABBOTT: It is done every day, in the courts.

Mr. COLDWELL: That being so, what value has a book of rules of this description? One can find something in one of these books of rules to meet almost any situation which may arise, and to support almost any decision.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. ROSS (Souris): It is like the bible.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I suggest that perhaps this discussion might now come to an end? No doubt it was the purpose of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) to make this move for the purpose of drawing special attention to the fact that—

Mr. COLDWELL: No, no.

Mr. GRAYDON: Mr. Speaker will tell my hon. friend when he should speak and when he should not. While I am speaking I have the floor.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): We had the same experience last year.

Mr. GRAYDON: Their purpose has been served, in that they have drawn the attention of the public to the fact that two of our number did not, for various reasons, record their votes last night. I suggest that now the discussion might end—if their purpose has been served.

Mr. COLDWELL: The interpretation placed by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon) upon what was said by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is entirely incorrect. I discussed this matter with the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, and we thought we should have it settled, because some of our new members do not fully understand the rules. We had told them that hon. members were bound to vote, and we think the situation should be cleared up. This was not done to bring before the house what any two members did or did not do—as a matter of fact I wish my hon. friend had not been challenged to name them, because it was not done with that intention at all.

Mr. GLEN: Mr. Speaker, this question has always been somewhat confused in this House of Commons. The hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Irvine) spoke of an incident which occurred at a time when he was a member of the house. He has pointed out that on that occasion the matter was brought to the attention of the house and that the hon. member in question was requested to record his vote. A year ago when we were dealing with a revision of the rules this matter was considered carefully by hon. members of the committee. At that time they did not think they should make a recommendation to the house in this connection. The postion I always took when

I occupied the Speaker's chair was that an hon. member who was in the house should record his vote; but if he did not do so the Chair had no power to compel him to do so.

Then, with regard to pairs; as has been already stated, pairs are not recognized in our rules. It is customary, however, between parties, for the convenience both of the house and of its members, that arrangements be made with regard to pairs. But so far as the rules of the house are concerned there is nothing which makes provision for them—although they are recognized by custom in the house.

MARSHAL ZHUKOV

INQUIRY AS TO VISIT TO CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. HERRIDGE (Kootenay West): I wish to direct a question to the Acting Prime Minister. According to a White House statement reported in the press, Marshal Gregory Zhukov has been invited to visit Washington and will arrive on October 4. Will the Acting Prime Minister inform this house if consideration has been given to extending an invitation to Marshal Zhukov to visit this country?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Acting Prime Minister): The government has no official information with respect to the proposed visit of Marshal Zhukov, and until it has, I shall not be in a position to answer the question.

FEDERAL DISTRICT

BEAUTIFICATION OF OTTAWA AND SURROUNDING AREA AS NATIONAL MEMORIAL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. M. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I should like to address the following questions to the Prime Minister, but possibly in his absence the Acting Prime Minister will answer them. I have already given notice of them. 1. Has the government consulted with veterans' organizations throughout Canada to see if they approve a national memorial taking the proposed form of the beautification of Ottawa and the surrounding district? 2. Has the government consulted—

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member should put that question on the order paper.

Mr. MACDONNELL: In deferring to your ruling, sir, may I say that I thought the question was of such immediate and widespread public interest that the government might think it well to answer it now.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must insist. It may be of public interest, but I do not see its urgency.

BUSINESS VISITS TO EUROPE

FACILITIES FOR FOOD, LODGING AND LIMITED TRANSPORTATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. K. FRASER (Peterborough West): May I ask the Acting Prime Minister whether he has an answer to the question I asked the Prime Minister yesterday in regard to business men of Canada travelling in Europe?

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs): Yes; I was waiting for an opportunity to answer it. The question submitted yesterday by the hon member for Peterborough (Mr. Fraser) appears on page 494 of *Hansard*. I should perhaps read it to make the answer pertinent. It is as follows:

> A press dispatch from Paris appearing in the New York *Times* of yesterday quoted the American ambassador to France as saying that facilities for food, lodging and limited transportation for American business men will be provided through the United States Embassy over there on and after October 1, 1945. May I ask the Prime Minister what steps this government is taking to provide similar service to Canadians on business in France and anywhere in Europe where the army has quarters and messes?

This is the answer which has been prepared by the Department of External Affairs; We are informed that, as a result of discussions which took place some time ago between the state department and the war department, the United States military authorities had been requested to cooperate with the embassy in Paris in working out arrangements for accommodating and assisting United States business men on visits to France. The details of the arrangements were to be worked out in the field between the embassy and the military authorities. Such arrangements as are reported in the press would be in line with the proposals.

Canadian offices in liberated countries have given every assistance to Canadian business men and others who travel to those areas and will continue to do so. As the house is fully aware, food, housing and travel facilities are extremely scarce in liberated territories. The army has been in close contact with the Canadian embassies in France and Belgium on this question and has provided facilities for

food and lodging whenever there were facilities available. These arrangements are being expanded.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

COUNCIL OF FOREIGN MINISTERS—PARTICIPATION OF CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs): Yesterday a question was submitted to the Prime Minister, in his capacity of Secretary of State for External Affairs, by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell). It appears at page 491 of *Hansard*, and is as follows:

I do not think the answer given by the Prime Minister quite covers what I have in mind. I was wondering whether any representations had been made regarding the disposition of persons and property. The question I had particularly in mind was this: Is Canada interesting herself in the fate of many of the people who are moving around Europe at the present time, the disposition of whom will be discussed by the foreign ministers in London?

The Secretary of State for External Affairs replied:

I should like to have that question stand. I will give a further answer to-morrow.

The answer I have been asked to make on his behalf is: As stated yesterday in particular relation to the Yugoslav-Italian frontier, the Canadian government has not put forward any representations respecting European boundaries. The government is, however, very much concerned with the effect which the peace settlements will have on future relationships with the community of nations.

As regards displaced persons, Canada has taken an active and responsible part in UNRRA which is the organization charged by the united nations with coordinating the work of caring for and repatriating displaced persons. Canada is also represented on the executive committee of the intergovernmental committee on refugees whose main task will be the care and settlement of persons who will not be able to return to their homes.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

STRIKE AT FORD MOTOR PLANT, WINDSOR

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): I should like to ask the Minister of Labour if he has any information to give to the house in regard to the progress made in the settlement of the Ford Motor Company strike.

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): I had notice of a question of a similar nature from the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Matthews), and as they both cut across the same thing perhaps I might deal with his question and the question of the hon. member for Vancouver East at the same time.

On Wednesday of this week I sent the following telegram to the president of the Ford Motor Company and to the president of Local 200, U.A.W.-C.I.O.

Arthur J. Rheaume, Mayor Windsor, has wired Minister of Labour for Ontario as well as myself as follows: "Telegrams were forwarded to-day urging Ford Motor Company of Canada Limited and union to request intervention of yourself and provincial Minister of Labour in present dispute. Company reply not yet received but union has authorized me by letter to request that you and the provincial minister of labour set a date for a meeting with union and company representatives either at Ottawa, Toronto or Windsor preferably the last mentioned." I have consulted by telephone Minister of Labour Hon. C. Daley for Ontario who is at Kirkland Lake to-day and I hereby invite the president of the company and one other and the president of the union and one other to meet with the Minister of Labour for Ontario and his deputy and with myself and my deputy at Minister of Labour's office Toronto on a date which is acceptable to you both. Arrangements could be made for meeting on Monday October first if this is acceptable or any other day next week. The meeting would be under my chairmanship and purpose would be to discuss the work stoppage with a view of convassing the possibilities of bringing about resumption of work.

So far no reply has been received from the union to the invitation to meet with the representatives of the Ford Motor Company in the presence of the Minister of Labour for Ontario and myself, but I understand from press reports that the union is willing to participate in this meeting.

A telegram was received last night from the president of the Ford Motor Company, which reads as follows:

Your wire twenty-sixth instant received inviting representatives of company to meet yourself and deputy and Hon. Mr. Daley and deputy together with representatives of union. Since and including thirteenth instant union in addition to illegally picketing company's factory premises has by means of mass unlawful picketing forcibly prevented company's office employees official of company and all persons having business with company's office from entering company's main office premises in this city. You will appreciate that without records and office

facilities company's office work consequent upon cancellation of war contracts and with respect to reconversion as well as other important business matters which can be dealt with only in the main office is at a standstill. This unlawful deprivation by union of free and unobstructed ingress to and egress from the company's main office premises has been the subject of formal representation by the company to both municipal and provincial authorities but has now continued for fifteen consecutive days. Acceptance of your invitation in these circumstances would in the company's opinion constitute acquiescence in the unlawful action by the union and would invite similar tactics should future differences arise. Upon discontinuance of the above described mass unlawful picketing of main office premises the company and receipt of satisfactory assurance of no resumption thereof I am prepared to meet you in Toronto on October first or other day to be arranged accompanied by two other representatives of the company to discuss as suggested by you the work stoppage with a view of canvassing possibilities of bringing about resumption of work. If meeting arranged consider president of company and two other company representatives should participate and have no objection to equal number of union representatives acompanying union president.

W. R. Campbell, President
Ford Motor Company of Canada Limited.

I should like to make this further observation with regard to the condition which the company lays down before attending the proposed meeting. I would say that the alleged illegal picketing is a matter governed by the provisions of the criminal code, responsibility for the enforcement of which lies with the provincial authorities. I understand that information has already been laid against one employee charged with illegal picketing, and court proceedings are pending. It would be improper, therefore, for me to make any comment at this stage. I have, however, conveyed to the officers of the union the contents of the company's communication.

Mr. J. E. MATTHEWS (Brandon): It is only fair that I should say that the question to which the minister referred when he rose was to have been asked by me on behalf of the hon. member for Essex West (Mr. Brown) who is unavoidably absent. It has been fully answered by the minister.

Mr. J. H. FERGUSON (Simcoe North): I wish to address a question to the Minister of Labour. Has an order or direction been given by his department to the selective service in Windsor or elsewhere that employees now on strike at the Ford Company's plant shall not be granted permits to seek work elsewhere?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): I have no knowledge of such an order.

Mr. FERGUSON: May I ask the minister another question. If in Windsor selective service is denying permits to seek employment elsewhere—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member has asked this or a similar question already.

Mr. FERGUSON: No; this is an entirely different question arising out of the first one. May I continue?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON: If selective service officials in Windsor are denying Ford employees permits to seek employment elsewhere without the knowledge of the minister, will the minister rescind that order at once?

Mr. MITCHELL: I do not think my hon. friend wants to be clever, but let us be fair with one another. I have been under pressure; I just got into the house, following a late meeting of council. I am not objecting to these questions, you understand, but I gave my hon. friend what I considered to be a fair answer. It may be that even he does not know what he is talking about, you understand.

Mr. FERGUSON: I know the answer or I would not ask you.

Mr. MITCHELL: Just a moment. I listened while you were putting me over the jumps, so you can wait a moment now. It may be that this has to do with open permits, I do not know. But I want to say to my hon. friend that if he is in doubt or if he has a problem, if he will see me I will have Windsor called up and we will find out the exact situation there. Then if a remedy is needed it will be applied.

EFFECT OF STRIKE OF MONTREAL LONGSHOREMEN ON PERISHABLE GOODS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): I desire to direct a question to the Minister of Labour, and his answer to one part of that question will perhaps be sufficient. During the day I have had an urgent long-distance telephone call from one of my constituents who is, perhaps, Canada's largest importer of Dutch bulb stock from Holland. In the Montreal harbour at the moment are two shipments of

$50,000 each awaiting transhipment from the Dutch steamer *Boskoop*. I see you are about to rise, Mr. Speaker, but I assure you I shall establish at once the urgency of the question. The cargo, as I say, is now awaiting transhipment to the Canada Steamship Lines, but the longshoremen have not been working for some days. These goods are of the most perishable nature and there is great urgency about the question which I am going to ask. First of all, have the longshoremen gone back to work, and secondly, if not, what steps does the government propose to take with respect to perishable goods of this kind, which will not stand any lengthy delay in transhipment to other boats?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): I may observe, by way of preface to my remarks, that it has been said this was a strike against meat rationing on the part of the longshoremen. I am assured by the officers of that organization that it was a strike against the people who were striking against meat rationing. That may seem peculiar, and I see that my hon. friends are smiling, but you cannot load ships on salads. You have to have solid food. The longshoremen themselves need meat to do the heavy work they have to do. However, I am glad to be able to assure my hon. friend that the strike is over. The first gangs went to work this morning, and we expect the port to be in full operation by to-morrow morning.

HOUSING

RELEASE OF BUILDING MATERIALS TO DISCHARGED SERVICE PERSONNEL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. A. KIDD (Kingston City): May I ask the Minister of Reconstruction if he has an answer to my question of yesterday?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction): I was waiting for an opportunity to answer it. I regret that I was not in the house when the question was asked. The hon. member's query was as follows:

Will the minister kindly inform the house whether immediate steps can be taken to release building materials to discharged soldiers in order to enable them to build or remodel houses or places of business for themselves and their families?

Building materials are released automatically when a building permit is obtained. The government has no machinery for release of materials other than through the issuance of building permits, although they can be bought, of course, through the retail establishments in any locality. Permits are given freely for small houses, and usually for alterations of houses. With regard to larger houses the need is carefully assessed in order that available materials may be directed to the smaller type of houses.

As far as shops are concerned, it is not possible at this time to release materials either for building new shops or for remodelling existing ones. We feel that we must get the housing situation in hand before we can extend the territory for which building materials can be released. However, the material situation is improving greatly. It is wholly a matter of manpower. We are still short manpower in the production of foundry products, electrical and other trades, and we are very short indeed of construction labour for the work on the site. The situation, as I say, is improving, and I am hopeful that later this autumn we shall be able to release permits for the remodelling and perhaps the building of shops.

Mr. FRASER: The minister has said that material is not being released for shops. In that case how is it that permits are being granted for large gasoline stations throughout the country?

Mr. HOWE: That is a matter of helping veterans become reestablished. Such permits are granted to veterans. The difference is that ordinarily a gasoline station does not require the type of equipment which is short. The shortage is in plumbing fixtures, and particularly in millwork such as doors and windows. The ordinary gasoline station, which does not require work of this kind, is being authorized to a limited extent at the present time.

WAR AND DEMOBILIZATION

PROVISION FOR APPROPRIATION OF $1,365,000,000 FOR WAR PURPOSES, DEMOBILIZATION, PROMOTION OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY, ETC.

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide, *inter alia*,

1. That sums not exceeding $1,365,000,000 be granted to His Majesty towards defraying any expenses or making any advances or loans that may be incurred or granted by or under the authority of the governor in council during the year ending March 31, 1946, for—

(a) the security, defence, peace, order and welfare of Canada;

(b) the conduct of naval, military and air operations in or beyond Canada;

(c) the expeditious demobilization of the Canadian armed forces;

(d) promoting the continuance of trade, industry and business communications, whether by means of insurance or indemnity against war risk or in any other manner whatsoever; and

(e) the carrying out of any measure deemed necessary or advisable by the governor in council in consequence of the war.

2. That the governor in council be empowered to raise by way of loan under the provisions of the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, 1931, such sum or sums of money, not exceeding in the whole the sum of $1,365,000,000 as may be required for the purpose of defraying such expenses or making such advances or loans, the principal and interest of any such loan to be a charge upon and payable out of the consolidated revenue fund.

3. That the governor in council be empowered to reexpend, advance or loan moneys that may be received by way of refund or repayment of advances, loans or expenditure under the War Appropriation Acts of 1939 (second session), 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944 and 1945.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I believe that you, sir, and the house are already familiar with the general purpose and nature of this resolution as a result of the consideration of the previous resolution and bill last week, which provided for immediate use a portion of the funds asked for under this resolution.

The form of this resolution is almost identical with those which have been introduced in previous years, asking for authority to introduce a bill designed to provide the appropriation required for war expenditures. There is a difference, however, which hon. members will no doubt have noted, in the detail of the resolution, which is that item (c) of paragraph 1 is a new item, providing explicitly that the funds being appropriated may be used "for the expeditious demobilization of the Canadian armed forces". This specific reference to demobilization will be carried over into the bill, both by the inclusion of the clause mentioned and by appropriate references in the title and preamble. This shift in emphasis to include demobilization is similar to that which took place after the last war in 1919, when parliament passed the Demobilization Appropriation Act. In view of the substantial number and amount of continuing costs of the war other than demobilization proper, I think it is more correct at this time to entitle our bill "The War Expenditure and Demobilization Appropriation Act".

I think it is essential at the beginning to realize that war expenditures proper must continue for some time after the actual end of hostilities. We have still very large bills to pay for the actual costs of equipping and supplying our fighting forces, particularly in the case of the army. Our forces are still mobilized and in many cases still beyond Canada, and they must be provided not only with pay and allowances, but with food, shelter, clothing and various other supplies and services. Some of our forces are engaged in the occupation of enemy territory and costs will continue to be incurred on this account for some time. The process of demobilization and discharge of the forces itself involves heavy expenditures apart from those of gratuities and re-establishment credits. The sudden termination of our war production involves very heavy expenditures in reimbursing contractors for costs which they had already incurred for production that will not now be needed and for other costs of cancelling war contracts. Many of the other more indirect costs of the war must continue, at least for a brief period after the end of hostilities—for example, the cost of the subsidies which are necessary in order to maintain our stabilization policy against the serious threats of inflation arising from shortages created by the war. Many outstanding accounts between Canada and Allied countries, particularly the United Kingdom and the United States have still to be determined in detail and settled.

It is clear, therefore, that quite apart from any future operations, however fast we manage to return to peace-time conditions and however strictly we may limit the incurring of new costs, the government will be faced for some months with heavy expenditures arising from the war. It is, of course, the government's earnest desire, as I am sure it is the desire of all members on both sides of the house, that war expenditures shall be terminated now as soon as possible. I should also state that it is our hope, and I am sure it will be the hope of the house, to return as quickly as possible to the normal peace-time practice of presenting detailed estimates to parliament to be voted in detail, rather than total appropriations to be voted as a whole, which practice has been and is still necessary in war appropriations, where so many uncertain amounts and unforeseen contingencies must be anticipated.

The amount of the appropriation for which the government is now asking is $1,365,000,000. Adding this to the interim appropriation of

$2,000,000,000 provided for war purposes by the last parliament in April of this year, we obtain a total for the fiscal year of $3,365,000,000. This total may be compared with total war expenditures for other years, but in doing so it is necessary to include in other years the amounts requested for Mutual Aid and similar purposes, because this year Mutual Aid was included as one of the purposes for which the interim appropriation could be used. It will be noted that this amount of $3,365,000,000 is $1,085,000,000 less than the total of the war and the mutual aid appropriations provided last year. Thus it represents already a very substantial reduction in our war expenditures, despite the fact that it contains very large amounts of bills carried over from previous years and large costs for the termination of war production. Moreover, it will be noted that the amount required for the latter half of this year is very much less than that required for the first half, even though many of the expenditures to be made in the latter half were really incurred during the period of fighting.

Before proceeding to speak of the estimates on which our total appropriation is based, and to note some of the factors affecting such estimates, I wish to emphasize that there is still a great deal of difficulty in forecasting our expenditures accurately, and therefore in making firm estimates even now when the fighting is over and when half the fiscal year is finished. In many cases, of course, our estimating problems are easier because we no longer have to make highly uncertain assumptions about the course of military operations and the amounts of equipment and supplies that will be necessary for them. The remaining new costs to be incurred are largely those connected with personnel, and once the programme of demobilization has been reasonably well established, we can expect to forecast with some accuracy costs of pay and allowances, travelling, transportation, and similar items. On the other hand, a great many of the costs which will be seen in the detailed estimates of the services represent amounts still to be paid in respect of equipment, services and supplies obtained some time ago. In many cases substantial amounts have already been paid by the Department of Munitions and Supply for these items, but the final bills have not yet been presented to and paid by the service departments. In the relatively short time since the termination of hostilities, it has not been possible to calculate with accuracy how much one should therefore allow in the estimates for refunds to the Department of Munitions and Supply accounts, which should be deducted from the total amount required by the government as a whole. In other cases, supplies have been obtained from the United Kingdom and the United States and some payments made on account, but there remains a balance to pay which it is difficult to forecast until final decisions are reached in regard to the details of amounts and prices. Finally, there is the cost of the termination of war contracts, arising from the sudden end of hostilities last month. There has not been time in the last few weeks fully to assess the effect of that happy event upon the costs of war production. Immediately upon receiving word that Japan was prepared to surrender, the government proceeded to cancel thousands of contracts for the production of munitions and other supplies, and, of course, our chief concern was to see that these cancellations were made as promptly and economically as possible. After this has been done, much work is still needed to determine exactly what the costs on all this multitude of accounts will be, and I must confess that in framing our estimates for the amounts required for cancellation of contracts we have had to proceed on the basis of informed judgment of those in the best position to know, rather than on a detailed analysis of accounts which cannot be completed quickly enough for our purpose.

I have stressed these points about outstanding accounts because I believe it is vital for the house to realize, first, that many of the costs still to be paid are in respect of operations now completed, and, secondly, that there is still considerable uncertainty as to exactly what these will turn out to be.

For the convenience of members of the house in the debate on this appropriation, I propose to place on *Hansard*, if I have the unanimous consent of the house, tables showing the various estimates for departments, which have been prepared and considered by the government in arriving at the figure for the appropriation for which parliament is being asked. The first of these tables is a summary one, listing the amounts required for the various departments, showing also the amounts which it is expected would be charged to active assets and the deduction for the estimated amount that is expected to be recoverable from the munitions production allotment fund of the Department of Munitions and Supply.

The table follows:

War Expenditures and Demobilization Appropriations 1945-46

Summary of estimated expenditures by services for the fiscal year 1945-46

	Amount already granted	Additional amount required to March 31/46	Total amount required for 1945-46
National Defence—			
Army Services	$ 460,000,000	$ 608,170,527	$1,068,170,527
Navy Services	127,667,897	171,860,770	299,528,667
Air Services	325,985,039	272,502,077	598,487,116
Sundry Services	6,364,000	10,633,878	16,997,878
	920,016,936	1,063,167,252	1,983,184,188
Munitions and Supply	69,300,000	212,700,000	282,000,000
	989,316,936	1,275,867,252	2,265,184,188
Other Services—			
Agriculture	48,342,877	53,490,061	101,832,938
Auditor General's Office	117,509	172,491	290,000
Civil Service Commission	240,908	417,600	658,508
External Affairs	275,662	110,663	386,325
Finance	49,331,491	98,043,834	147,375,325
Fisheries	970,560	679,990	1,650,550
Justice	20,160	13,740	33,900
Labour	11,153,846	20,287,869	31,441,715
Military Relief (partially recoverable)	34,000,000	....	34,000,000
Mines and Resources	2,342,913	3,315,626	5,658,539
Mutual Aid, excluding UNRRA	654,317,000	....	654,317,000
Mutual Aid—UNRRA	65,907,000	25,000,000	90,907,000
National Harbours Board	163,500	281,000	444,500
National Health and Welfare	4,202,446	5,711,958	9,914,404
National Research Council	1,550,000	1,733,700	3,283,700
National War Services	12,083,653	10,856,574	22,940,227
Post Office	349,528	2,100	351,628
Privy Council Office	895,417	597,025	1,492,442
Public Works	3,231,830	4,116,267	7,348,097
Reconstruction	107,500	5,200,000	5,307,500
Royal Canadian Mounted Police	3,230,882	2,496,832	5,727,714
Secretary of State	2,751	6,250	9,001
Trade and Commerce	1,085,729	1,377,587	2,463,316
Transport	3,067,595	4,000,889	7,068,484
Transport—Air	5,269,248	5,754,127	11,023,375
Veterans Affairs	17,200,174	54,502,877	71,703,051
	919,460,179	298,169,060	1,217,629,239
	1,908,777,115	1,574,036,312	3,482,813,427
Provision for contingencies	....	8,489,479	8,489,479
	1,908,777,115	1,582,525,791	3,491,302,906
Active Assets	4,617,340	19,079,754	23,697,094
	1,913,394,455	1,601,605,545	3,515,000,000
Unallotted portion of the present appropriation available for future requirements....	86,605,545	— 86,605,545	....
Total estimated requirements chargeable to the war and demobilization appropriation..	2,000,000,000	1,515,000,000	3,515,000,000
Less estimated amount recoverable from the munitions production allotment fund.....	....	150,000,000	150,000,000
	2,000,000,000	1,365,000,000	3,365,000,000

The second is a detailed table of the estimated requirements of the army, navy and air services under the various categories which have been used in this house in recent years, and also showing the detailed purposes for which funds have been requested from the war expenditure appropriation by other departments. The following is the table:

WAR EXPENDITURES AND DEMOBILIZATION APPROPRIATIONS—1945-46

Details of estimated expenditures by departments and services for the fiscal year 1945-46

National Defence	Amount already granted	*Additional amount required to March 31/46	Total amount required 1945-46
Army Services—			
Civil Salaries and Wages.	$ 6,150,000	$ 4,739,948	$ 10,889,948
Pay and Allowances.	295,800,000	179,176,990	474,976,990
Travel, Transportation and Freight.	21,700,000	44,239,968	65,939,968
Construction, Purchase, Repairs and Operating Expenses of Properties.	11,100,000	29,677,263	40,777,263
Personnel Supplies and Services: Food, Medical and Dental Stores, Clothing and Personal Equipment.	48,150,000	94,707,171	142,857,171
Signal and Wireless Equipment, Line Construction, etc.	3,600,000	9,425,424	13,025,424
Ammunition and Bombs.	19,900,000	50,625,161	70,525,161
Armament, including Rifles, Machine Guns, Mortars and Guns of all Descriptions.	12,750,000	71,256,979	84,006,979
M.T. Vehicles: Trucks, Tractors, Trailers, Tanks, A.F.Vs., and Repair Parts.	29,200,000	96,802,216	126,002,216
Operating Cost of Mechanical Transport: Fuel, Maintenance, etc. (not including repair parts)	8,500,000	17,274,636	25,774,636
Sundries, including Printing, Stationery, Telephones, Telegrams and Other Costs not included in above items.	3,150,000	10,244,771	13,394,771
	460,000,000	608,170,527	1,068,170,527
Naval Services—			
Civil Salaries and Wages.	2,654,295	4,384,039	7,038,334
Pay and Allowances.	65,319,424	33,031,823	98,351,247
Travel, Transportation and Freight.	4,073,016	5,935,853	10,008,869
Construction, Purchase, Repairs and Operating Expenses of Properties.	5,098,847	9,809,277	14,908,124
Personnel Supplies and Services: Food, Medical and Dental Stores, Clothing and Personal Equipment.	6,190,505	6,714,774	12,905,279
Signal and Wireless Equipment, Line Construction, etc.	1,534,289	9,868,000	11,402,289
Ammunition and Bombs.	2,296,855	6,766,708	9,063,563
Armament, including Rifles, Machine Guns, Naval Guns, etc.	5,695,055	19,021,770	24,716,825
Fuel Cost of Ships.	5,013,082	4,902,188	9,915,270
Acquisition, Construction, Charter, Repair and Upkeep of Ships.	15,203,721	35,491,842	50,695,563
Naval Stores: Small Boats, Minesweeping, Degaussing, Anti-Submarine, Fire-Fighting and Training Equipment, etc.	7,587,039	22,058,241	29,645,280
Miscellaneous Stores and Services: Printing, Stationery, Laundry, Office Machinery, Teletype Rental, etc.	5,025,756	5,818,822	10,844,578
Sundries: Postage, Pilotage, Prize Funds and Other Costs not included in above items.	1,976,013	8,057,433	10,033,446
	127,667,897	171,860,770	299,528,667

*In many categories, this includes largely amounts required for settlement of outstanding accounts.

[Mr. Ilsley.]

Details of estimated expenditures by departments and services for the fiscal year 1945-46—*Con.*

	Amount already granted	*Additional amount required to March 31/46	Total amount required 1945-46
Air Services—			
Civil Salaries and Wages	6,294,610	5,799,710	12,094,320
Pay and Allowances	130,033,315	139,404,019	269,437,334
Travel, Transportation and Freight	9,076,361	14,836,414	23,912,775
Construction, Purchase, Repairs and Operating Expenses of Properties	10,179,463	16,652,964	26,832,427
Personnel Supplies and Services: Food, Medical and Dental Stores, Clothing and Personal Equipment	7,423,964	7,637,710	15,061,674
Signal and Wireless Equipment, Line Construction, etc.	3,864,475	12,860,044	16,724,519
Ammunition and Bombs	2,288,129	8,198,939	10,487,068
M.T. Vehicles and Marine Craft: Capital Cost and Repairs	1,063,180	1,388,352	2,451,532
Fuel Costs for Aircraft, M.T. and Marine Craft	6,019,702	18,327,677	24,347,379
Aircraft Engines and Spares, including Overhaul	25,204,117	46,676,988	71,881,105
Miscellaneous Stores and Equipment, including Machine Guns and Other Armament	2,408,129	3,836,871	6,245,000
Flying Training Contracts	1,000,000	—	1,000,000
Maintenance of Overseas Squadrons	120,000,000	9,018,454	129,018,454
Sundries, including Printing, Stationery, Telephones, Telegrams, Teletype Rentals and Other Costs not included in Above Items	1,129,594	3,002,473	4,132,067
	325,985,039	287,640,615	613,625,654
Less: Estimated Recoverable Items	—	15,138,538	15,138,538
	325,985,039	272,502,077	598,487,116
Sundry Services—			
Departmental Administration	575,000	1,119,000	1,694,000
Experimental Station, Suffield	820,000	1,360,342	2,180,342
Internment Operations and Refugee Camps	595,000	1,258,296	1,853,296
Dependents' Allowance Board	250,000	586,600	836,600
Dependents' Supplementary Grants Fund	1,915,000	3,165,000	5,080,000
Inspection Board of the United Kingdom and Canada	2,200,000	3,100,000	5,300,000
Imperial War Graves Commission	9,000	44,640	53,640
	6,364,000	10,633,878	16,997,878
Munitions and Supply			
Departmental Administration	3,700,000	3,300,000	7,000,000
Termination of Contracts	15,000,000	160,000,000	175,000,000
General Expenses, including Housing Development, Cargo Vessels operated by Park Steamships, Emergency Coal Production Board, etc.	50,600,000	49,400,000	100,000,000
	69,300,000	212,700,000	282,000,000

*In many categories, this includes largely amounts required for settlement of outstanding accounts.

Details of estimated expenditures by departments and services for the fiscal year 1945-46—*Con.*

	Amount already granted	Additional amount required to March 31/46	Total amount required for 1945-46
Agriculture			
Agricultural Food Board—			
Administration	21,334	40,695	62,029
Subsidies to Producers of Food Products	27,111,749	27,050,000	54,161,749
Agricultural Supplies Board—			
Administration	20,219	28,005	48,224
Programmes to encourage the production of essential war supplies	450,382	174,111	624,493
Assistance in disposal of agricultural products rendered surplus by war	400,000	1,050,000	1,450,000
Feeds Administrator—			
Administration	17,978	30,168	48,146
Freight assistance on Western feed grains	6,000,000	10,500,000	16,500,000
Subsidy on Western wheat used as feed for live stock	3,250,000	4,750,000	8,000,000
Reserve Stocks of Feed Grains as per Plan "A"	766,667	533,333	1,300,000
Other Programmes	6,400	....	6,400
Flax Fibre Administrator—			
Administration	14,870	21,980	36,850
Fertilizers and Pesticides Administrator—			
Administration	11,336	18,185	29,521
Fertilizers subventions and freight allowances	437,500	....	437,500
Payments to Provinces for use of lime for soil amendment purposes	141,667	250,000	391,667
Seeds Administrator—			
Administration	5,615	7,290	12,905
Seed Programmes	49,179	120,000	169,179
Dairy Products Board—			
Administration	11,494	17,608	29,102
Purchase of Creamery Butter for Storage	2,000,000	....	2,000,000
Meat Board—			
Administration	43,898	61,190	105,088
Premiums on Hog Carcasses suitable for export to Great Britain	5,349,998	8,650,002	14,000,000
Other Programmes	56,500	97,500	154,000
Special Products Board—			
Administration	40,528	41,858	82,386
To provide funds to pay for dehydrated agricultural products prior to receipt of payment from the ultimate purchasers	2,000,000	....	2,000,000
Other Programmes	121,280	26,400	147,680
Seed Export Office—			
Administration	12,283	21,736	34,019
Sundry Services	2,000	....	2,000
	48,342,877	53,490,061	101,832,938
Auditor General's Office			
Audit of War Expenditure	117,509	172,491	290,000
Civil Service Commission			
Supply of Personnel for War Services	240,908	417,600	658,508
External Affairs			
Departmental Administration and Passport Office	46,606	40,694	87,300
Representation Abroad	37,425	34,000	71,425
Repatriation of Prisoners of War	22,000	8,000	30,000
Expenses of Delegation to United Nations Conference at San Francisco	127,700	....	127,700
Sundry Service	41,931	27,969	69,900
	275,662	110,663	386,325

Details of estimated expenditures by departments and services for the fiscal year 1945-46—*Con.*

	Amount already granted	Additional amount required to March 31/46	Total amount required for 1945-46
Finance			
Comptroller of the Treasury	4,205,500	5,206,250	9,411,750
Wartime Prices and Trade Board—			
Administration	5,903,000	10,197,000	16,100,000
Commodity Prices Stabilization Corporation	30,000,000	70,000,000	100,000,000
Payments to Millers and other Manufacturers of Wheat Products	7,500,000	10,500,000	18,000,000
Employees' Plan—Victory Loans—Administration	95,000	135,000	230,000
Expenses of Dominion-Provincial Conference	46,875	100,000	146,875
National Housing Branch—House Conversion Programme	1,482,700	1,858,000	3,340,700
Sundry Services	98,416	47,584	146,000
	49,331,491	98,043,834	147,375,325
Fisheries			
Assistance in the construction of vessels of the Packer-Seiner type	27,200	22,300	49,500
Assistance in the construction of vessels of the Dragger type and the conversion of fishing schooners to Draggers	100,000	50,000	150,000
To provide for the payment of subsidies in connection with the purchase of Canadian Canned Salmon	740,000	460,000	1,200,000
Operation of Experimental Long Line Fishing Vessel	25,000	25,000	50,000
Construction of Fishermen's Floats, Prince Rupert, B.C.	33,638	45,400	79,038
Sundry Services	44,722	77,290	122,012
	970,560	679,990	1,650,550
Justice			
Administration of the Defence of Canada Regulations	1,000	4,000	5,000
Expenditures in connection with Prize Courts	3,000	7,000	10,000
Commission re Inquiry into Disorders at Halifax, N.S.	14,500	.....	14,500
Sundry Services	1,660	2,740	4,400
	20,160	13,740	33,900
Labour			
National Selective Service Programme—			
Labour Supply—Administration	315,850	476,740	792,590
Mobilization Division	1,039,500	135,500	1,175,000
Manpower Statistics Unit	93,130	81,870	175,000
National Registration, Administration	149,170	175,455	324,625
Expenses in connection with work to be performed by the Unemployment Insurance Commission	3,867,200	6,271,600	10,138,800
National War Labour Board and Regional Boards	213,610	236,089	449,699
Wartime Bureau of Technical Personnel	68,990	81,010	150,000
War Emergency Training—Administration	22,580	32,420	55,000
Payments to the Provinces re training for skilled and semi-skilled occupations connected with war work	474,100	325,900	800,000
Payments to the Provinces for Aircraft Manufacturing and for Ground Mechanics	15,000	.....	15,000

Details of estimated expenditures by departments and services for the fiscal year 1945-46—*Con.*

Labour—*Con.*	Amount already granted	Additional amount required to March 31/46	Total amount required for 1945-46
Vocational Training of discharged members of Canada's Armed Forces	1,171,500	2,978,500	4,150,000
Assistance in meeting extra costs of Universities in accelerating certain courses and to provide loans to students.	55,500	19,500	75,000
Assistance to the provinces in recruiting and placing labourers on farms.	170,000	505,000	675,000
Transportation expenses of members of Armed Forces who have been granted harvest leave.	104,000	146,000	250,000
Co-ordination of ship loading and unloading at Halifax.	53,615	54,385	108,000
Stabilization of Longshore Labour, Halifax.	160,000	90,000	250,000
Payments to the Provinces in connection with organizing and operating day nurseries and like facilities.	233,000	217,000	450,000
Industrial Production Cooperation Board—Administration.	56,385	91,615	148,000
Wartime Labour Relations Board—Administration.	43,650	81,350	125,000
Removal of Enemy Aliens from protected areas.	1,104,000	1,546,000	2,650,000
Unemployment Insurance Commission—			
General labour transference in war industries and agriculture.	250,000	300,000	550,000
Assistance to Provinces in transporting labourers to farms.	110,000	290,000	400,000
Transfer of Ex-coal mine workers.	35,000	65,000	100,000
Army Labour Annual Revolving Fund.	40,000	110,000	150,000
Japanese Wood Projects Annual Revolving Fund.	83,000	117,000	200,000
Industrial Selection and Release Board and Committees.	.....	500,000	500,000
Vocational Training Co-ordination Act—			
Payments to the Provinces under Agreements—			
Respecting training and retraining of former war workers.	333,334	1,166,666	1,500,000
Respecting Dominion Assistance to Vocational Schools	333,334	1,666,666	2,000,000
Respecting capital expenditures for Vocational School Buildings and Equipment.	500,000	2,500,000	3,000,000
Sundry Services.	58,398	26,603	85,001
	11,153,846	20,287,869	31,441,715
Mines and Resources			
Administrative Branch—			
Report on resources, etc. of Canada's Northwest Region.	750	4,250	5,000
Mines and Geology Branch—			
Reimbursement of R.C.A.F. for aerial photography	1,200	648,800	650,000
Remodelling and expansion of plant of Abasand Oils Limited.	350,000	50,000	400,000
Investigations of petroliferous deposits and areas.	83,333	116,667	200,000
Special exploration, etc. re supply of strategic minerals.	6,850	3,150	10,000
Bureau of Mines—Metallic Minerals—			
Services to War Departments and expansion of physical metallurgy investigations.	141,666	198,334	340,000
Bureau of Mines—Extension to Metallurgical Laboratories.	301,665	423,670	725,335
Bureau of Geology and Topography—Postwar Reconstruction Programmes—Planning.	65,917	219,083	285,000
Sundry Services.	29,805	42,975	72,780

Details of estimated expenditures by departments and services for the fiscal year 1945-46—*Con.*

Mines and Resources—*Con.*	Amount already granted	Additional amount required to March 31/46	Total amount required for 1945-46
Lands, Parks and Forests Branch—			
Dominion Forest Service—			
Internment and Prisoners of War Operations	23,335	36,665	60,000
Forest Products Laboratories	32,160	49,840	82,000
Alternative Service Work Camps	55,630	62,370	118,000
Land Registry — Alaska Highway — Legal, Survey and other costs	26,000	19,300	45,300
Postwar Reconstruction Programmes—Planning	21,508	110,492	132,000
National Parks Bureau—Alternative Service Work Camps	149,000	200,000	349,000
Surveys and Engineering Branch—			
Prince Rupert-Terrace-Cedarvale Highway	14,500	20,500	35,000
Employment of Persons of the Japanese Race and/or Japanese Nationals	210,000	210,000	420,000
Postwar Reconstruction Programmes—Planning	335,192	288,498	623,690
Sundry Services	51,432	54,615	106,047
Immigration Branch—			
Expenses in connection with British Evacuee Children	60,000	....	60,000
Expenditures in connection with looking after Canadian Interests Abroad	309,150	465,850	775,000
Medical Inspection of dependents of members of the Armed Forces and of the Corps of (Civilian) Canadian Fire Fighters	37,500	52,500	90,000
Assistance to National Advisory Committee for Children from Overseas	20,833	29,167	50,000
Sundry Services	15,487	8,900	24,387
	2,342,913	3,315,626	5,658,539
National Harbours Board			
Equipment and Operation of Fire Tug *Rouille* at Halifax	21,000	46,000	67,000
Halifax Harbour—Special Fire Protection	35,000	15,000	50,000
Halifax—Reconstruction of Transit Shed No. 21	80,000	220,000	300,000
Halifax—Construction of additional platform and shelter roof at embarkation areas, ocean terminals	25,000	....	25,000
Vancouver—Dredging False Creek to depth of 14 feet	2,500	....	2,500
	163,500	281,000	444,500
National Health and Welfare			
Old Age Pensions and Pensions to the Blind	3,700,000	5,500,000	9,200,000
Industrial Hygiene, including Inspection of Industrial Plants	14,575	22,435	37,010
Laboratory analyses and services for Department of National Defence	5,825	....	5,825
Public Health Engineering—Inspection of Camp Sites and Airports for Department of National Defence in connection with Sanitation and Water Supply	14,570	20,430	35,000
Quarantine Medical Service—at Ports of Halifax, Quebec, Sydney, Montreal and Other Ports	35,525	22,316	57,841

Details of estimated expenditures by departments and services for the fiscal year 1945-46—*Con.*

National Health and Welfare—*Con.*	Amount already granted	Additional amount required to March 31/46	Total amount required for 1945-46
Processing, Storage and Distribution of Blood for Transfusion	237,764	....	237,764
Maintenance, medical and other care of incapacitated non-resident seamen pending deportation	16,665	23,335	40,000
Grant to the Canadian Nurses Association to increase the supply of qualified nurses in Canada	104,150	55,800	159,950
Contribution towards Health Services at Halifax	18,750	11,250	30,000
Sundry Services	54,622	56,392	111,014
	4,202,446	5,711,958	9,914,404
National Research Council			
Special War Activities	1,550,000	1,733,700	3,283,700
National War Services			
Departmental Administration	36,904	49,779	86,683
War Charities Division—			
Administration	29,109	33,601	62,710
Auxiliary Services	8,050,000	9,450,000	17,500,000
Recoverable Advances for purchases of Canteen Supplies	1,005,750	....	1,005,750
Salvage Division	72,135	68,000	140,135
Corps of (Civilian) Canadian Fire Fighters for the United Kingdom	210,655	....	210,655
Citizenship Division	13,365	37,070	50,435
Censorship—			
Administration	8,960	4,325	13,285
Information and Records Branch	55,365	5,000	60,365
Postal Censorship	601,723	25,000	626,723
Censorship of Publications	46,115	14,500	60,615
Telegraph and Cable, etc. Censorship	135,815	29,400	165,215
Canadian Broadcasting Corporation—			
Short Wave Station	713,469	390,847	1,104,316
National Film Board—			
Special War Film Library	17,167	22,833	40,000
Wartime Information Film Programme	504,167	585,833	1,090,000
Acquisition of Film Prints for Sale	12,500	17,500	30,000
Still Photograph Production and Distribution	40,750	79,250	120,000
Revolving Fund for Production of Films	500,000	....	500,000
Sundry Services	29,704	43,636	73,340
	12,083,653	10,856,574	22,940,227
Post Office			
Canadian Postal Corps	345,705	....	345,705
Sundry Services	3,823	2,100	5,923
	349,528	2,100	351,628
Privy Council			
Statutory Orders and Regulations Division	15,263	22,165	37,428
Wartime Information Board	332,917	463,083	796,000
Rehabilitation Information Committee	540,092	100,000	640,092
Sundry Services	7,145	11,777	18,922
	895,417	597,025	1,492,442

Details of estimated expenditures by departments and services for the fiscal year 1945-46—*Con.*

Public Works	Amount already granted	Additional amount required to March 31/46	Total amount required for 1945-46
Chief Architect's Branch—			
Repairs, Alterations, Operation and Maintenance of Buildings occupied for War Purposes	852,333	1,427,667	2,280,000
Rental of Premises occupied for War Purposes	850,000	1,050,000	1,900,000
Furniture, etc., for War Employees	250,000	350,000	600,000
Postwar Construction Programme—Preparation of plans, specifications, etc.	15,000	35,000	50,000
Armoury accommodation for Canadian Officers Training Corps Units	....	55,000	55,000
Halifax, N.S.—Construction of temporary office building for Dept. of Veterans Affairs.	50,000	55,000	105,000
London, Ont.—Purchase and Alterations to Garvey Building for Dept. of Veterans Affairs	75,500	114,500	190,000
Ottawa, Ont.—Addition to Temporary Building No. 8, Carling Ave.	15,000	....	15,000
Ottawa, Ont.—Annex to Records Building, Carling Ave.	41,000	....	41,000
Quebec, P.Q.—Construction of Temporary Office Building.	200,000	220,000	420,000
Vancouver, B.C.—Construction of Temporary Office Building for Dept. of Veterans Affairs	25,000	335,000	360,000
Norman Wells, N.W.T.—Office and Living Accommodation	20,000	....	20,000
Chief Engineer's Branch—			
North Sydney, N.S.—Reconstruction of wharf and terminal facilities	110,500	....	110,500
Saint John Harbour (Courtenay Bay)—Dredging	35,000	....	35,000
Waterways, Alta.—Improvements and Dredging in Athabaska and Clearwater Rivers	68,800	5,900	74,700
Post-war Construction Programme—Surveys, preparation of plans and specifications, etc.	155,800	194,200	350,000
Seymour Narrows, B.C.—Removal of Ripple Rocks No. 1 and 2	257,697	30,000	287,697
Telegraph Branch—			
To provide for 24-hour service on the Pacific Coast	32,500	47,500	80,000
Ottawa—Telephone Service	154,000	166,000	320,000
Contingencies	11,000	22,000	33,000
Sundry Services	12,700	8,500	21,200
	3,231,830	4,116,267	7,348,097
Reconstruction			
To provide for expenses of Surveys, Investigations and Research in various fields in order to obtain necessary data upon which Reconstruction plans and policies may be based	107,500	200,000	307,500
Reconstruction Projects	....	5,000,000	5,000,000
	107,500	5,200,000	5,307,500
Royal Canadian Mounted Police			
Increased Activities of the Force due to the War	3,183,675	2,479,625	5,663,300
Security Control Service	47,207	17,207	64,414
	3,230,882	2,496,832	5,727,714

Details of estimated expenditures by departments and services for the fiscal year 1945-46—*Con.*

Secretary of State	Amount already granted	Additional amount required to March 31/46	Total amount required for 1945-46
Department Generally	2,000	6,000	8,000
Sundry Services	751	250	1,001
	2,751	6,250	9,001
Trade and Commerce			
Export Permit Branch—Administration	72,938	108,487	181,425
Canadian Shipping Board—			
Administration	45,695	66,405	112,100
Revolving Chartering Fund	200,000	300,000	500,000
Shipping Priorities Committee—Administration	20,860	34,140	55,000
Steamship Subsidies War Stabilization Fund	200,000	300,000	500,000
Canadian Export Board—			
Administration	41,236	68,555	109,791
Revolving Fund	500,000	500,000	1,000,000
Sundries	5,000	....	5,000
	1,085,729	1,377,587	2,463,316
Transport			
Departmental Administration	16,810	26,125	42,935
Transport Controller's Office	136,250	180,750	317,000
Director of Merchant Seamen	1,476,670	1,991,670	3,468,340
Joint U.S.A.-Canada Defence—Purchase, leasing or otherwise acquiring properties	25,000	75,000	100,000
Marine Service—			
Marine Service Steamers, including Icebreakers	83,400	103,600	187,000
War Bonus to Crews of Departmental Vessels operating in War Zones	41,600	58,400	100,000
Dominion Lighthouse Depot, Prescott—			
Revolving Fund	500,000	....	500,000
Aids to Navigation	20,000	22,000	42,000
Nautical Services	34,041	93,959	128,000
Compensation to Masters and Crews of Canadian Vessels for loss of personal effects	41,000	34,000	75,000
Government Employees Compensation Act—			
Administration	27,720	41,280	69,000
Railway and Steamship Service—			
Cost of fitting Canadian Ships, as well as foreign flag vessels either seized in prize or requisitioned by the Canadian Government, with special defensive apparatus	87,500	87,500	175,000
Design, construction and operation of additional harbour and transportation facilities at the Port of Halifax, N.S.	41,666	264,444	306,110
Assistance to the Canadian National Railway Co. in the development of the iron ore deposit owned by the Steep Rock Iron Mines Ltd. near Atitokan, Ont	416,667	828,752	1,245,419
Contribution towards the reduction of freight rates on iron ore to be shipped from Steep Rock Mines Ltd	119,271	193,409	312,680
	3,067,595	4,000,889	7,068,484
Air Service—			
Special Radio Interception and Monitoring Services, Weather Observation and Teletype Services—			
Radio Service—Operation and Maintenance	911,000	1,494,000	2,405,000
Radio Service—Construction and Improvements	171,000	274,000	445,000
Meteorological Service	872,920	1,227,080	2,100,000

Details of estimated expenditures by departments and services for the fiscal year 1945-46—*Con.*

Transport—*Con.*	Amount already granted	Additional amount required to March 31/46	Total amount required for 1945-46
Civil Aviation Division—			
Airway and Airport Traffic Control	250,000	416,130	666,130
Operation and Maintenance of Municipal (Terminal) Airports	140,000	373,555	513,555
Moncton to Newfoundland Airline	25,000	50,000	75,000
Airways and Airports—Construction and Improvements	135,208	219,292	354,500
Care and Maintenance of R.C.A.F. Airfields transferred to the Department of Transport	87,000	263,000	350,000
Mackenzie River Route	175,000	279,500	454,500
Northwest Staging Route	641,875	588,625	1,230,500
Construction of additional Hangar Space, Hospital and other facilities for use of the R.A.F. Transport Command at North Bay and Dorval Airports	150,000	210,000	360,000
Northeast (Crimson) Staging Route—			
Operation and Maintenance—			
Maintenance of Airfields	75,335	263,665	339,000
Operation and maintenance of Radio Facilities	5,000	17,500	22,500
Operation and maintenance of Meterological Facilities	22,220	77,780	100,000
Canadian Government Trans-Atlantic Air Service—			
Payment to Trans-Canada Air Lines in connection with the carriage of Trans-Atlantic Air Mail	1,607,690	.....	1,607,690
	5,269,248	5,754,127	11,023,375
Veterans Affairs			
Treatment and Pension Examinations—Members and Ex-members of the Armed Forces (Present War)	5,075,000	11,925,000	17,000,000
Treatment—Royal Canadian Mouned Police	35,000	65,000	100,000
Pensions—Armed Forces; Fishermen; Seamen; Special Constables, R.C.M.P.; Civil Servants; Auxiliary Services and Civil Defence Workers	8,550,000	16,450,000	25,000,000
Detention Allowances on behalf of Canadian Seamen	39,000	11,000	50,000
Pensions under the Dual Service Pension Order and War Veterans Allowance Benefits to veterans of the present war and of the Northwest Rebellion of 1885	60,000	140,000	200,000
Gratuities—Canadian Fire Fighters	70,000	105,000	175,000
Gratuities—Auxiliary Services	.....	70,000	70,000
Civil Defence	82,075	87,925	170,000
Rehabilitation Benefits	3,050,000	9,950,000	13,000,000
Investigations, Dependents' Allowance Board	16,000	54,000	70,000
Sundries	39,347	4,850	44,197
Hospital Accommodation and Facilities	183,752	15,640,102	15,823,854
	17,200,174	54,502,877	71,703,051
Active Assets			
Purchase of Railway Equipment—			
Canadian National Railways	4,587,340	19,056,754	23,644,094
Loan to Village of Dawson Creek, B.C. re Sewage Disposal System	30,000	23,000	53,000
	4,617,340	19,079,754	23,697,094

In all cases we are showing the amounts which have already been allotted to these various departments and purposes out of the interim appropriation granted by parliament in April of this year, and the additional amount which is expected to be required for the remainder of this fiscal year for the settlement of outstanding accounts and for expenditure incurred and paid during the remainder of the year. It will be noted that all about $86,000,000 of the $2,000,000,000 interim appropriation has already been allotted to departments. The totals for the various categories for the year as a whole are also given. While these details, taken all together, add up to a rather formidable table, I think the hon. members will appreciate having this information in this way for convenient reference.

I am also proposing to place upon *Hansard* at the same time a table of charges to the war appropriations by departments and main categories for each of the past five fiscal years. This record of actual expenditures will, I think, be of considerable use to members in placing in proper perspective the amounts currently required. Those who wish to compare the present appropriation and estimates with previous appropriations and estimates will find those for recent years conveniently set forth in *Hansard* of February 11, 1944, in the speech which I made in introducing the legislation last year, corresponding to the present legislation. The table is as follows:

Charges to War Appropriations by Fiscal Years, 1940-41 to 1944-45
(Thousands of dollars)

Departments and major items	1940-41	1941-42	1942-43	1943-44	1944-45
National Defence—Army Services....	$380,345	$502,773	$1,021,944	$1,312,348	$1,243,732
National Defence—Naval Services...	88,163	129,368	210,182	369,556	417,099
National Defence—Air Services—					
Overseas War Establishment.....	5,362	13,333	23,666	383,888	759,070
Home War Establishment.....	49,415	109,820	226,550	312,761	227,942
Air Training	121,502	247,383	366,897	233,893	272,342
Sundry	....	113	122	124	103
	176,279	370,649	617,235	930,666	1,259,457
National Defence—Sundry Services—					
Dependents Allowance Supplementary Grants Fund.....	....	15	944	2,743	4,041
Internment Operations	805	1,370	1,556	1,100	1,580
Inspection Board of the U.K. and Canada	....	4,876	10,946	10,522	8,362
Sundry	2,085	2,135	2,400	2,092	4,039
	2,890	8,396	15,846	16,457	18,022
Department of Munitions and Supply—					
Administration	2,068	4,930	9,457	9,957	8,842
Investment in plant and equipment:					
Acquisition of U.K. Assets.....	....	....	200,000	5,000	1,964
Other plant and equipment.....	64,902	135,347	208,524	216,641	168,942
Investment in production assets (working capital)	12,398	106,560	245,000	427,724	4,841
Sundry	586	5,854	16,151	28,439	31,255
	79,954	252,691	679,132	687,761	215,844
Agriculture—					
Disposal of agricultural products rendered surplus by the war....	4,350	2,260	2,901	1,876	1,194
Subsidy to increase export bacon price to secure adequate supplies for the U.K.	....	2,281	....	....	....
Payments on cheese exports to the U.K.	....	1,784	....	....	....
Freight assistance on western feed grains	....	3,972	10,318	17,754	15,943

Charges to War Appropriations by Fiscal Years, 1940-41 to 1944-45—*Con.*
(Thousands of dollars)

Departments and major items	1940-41	1941-42	1942-43	1943-44	1944-45
Agriculture—*Con.*					
Payment to increase the income of farmers in the spring wheat area of western Canada	....	16,299	2,678	19	2
Fertilizer subventions and freight allowance	....	....	1,036	903	350
Subsidy on western wheat used exclusively as feed for live stock.	....	....	836	4,500	7,471
Subsidy on milk and milk products.	....	....	....	29,505	42,330
Premium on hog carcasses suitable for export to Great Britain	....	....	....	3,855	14,091
To provide for reserve stocks of feed grains	....	....	....	1,292	715
Sundry	140	791	2,211	4,589	5,958
	4,490	27,387	19,980	64,293	88,054
Finance—					
Comptroller of the Treasury	1,602	3,866	6,493	8,404	9,216
Payment of premiums on the purchase of Dominion of Canada Registered Stock	....	8,100	126	13	14
Wartime Prices and Trade Board—Administration	(1)....	1,437	9,278	13,705	12,720
Subsidies due to application of Order placing a ceiling over all prices	....	3,242	67,715	81,519	107,338
Accountable advances for payment of drawback claims to millers and other manufacturers of wheat products	....	....	(2)....	20,500	19,700
Deficits of Canadian Wheat Board	....	....	....	....	13,058
Home Conversion Programme	....	....	....	....	4,053
Old Age Pensions, increased benefits	....	....	....	3,062	8,788
Sundry	90	80	1,051	1,258	1,632
	1,692	16,725	84,663	128,461	176,519
Labour—					
Industrial training	1,400	4,569	4,360	3,478	1,617
Training aircraft mechanics	249	1,489	2,019	1,378	333
National Selective Service	....	....	4,737	9,346	11,098
Removal of enemy aliens from protected areas	....	....	4,328	2,545	2,137
Sundry	248	496	1,383	2,891	4,479
	1,897	6,554	16,827	19,638	19,664
Mines and Resources—					
Prince Rupert-Terrace-Cedarvale Highway	....	10	2,965	5,750	2,499
Employment of Japanese	....	71	1,686	894	511
Sundry	292	678	1,626	2,761	2,804
	292	759	6,277	9,405	5,814

(1) Included under Department of Labour.
(2) See Department of Trade and Commerce.

Charges to War Appropriations by Fiscal Years, 1940-41 to 1944-45—*Con.*
(Thousands of dollars)

Departments and major items	1940-41	1941-42	1942-43	1943-44	1944-45
National War Services—					
War Charities	....	1,175	6,499	10,910	15,933
National Film Board	....	10	122	1,220	1,341
Censorship	....	22	(3)1,070	(3)1,727	(3)1,856
Sundry	2,370	2,011	954	1,330	6,852
	2,370	3,218	8,645	15,187	25,982
Pensions and National Health—					
Treatment—Defence Forces	2,144	2,696	4,175	6,456	11,449
Pensions—Defence Forces	189	886	2,760	5,637	11,939
Civil Defence	140	619	5,027	1,724	484
Sundry	897	1,412	2,358	4,135	8,887
	3,370	5,613	14,320	17,952	32,759
Public Works	4,917	4,497	6,880	6,467	6,500
Privy Council	6	4	1,503	845	1,758
Royal Canadian Mounted Police	2,385	3,001	3,870	4,267	3,709
Trade and Commerce—					
Gift of wheat to Greece	....	....	3,835	8,798	6,749
Accountable advances for payment of drawback claims to millers and other manufacturers of wheat products	....	....	3,000	(4)....	(4)....
National Research Council	419	1,125	2,091	2,640	2,932
Sundry	21	80	529	745	670
	440	1,205	9,455	12,183	10,351
Transport	1,464	5,228	5,762	9,941	16,433
Acquisition of Airfields and Works from United States Government	....	....	....	66,600	18,661
Other Departments and Miscellaneous	1,091	1,606	1,728	2,393	4,543
Military Relief	....	....	....	....	50,199
Total Expenditures	752,045	1,339,674	2,724,249	3,674,420	3,615,100
Charged to Active Assets	26,379	42,817	65,232	91,906	35,239
Total Charges	778,424	1,382,491	2,789,481	3,766,326	3,650,339
The War Appropriation (U.K. Financing) Act, 1942	....	....	1,000,000	....	....
The War Appropriation (United Nations Mutual Aid) Acts 1943 and 1944	....	....	....	912,603	803,346
GRAND TOTAL	778,424	1,382,491	3,789,481	4,678,929	4,453,685

(3) Including the censorship of telegrams, cables, etc., which was detailed under National Defence—Army, in previous years.
(4) See Department of Finance.

Hon. members will note that the amount which the army estimates it will require for the current fiscal year is approximately $1,068 million, which compares with an estimate of $1,535 million for last year and actual expenditures for last year of $1,244 million. I should point out that it has always been particularly difficult to forecast the army's requirements accurately because it has drawn the bulk of the supplies it has currently required from United Kingdom stocks and paid for them as they were used. Consequently its expenditures depended very much upon the actual course of operations, and it was necessary to leave a considerable margin of safety in such items as ammunition, armament, and fighting vehicles. On the other hand, this year the army in particular is faced with a large accumulation of outstanding accounts to be settled for items supplied to it in previous years both from Canadian and United Kingdom sources. This will be quite evident to members if they examine with care the items for the additional amounts required in the balance of the fiscal year in the various categories under army services, where considerable amounts are shown for items of which obviously no substantial future deliveries will now be necessary. Of course, the principal questions of substance in regard to the expenditures which the army will be incurring henceforward are the rates of demobilization and repatriation, and the size and nature of the occupation forces and the continuing army establishment. These are matters which must be left for the Minister of National Defence to explain and to discuss with the house, and I shall therefore not attempt to make any comment upon them except to say that on financial grounds, as well as other equally important grounds, the government has been determined to see that nothing is allowed to stand in the way of the most rapid and most equitable repatriation and demobilization of our forces.

For naval services the amount of the estimate for the current year is approximately $300 million, which compares with an estimate last year of $410 million, and actual expenditures last year of $417 million. It will be noted from an examination of the details in the case of the navy that there are still substantial amounts to pay on outstanding accounts for equipment, ammunition, armaments, vessels and supplies of one sort and another which were obtained during the course of hostilities. The fairly rapid pace of demobilization in the naval services is indicated by the fact that pay and allowances for the last seven months of the year, that is, the additional amounts required for this category, are only about half what they are for the first five months, despite the fact that special factors like clothing allowances and extra leave upon discharge swell the costs of this item.

In the case of air services, the estimate requested, after allowing for recoverable items, is approximately $600 million compared with an estimate last year of $1,090 million and actual expenditures last year of approximately $1,260 million. It will be noted in the case of air services that expenditures for the latter part of the year are substantially below those for the first five months. When one examines the details, the reason for this becomes evident as it shows up in the practical disappearance of the cost of maintenance of overseas squadrons. This is possible because the air force does not have now such large outstanding accounts as the other services have for supplies already received. The reason for this is that the cost of the overseas squadrons is paid monthly and there are not the same outstanding problems in determining the rate of such payments as there are in the case of the army.

I think it is unnecessary for me to make any particular comment on the items for sundry services under the Department of National Defence, which have been estimated for the current year at approximately $17 million as compared with $22 million last year. I should point out, however, that for administrative reasons the responsibility for military relief was transferred to the Mutual Aid board from the Department of National Defence, and consequently the expenditures on, and estimates for, this item no longer appear among the sundry national defence services, as I indicated they would in April of this year. Now that I have made reference to this item, I may well go on to point out that expenditures on it last year are shown at a total of $50 million, and the estimates of the amount required this year are shown to be $34 million, all of which have already been allotted. These expenditures represent the cost of supplies procured in Canada and shipped overseas for distribution by the combined military authorities during the course of military operations and in the zones of military control. They represent a part of the cost of military operations which takes the form of the provision of supplies to civilian populations on whom the military are dependent for assistance and co-operation or for whose maintenance they are responsible during the time they are in control of the territory. The countries receiving such supplies

have been requested to pay for them, and it is expected that a large part of the moneys expended in this way will be recoverable.

It will be noted that the estimate for the Department of Munitions and Supply for the current year is $282 million, as compared with an estimate of $183 million last year and actual expenditures last year of approximately $216 million. These figures all exclude the effects of the amount recoverable from munitions production allotment fund and allotted to other expenditures outside the department which is shown separately at the bottom of the summary table. The nature of the expenditures for which this estimate is requested has largely changed from previous years, as now the main item is $175 million to cover the costs arising from the termination of contracts. These termination or cancellation costs are to be covered by one large item in this way rather than by individual items under the various headings appropriate to the use for which the deliveries were intended had the war gone on. Broadly speaking, this item therefore represents the cost of terminating our war production suddenly as a result of the unexpectedly early end of the hostilities against Japan. I should add that this figure does not represent the total cost, as there is also likely to be necessary some writing off of amounts advanced for production out of the munitions production allotment fund. As I have already warned the house, however, any estimate of these termination costs at this time is only an informed guess and it will be some months before we can be sure whether the figure included here is too high or too low.

The costs of Mutual Aid this year have been met from the interim war appropriation passed by parliament in April, as was specifically authorized in that appropriation, as well as from some funds carried over from the earlier Mutual Aid appropriations. Mutual Aid requirements were particularly heavy during the first five months of this current year—indeed, right up until the end of hostilities. Shipments of munitions and other war supplies to allied countries were at a high level in the opening months of the year while hostilities were still proceeding in Europe. After victory in Europe, the need for munitions and military supplies fell off substantially, but a good deal of war production was still required, particularly of aircraft and naval vessels for the war in the Pacific. On the other hand, there was a very drastic decline in the expenditures overseas of the Canadian army and air force, which had been providing the United Kingdom with Canadian dollars to pay for the cost of war supplies required from Canada. Consequently the need for Mutual Aid on the part of Britain remained at a high level during the period of intensive preparation for large scale operations in the Pacific.

In the figures of requirements for the current year for Mutual Aid, I have separated those for UNRRA, which will continue, from those for allied countries to which transfers of supplies as Mutual Aid were terminated as of September 2. The total allotted to Mutual Aid from the interim appropriation was $720,224,000. The amount required to complete our first contribution to UNRRA, in addition to the expenditures last year, is $65,907,000, all of which will, I expect, be spent this year. Deducting this from the total allotment leaves $654,317,000 as the amount required for Mutual Aid to allied countries from this year's appropriation. This figure includes the estimated cost of production of certain items not delivered by September 1, but which will be completed in the expectation that they can be sold. The proceeds of such sales cannot yet be estimated, but they will in due course be credited to our Mutual Aid account.

It will be noted that I have included a figure of $25,000,000 for UNRRA in the further amounts required for the current year but not yet provided. This is intended to enable us to furnish, before the end of our fiscal year, a portion of a second contribution to UNRRA, which the Canadian government has agreed to make, provided that the United States and other contributing nations will also make a second contribution. The total of our second contribution would be the same as our first, that is, one per cent of our estimated national income for the year ended June 20, 1943, which amounts to $77,000,000 in all. It would mainly take the form of contributions of Canadian supplies, but it may be that we will contribute a portion in cash, as we did the first time, to provide UNRRA itself with some funds to meet expenses in Canada and elsewhere. I might add that in fact UNRRA is spending a large amount of its own free funds in Canada, as practically the whole of our first contribution was committed for the purchase of Canadian supplies at a fairly early date this year. I feel sure that all Canadians will be gratified that Canada is able to furnish substantial amounts of urgently needed supplies to the poor and suffering people of Allied countries through this democratic, international organization. The house will, I understand, hear further about UNRRA, if it wishes, during the debate on the war appropriation, and there will be an opportunity to discuss Canada's part in UNRRA.

The amount estimated to be required for the Department of Veterans Affairs is, of course, considerably higher than in previous years. It includes pension costs for the veterans of this war and for various others who have been accorded pension rights similar to the armed services such as merchant seamen, fishermen, civil defence workers, etc. It also includes costs of hospitalization and rehabilitation benefits for veterans. It does not, however, include the cost of war service gratuites and reestablishment credits, which are payable by statute out of unappropriated moneys in the consolidated revenue fund. The amount which we estimate will be required for war service gratuities and re-establishment credits is approximately $240 million, which will, of course, be an expenditure in addition to the appropriation being requested under this resolution and in addition to the amounts specified in the main estimates which have been presented to the house.

It will be noted that only the relatively small amount of $5 million for reconstruction projects has been included in the estimated amounts required this year. This is intended to cover only the costs incurred before the end of March next in projects not directly provided for by other departments, such as public works or housing, and which may be required, it is believed, on a relatively small scale in a few localities to meet the danger of unemployment in those areas of persons who cannot reasonably be expected to move to other areas where work is available and to make a start on some urgent developmental projects. This is in accordance with the general policy explained to the house the other evening by the Minister of Reconstruction. As he explained, there is a large volume of private work ready to go forward as soon as materials and labour can be made available for it. Much of this private investment is necessary if Canadians are going to be able to have steady and remunerative jobs in industry. In addition, all available building materials and, I believe, building labour, are urgently needed now for the building of houses, and we do not wish to utilize our scarce building supplies for public projects that can be deferred until later, when the acute housing demands have been met. So far as one can tell at this time, it appears that total expenditures in Canada, private, public and for exports, will be sufficient to maintain employment as a whole at satisfactory levels, despite the rapid rate of demobilization and the termination of war production. There will obviously be problems in the movement of workers to take advantage of the new demands which are taking the place of the war demands, which have now ceased. I do not myself believe that large expenditures on reconstruction projects will be needed in the next six months to facilitate this process of readjustment. The general policy and philosophy of the government in regard to public investment have, of course, been set forth at considerable length in the proposals made by the government to the dominion-provincial conference on reconstruction, and I do not believe it is necessary for me to enter upon them here. What I do wish to point out is that the provision made in the present appropriation is based upon an appraisal of the situation over the next six months only, and cannot be taken as any guide to the scale of reconstruction expenditures that will later be required.

In conclusion I would like to say a word or two about the general scale and nature of our expenditures for the current year. Adding together the appropriations for war expenditures, the items covered in the main and supplementary estimates, and the items to which I have referred above for gratuities and re-establishment credits, one obtains a total of between $4,600 million and $4,700 million for expenditures in the current fiscal year. To this must be added certain other cash requirements, particularly those for export credits and the financing of the foreign exchange control board, which will bring our total requirements for the year above $5 billion. These are formidable figures. They show that the scale of our financial operations remains at the high levels achieved in the war. They make clear that the task of the Minister of Finance is still a difficult one. On the other hand, they mask to some extent the decline—the rapid decline —that is already occurring in the government's demands upon goods and services of the community. Already the government has cancelled practically all its contracts for purchases for war purposes. The substantial expenditures still to be made on these accounts represent almost entirely settlements in respect of past operations and the cancellation of contracts. At the same time, our armed forces are being demobilized as rapidy as is reasonably possible in all the circumstances. Indeed, I believe that this month the total number of men being released exceeds an average of 2,000 a day. The government is paying these men substantial amounts of deferred pay, of pay for leave upon discharge and clothing allowances, and will continue payments to them for some months in the form of gratuities and reestablishment credits. These men will nevertheless be available for useful employment in other fields. Even our expenditures under the main estimates this year

include a much higher proportion than normal of what we may term "transfer payments," which do not represent a demand on the part of the government for either goods or services. This applies to the very large figures both for family allowances and for interest on the public debt, which, taken together, constitute well over half of the total of these estimates.

Bearing these facts in mind. I think it is evident that despite the apparently large totals of government expenditure this fiscal year, the activities of the government are in fact being rapidly curtailed, and supplies and services are being released quickly for use in meeting the demands of Canadian enterprise and Canadian consumers.

I should like before concluding to say a word or two about the scale of our expenditures and other cash requirements in relation to the ninth victory loan. This loan is to be obtained in the latter part of next month and the early part of November. It is to be our greatest victory loan, the climax of the series of outstanding successes which have been achieved in this vital part of our war finance. We have already announced that the minimum objective for the loan is to be one and one-half billion dollars—the largest objective we have ever set. It is natural that many people should be surprised that we should need so much money now that the fighting is all over, and I want to make the reason clear.

In the first place it should be realized that this is really two loans in one—it is intended to cover our borrowing needs for a year, and not for half a year, as previous victory loans have done. This is possible because our expenditures are declining rapidly and we believe we can now get along with one loan—if it is a big one. Our last two victory loans have each produced about a billion and a half dollars, which in each case has met our needs for about half a year. This new loan, which we hope and expect will exceed its objective and yield well over one and one-half billion, is intended to cover our needs for a full year. There will be no victory loan or similar loan next spring.

During the year following this ninth victory loan, and for which it is expected to provide the moneys required over and above our revenues, our expenditures and other cash requirements, including the loans we propose to make to allied nations for reconstruction, will probably amount in all to about four billion dollars. About thirty per cent of this will be for the normal and continuing expenses of civil government. The balance will include the costs of demobilization and rehabilitation of our servicemen, the costs of bringing them home from overseas, the costs of our occupation forces and post-war military forces, part of the cost of terminating war production, and some costs for reconstruction and new post-war development. It will also include hundreds of millions—how many I cannot yet say—for loans to allied nations for supplies urgently needed from Canada during the period of reconstruction. The government intends to ask authority from parliament in this session to make such loans to allied countries on a large scale.

In view of these large requirements I believe we must borrow something approaching two billion dollars for this period. This is a huge amount, even though it is much less than the totals we have borrowed in recent years. Something on this scale is required, however, if the total reduction in our expenditures and cash requirements is not to be reflected solely in our borrowing. It is with these needs in mind that we established one and one-half billion as the minimum objective for the ninth victory loan. I hope and believe that we will be able to exceed this objective by a good margin and thereby obtain from this one loan nearly all the borrowed money we shall require to carry us through until the fall of next year.

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): I am sure that the house has listened with a great deal of interest to what the minister has had to say. It is not my intention to speak at this time. I had intended to speak for half an hour or more, and will take the opportunity of doing so later. For the information of the house I may say that one of our members, who is very much concerned with the war appropriation measure, has to leave, and I am therefore giving the floor to him. I refer to the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green).

Before he rises to speak I should like to say a word or two with respect to one item mentioned by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley), namely, the forthcoming victory loan. Plans for the securing of that loan is the task of the government, but I wish to say to the house at this time that we shall be glad to lend our support to the successful flotation of that loan. With these brief remarks I give the floor to the hon. member for Vancouver South because what I have to say can be said at a later time.

Mr. H. C. GREEN (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful to my leader for giving me this opportunity to speak, and to the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (Mr. Coldwell), who also agreed that I should go ahead.

I propose to say a few words about our defence forces and something about the policy that will be adopted with regard to them. I had intended to make my suggestions when the house is in committee, and I am a little premature in making them now on behalf of my party, but I am sure that the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Abbott) and the Minister of National Defence for Air (Mr. Gibson) will understand my reasons for doing so.

We are convinced that it would be in the interests of the house and of the country if the Minister of National Defence would make some broad statement of government policy with regard to Canada's defence forces in the years that lie ahead, rather than making two statements, one for the navy and one for the army, with a third statement to come from the Minister of National Defence for Air. It will be very difficult for the hon. members to give proper consideration to the policy if it comes piecemeal, namely, if the navy policy comes first and then two or three days later the army policy, and finally two or three days after that the air force policy. We should like to know the general picture. It may be that the air force is to be greater, as compared with the other forces, than before the war, or the same may be true of the navy or the army. We should like to have the over-all picture at the opening of the debate if the government can arrange to give it to us.

It seems to me that at the present time the Canadian people are very uncertain as to what the defence policy of this nation should be; perhaps there is some uncertainty in the minds of the members of the house and of the ministry, because it is a very difficult problem to solve. But there are certain facts which should be kept in mind. The first is that our civilization has been saved by our efforts during the last war. That is something we should never overlook. We should also remember that for a whole year the British peoples—I mean the peoples of the different nations of the commonwealth and of the colonial empire—stood alone between our enemies and the destruction of civilization. None of the peoples of the empire have any reason to hang their heads over the part they have played during the war. And of course that is true of Canada. Our fighting power was used to great advantage and was a real factor in winning the war. Our production of supplies and equipment has been splendid, and we have every reason to be proud of the part we have played.

Now Canada and the other nations of the world who believe in freedom are determined that there shall be no more wars; but rather than take the attitude which was taken after the last war by saying, "Now let us forget all about war; there will never be war again," we are determined to defend the peace by force if necessary. I think that is the attitude of every nation that believes in freedom. Canada must play her part in defending the peace. There are other factors, too, which must be kept in mind. There have been extensive scientific developments. I need only mention radar, rocket projectiles and the atomic bomb, which is made primarily from uranium from the pitchblende found in our own Northwest Territories. That fact alone should give Canadians a good deal of concern over our future defence policy. As I say, there have been tremendous scientific developments during the period of the war. Another fact is that Canada is now more vulnerable than ever before. I certainly hope this may not be, but I think we must bear in mind that with all these developments Canada might be the battleground if there should be another war.

Having those facts in mind, various members of the official opposition have given consideration to certain broad principles which we believe can be approved by everyone in this house and which we think will help the Canadian people to crystallize an opinion as to what the defence policy of Canada should be. In the first place we believe that two obligations in regard to defence should be recognized by the house and the Canadian people. The first is that we must be prepared to defend Canada to the very best of our ability. The second is that we must remain in a position to live up to our commitments to the united nations organization. This means that we must be prepared to do our share, by force if necessary, to maintain world peace. We must not get into the frame of mind where we expect somebody else, somebody else's sons, to be responsible for our defence and for maintaining world peace.

That is the first broad principle. The second is that we must not destroy the efficiency of our fighting forces. We on this side of the house are very much concerned for fear that is happening at the present moment. There is a great movement to demobilize, which is a perfectly proper thing to do; but we have met with this situation. Young officers have come in to us. For example, I had a young officer of the navy, with a distinguished career, come to me and say, "I should like to carry on in the Canadian navy. I think it is a grand profession; I think there is a service to be rendered to Canada and to the world, and I should like to stay on. But I cannot find out what the conditions are to be. I do not know what the rates of pay or the pensions are to

be; or how many men will be required; as a result I have made up my mind to get out of the navy and go back into business." We had a young battalion commander, twice decorated for gallantry, one of the outstanding soldiers from my province of British Columbia, come in and say the same thing. He wanted to stay in the Canadian army, but he could not find out anything definite and he was not prepared to wait for a two-year period and take a chance on being able then to get back into business. So he decided to get out just as quickly as he could. We have had the same position taken by outstanding men in the air force, and I think it is also true of skilled men in the ranks of all the services. I quite realize the government's difficulty. I know it is frightfully hard to draw up a definite policy at this stage. But there is a time element which enters into the picture, and the human factor must also be considered. Perhaps the better the man is the more determined he will be to get out if he does not have any reasonable assurance that he can make a career in the armed forces of Canada. We all know what happened after the last war, during which the Canadian corps had a record second to none; we were all intensely proud to belong to that corps, and the same was true of the air force and the navy; yet after the war very little attempt was made to maintain efficiency.

Now here we are again with very efficient forces, none better in the world. Let us adopt a policy that will enable us to maintain efficiency even while we have to cut down the size of the services. I do not think we can afford to delay. The same thing is true with regard to equipment and supplies. Let us remain in a position to be able to manufacture, as much as possible, whatever equipment is needed for our forces. We did very well in that regard during the war; let us make sure we can continue to carry on in the same way. If we do not take these steps and trouble does come again, the price of our failure and neglect will be paid with the lives of our sons. They are the men who will have to pay the shot if this house does not adopt a proper policy at this time. Mind you, Mr. Speaker, in advocating efficiency I am not advocating waste. We intend to check very carefully for any waste that may be found in the appropriations, but we believe that efficiency must be the main consideration, certainly during the period which lies immediately ahead, while everything is up in the air and no one can tell what the world situation will be.

Our third broad principle is that the defence forces must be given the help of our scientists. Every facility must be afforded to the defence forces to enable them to keep up to date and to get the most modern improvements, not only in the way of equipment but also in the way of training. During last winter or perhaps early in the spring arctic and sub-arctic exercises were carried out in western Canada by the Canadian army. I believe one exercise was conducted in northern Saskatchewan and one in British Columbia. In the latter province it took place between the main lines of the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National but still it was a sub-arctic exercise. I believe those should be extended; that the forces should be able to carry on further exercises of that type. They should be able to carry on exercises in the Northwest Territories up toward the arctic, up above where these pitchblende deposits are located, and in the Mackenzie river district. They certainly will never be able to do that if the attitude of the house and of the Canadian people is to be the same as it was after the last war. The carrying out of exercises such as I suggest would help open up that northern country. I believe that in due course several hundreds of thousands of people can be settled in northern Canada, and that there can be a great development in that area. This has happened in Siberia, where the Russians have had outstanding success; and there is no reason why in our country Canadians cannot do the same; if the army and the air force working together could carry out exercises of that type it would be a great help in opening up that northern country. There are many other things that could be done if we had efficient forces properly supported by the House of Commons and by the people of Canada.

The fourth broad principle is that there should be the closest coordination in training and in types of equipment among the different nations of the empire, and also with the United States. This must always be borne in mind. A good example of the success of this type of venture is to be found in the British commonwealth air training plan. We cannot stand alone; we must work with other people, and I think the natural thing for us to do is to coordinate our efforts with those of other British peoples and of the people of the United States.

These are the four broad principles we suggest. We believe in them; we are convinced that they are at least worthy of the most careful consideration of the house and the people of Canada. In connection with their consideration, and for the benefit of the defence forces of Canada, we believe it would be helpful if there were set up a standing committee of this house on defence matters.

In the United States house of representatives there is a committee on naval affairs and one on military affairs; I believe that they have similar committees in the senate. We see no reason why we could not have committees of that type in Canada; in such circumstances we would be in a position to call chiefs of staff before such committees, and to find out their reasons for doing certain things and for wishing to have certain plans adopted. In this way, too, we would get the members of the House of Commons and the Canadian people more solidly behind the defence forces. In these modern times the defence of a country involves every man, woman and child. It is no longer a matter of a few trained men; everybody is vitally interested. I am sure great help would come from civilian members who happened to serve on committees of that kind. We ask for support of this suggestion from the various parties in the house.

That is all I have to propose to-day. I repeat the hope that everybody will support us in our submissions. We think the defence of Canada, the constitution, the training and the work to be done by her fighting forces should be above politics, and something to which we should all agree.

May I repeat the request I made when opening, that the Minister of National Defence try to give us an over-all picture when he makes his statement, which probably will not now be made until the first of next week.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) has placed before us a most comprehensive outline of the proposed expenditures for the coming year for war purposes and demobilization. It was a lengthy and detailed statement which, of course, will be discussed more thoroughly when the house goes into committee.

May I take this opportunity to congratulate the hon. member who has just spoken. I believe he placed his views before the house in a clear manner, and in a non-partisan spirit which should be appreciated by all of us. In his observations he raised some questions and made some suggestions which are worthy of more than passing consideration.

It seems to me that when we are discussing these estimates on this occasion we should consider them in a manner very much along the lines suggested by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green), namely, in the light of the policies we are likely to follow in the next few years. I agree with him that those policies cannot immediately take shape in a concrete form. But at least when we are discussing the problems arising out of defence and demobilization I suggest we should keep in mind the kind of external policy Canada will have to follow in the next few years.

It was that phase of the problem I had intended to discuss this afternoon, because obviously one has had no time to consider the very much detailed and comprehensive financial report which has been placed before the house by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley). I should like to say, as the hon. member for Vancouver South implied, that the situation to-day psychologically is vastly different from the situation which we all faced at the end of the first world war. At the end of that war I think many were filled with the idea that perhaps we had seen the last of all the great wars, that we were about to organize some form of collective security which would ensure universal peace for a long time. There was a very high idealism—a Christian pacifism, if you will—which permeated the minds of most men and women of good will in every part of the world and in every party. But in the last ten years there has been disillusionment.

Mr. REID: Not all countries were thinking of peace.

Mr. COLDWELL: I believe there has been disillusionment in the last ten years, and I am speaking of what might be called Christian countries, and men and women of good will.

Mr. REID: Germany was not.

Mr. COLDWELL: I am not including Germany, because no one could include that country as a country having Christian ideals from the rise of Hitler in 1933 to the present. But I believe it is true to say there was that feeling throughout the democratic world. I regret very much to say that to-day to a large degree that feeling is absent; and to a considerable degree I believe that absence can be traced to a feeling of uncertainty with respect to the future. Even those of us who had the privilege of attending the great conference at San Francisco realized while we were there that there were great dangers in the international situation. There were tremendous difficulties to iron out, and we realized that we had to consider the future defence of our various countries and of peace itself very realistically indeed.

Whether we have witnessed, as some of us did, the flying bombs going over London a year ago, or whether we have only read about them and seen pictures in the moving-picture theatres, and whether we have only read of the atomic bomb, I believe we have learned another lesson and know perfectly well to-day

that any form of isolation must be entirely removed from our minds. Isolation is not a policy any more—if it ever was. We are all vulnerable to attack from without, in the event of another war. We have to hope and trust and pray that the nations of the world, realizing the danger that besets them, will not again turn to the dreadful arbitrament of war, if I may put it in that way. We have to face the future realistically and do all that must be done for the defence of our own country and our own civilization.

When we have approved the united nations charter we may be in a better position to see what Canada should really do, but until that is done we must consider the defence problems of this country from the point of view of this country and of the allied nations with which this country has cooperated throughout the entire war. I was hoping that by this time the nations of the world would have adopted the united nations charter and that perhaps some of its provisions might be operative now, particularly in so far as the security system was concerned. Under the security council there will be established a military staff representing the general staffs of the five principal powers. That military staff will be obligated to enter into agreements with the various nations that adhere to the charter. Hence we should get some idea of the part that Canada should play in the world security situation. We do not know that at the present time, and consequently we have to gear our policy to what this house, this government and this country believe to be in their interests at the present time. I do not know when the military staff of the united nations will be established, and I do not know when Canada will be called upon to enter into some agreement for the general security of the world.

This is what I really had in mind when I rose to speak this afternoon. In all probability this was the last of what we might call the traditional wars, wars in which great armies moved and men fought in close combat. The rocket bomb and the application of atomic energy to bombs have provided a new phase of warfare and one of which we must take cognizance at the present time.

The hon. member for Vancouver South spoke a few moments ago of the necessity of maintaining our scientific and industrial strength. It is altogether probable that scientific research and industrial strength may be of greater import in the future than our armies. In looking over these estimates I was surprised and sorry to see that there has been no increase in the appropriation for the national research council. Indeed there is a slight decrease in the total amounts in the war appropriation bill and the civil estimates. I think that is wrong. I think any one who knows anything about Canada's part in the development of radar and the development of at least the raw material for the atomic bomb realizes that the young scientists of this country played a very important role in the course of the war. We should see to it that we do not lose these young scientists because, while they may not be our first line of defence, they will be at least our second line of defence in the event of another war. I find that the estimates, civil and war, for the national research council have been decreased from some $5,000,000 to just over $4,500,000, that is taking the two estimates together.

Under the united nations charter raw material and scientific research may be regarded as one of our principal contributions to the world organization. As those who have read the charter will remember, the military general staff will negotiate agreements, not only with regard to the military aid, naval, army and air, which a nation will give, but will decide what that nation should do, in agreement of course with the nation itself, to assist in the enforcement of international decisions or the maintenance of security. We should look very carefully into this phase of the matter in considering the estimates now before us.

As the hon. member for Vancouver South has indicated, when we are considering these estimates we should make a careful study and report of the post-war military organization that this country requires and can best maintain. In other words, I think the country should know from the Minister of National Defence, indeed from all the ministers if you wish, the policy that Canada is to pursue in organization, the allotment of personnel among the three forces and, as I have said already, in the realm of scientific research, industrial training, war-time mobilization and so on.

Let us bear in mind that at the end of the last war there was a disposition on the part of military leaders to think of future wars in the terms of the war that had just ended. That was a very natural disposition, and I do not think there is any profession or trade represented in this house that might not be guilty of the same kind of thinking. We think rather in terms of what we have been doing than in terms of changes in the manner of doing what we should do. I am not singling out the military profession in this particular. In my opinion in the period which will follow this war there may be a danger that methods which are becoming or

have become obsolete since August 6 may be the methods which the military leaders of this and other countries may wish to follow.

We remember how France emerged from the last war with probably the most powerful army in the world and then continued to train that army largely—not wholly of course—on the assumption that the war which might come again would be like the war in which France had been victorious with her allies in the period 1914-18. The result was that the more progressive military leaders like de Gaulle, who wished to change the tactics of the French army, were not paid any attention. We know what the result was in 1940, when the French army crumbled before an army which had been organized on a new basis with new and different equipment. Consequently I think the house should bear in mind that there is a disposition on the part of any profession to keep its policies in line with what it has known in the past, and we should exercise care lest we allow that to happen again in our country. We must beware that we do not merely allow the desires and the prerogatives of those who have served us well in high places in the army, navy and air force to dominate our thinking and our programme, because they may again be thinking, not in terms perhaps of personal advantage, but in military terms that are becoming obsolete.

One other fact I should like to mention at this time is this. In dealing with demobilization we have to think of the men who are to-day overseas. We have, for example, large forces in Holland which are being gradually reduced, and Holland to-day is very largely under military government. Perhaps when the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) goes to Holland he may find that there is considerable criticism by our Dutch allies of the military government we have established in Holland. I have been told by young men who have just come back from Holland that there is a good deal of discontent with our arrangements there. For example, the Dutch people find that, while they have no transportation, our own military transportation is quite adequate not only for our needs but if used to meet the needs of the population, but there are regulations which do not permit our military in Holland to assist in the transportation of supplies or even the refugee people who are found along the highways. That may be a matter of military necessity, but some young men who have recently returned from Holland fail to understand the situation, and have told me that it is causing a good deal of misgiving among the Dutch and is upsetting some of the splendid relations which exist there. Those of us who were in Belgium and France a year ago—I think it is a year ago to-morrow that we went across to Belgium—will never forget the enthusiasm with which the people of Belgium and France met our car with the Canadian maple leaf painted on it as one of the symbols, and the friendliness with which our boys were greeted everywhere. It would be too bad if we lost that very fine and friendly spirit in the low countries.

The hon. member for Vancouver South suggested that a defence committee of this house be established where matters of defence could be discussed and members would become more thoroughly acquainted with what was necessary and with the policies which were being followed, and could interest the people of the country. I think that is a good idea, but I was going to suggest something a little different. I intended to suggest that we try to establish a non-partisan committee, which would be a mixed committee of civilians and military men, to go continuously into the field of defence. That is not unlike the suggestion which has already been made. Somewhere at least we can find a suitable committee to deal continuously with these matters. That would be helpful. Before the recent war we had too little discussion in this house, and certainly too little discussion before any committees of the house, regarding the necessities with which the country was then faced. That I think was particularly true after Munich. May I remind the house that Munich was hailed by most of the people of this country as a great step toward universal peace. It was at that time that I was jolted into believing that war was coming, but we in this house did not give the attention to the policies behind the naval, military and air force estimates which I think should have been given, nor did we give attention to the external policies which were likely to make military arrangements necessary. I am therefore very glad indeed that the government has seen fit to grant the request which has been made from time to time in this house over the years and to set up a special standing committee to deal with external affairs. In that way the house should be well informed as to what the necessities of the external scene will demand.

I do not think I wish to say very much more this afternoon, but I wanted to bring these points before the house and the minister in the general discussion before we go into details. In the light of the present world situation we cannot neglect them. The united nations charter will be discussed in this house. I do not propose to anticipate that discussion, except to say that I believe there is not a thinking man who reads and understands the

dispatches which are coming from Europe, and indeed from all over the world, who does not believe deep down in his heart that the international situation has deteriorated since the united nations charter was adopted at San Francisco. I think when we were there we felt that there was reason to hope that the great powers would understand each other a little better and that the longer the conference continued the better that understanding would become. It looked that way. Watching the news to-day, and reading all that comes to us through the press and in articles from well-informed sources, one is forced to the conclusion that the world is in a desperate condition.

So, then, I say to the minister that we shall go into these estimates with a great deal of sympathy; we shall endeavour to find out what they all mean, and we shall bring before him observations which may sometimes appear, perhaps, to show a very critical spirit. But I assure him and the house generally that in doing so we shall have only one end in view, namely, to make our contribution as a nation to the establishment throughout the world of universal law, order and peace.

Mr. SOLON E. LOW (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I shall not take very much of the time of the house just now to deal in any detail with the estimates which were placed before us a short time ago; but I thought I should say a few words, particularly in response to the suggestions which were made by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green). I felt that the hon. member very skilfully placed before this house a number of principles to which every dynamic Canadian could subscribe.

I feel and have always felt that Canada must be strong, not only in a naval, military, and air force way. These strengths are necessary, to be sure, and we have always in this corner of the house advocated that Canada should be prepared. We have never lost sight of that necessity, and if hon. members will look back over records of sessions during the last ten years they will note that we have been consistent in advocating a strong and a prepared Canada.

We need to be strong economically also, because faith in Canada of a dynamic kind cannot be engendered into our people unless we have ensured the well-being of every family in Canada. That is important, and I would suggest to the government that, while they are making their plans and laying their policies for the years to come, economic strength be given the most earnest and careful consideration along with preparedness in a military way.

I have felt for some years that Canada perhaps has been trying to do too much considering the population that we have had. We need more people in this country. We have a grand country, which is capable of maintaining, I would say, a population of fifty million people, and we cannot be strong and virile until such time as we have increased our population to the extent that it is possible for us to stand forth as one of the first-rate nations of the world in the way of population as well as in strength of natural resources. I do not know whether the government has given any consideration to means by which, during the next few years, the population can be successfully increased. I will not take the time of the house to advocate any particular principle. Perhaps the government have already laid their plans. It may be necessary for us to combine several methods of accomplishing this objective, but surely there is one thing certain, that the population will not increase sufficiently by natural means—through the birthrate—unless and until we remove from our people fear of want. That is the thing which accounts in the main for small families, and I say to you, what is the use of having a strong navy, a strong army and a strong air force to save the country for posterity if there is not going to be any posterity?

We must realize, Mr. Speaker, that methods of war to which we have been accustomed in the past are outmoded; and because those methods are outmoded we must revise our ideas of war. We must revise our ideas of defence, and, I might add, our ideas of security—world security as well as Canadian security. I have heard to-day things which lead me to believe that we have not changed our ideas one particle since before the atomic bomb became a reality. My judgment is that we are up against something in that regard where we have no human experience to draw upon, and therefore we need a new approach, a complete revision of our ideas on security. I hope that this Parliament in the next few weeks will prove itself capable of meeting the new conditions and of revising its ideas so as to be thoroughly prepared for the exigencies of the future.

While we are making Canada strong, we must at the same time be prepared to contribute of our strength to ensure the preservation of Britain. Britain is in danger. Britain is in a serious condition. If Great Britain is destroyed the British commonwealth of nations cannot endure; therefore we must be prepared to contribute of our strength to ensure that Britain will remain strong and virile, and that the British commonwealth of nations will be maintained. For I say to you, Mr.

Speaker, with all the gravity at my command, that the one great barrier in this world to-day against world domination by totalitarianism is the British commonwealth of nations. We must not allow ourselves to be lulled into a sense of false security and into the type of psychology that seemed to prevail among great numbers of the people of the country from 1930 to 1939. We were ostriches, in the main; we hid our heads in the sand so that we would not see what was going on around us.

Many brave words have been spoken since we have learned world facts by experience, and tragic experience at that. Restless and warlike nations will hesitate to attack a strong, virile and well-prepared Canada. Let us therefore keep her in ever-growing strength.

One other thing we should not overlook as we face these estimates, and study and discuss them in the days to come. An important source of strength, it seems to me, in any people, is to keep those people properly informed. A nation that is ignorant of the facts and the truth of the world situation, a nation that is victimized by the worst and most subtle propaganda imaginable, can never have that source of strength to draw upon which was mentioned so often in the old days: "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

Along with all these other suggestions that have been given, the government ought to take note of the need for watching the sources of dissemination of information in this country, and see to it that the information that is fed to the people is the truth and not subversive propaganda. A strong people can stand the truth and they will react well to it, but if they do not have the truth, the lack of it immediately becomes a source of disintegrating strength. Therefore I say it is necessary for us to keep in mind the importance of getting to our people information so that they can prepare themselves individually and so that they will not be victims of deteriorating propaganda. I say that whatever money is needed to accomplish the worthy objective of making Canada strong in every way, we in this house ought to be prepared to furnish, and without question. The group in this section of the house is prepared to go into the study of these estimates sympathetically and carefully, and to assist the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) to accomplish for Canada the position which I have envisioned in my own mind, and which I am sure that every worth-while Canadian has envisioned in his mind.

Listening to the hon. member for Vancouver South, I was happy to hear the suggestions he made. I am sure that the group in this section of the house are prepared to accept those principles as a working basis for the examination of these particular estimates, and we shall be prepared to extend to the minister every cooperation and help in accomplishing all worth-while objectives.

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): I rise only for the purpose of placing before the government certain questions with regard to the very important matter that must be determined, namely, is this country still at war? When will the proclamation be made that will terminate war in so far as the powers of the War Measures Act are concerned? Having regard to the proposals that have been brought before the house to-day, it seems apparent that the government of this nation intends to continue the fiction that the war is still proceeding, and will not terminate before March 31, 1946, at least.

But before asking these questions, may I as one who had the very humble position of an observer for the Progressive Conservative party at San Francisco say, after listening to-day to the speech of the leader of the C.C.F. party (Mr. Coldwell) and the speech of the leader of the Social Credit party (Mr. Low)—which party throughout the years has represented no changed policy but has always realized the need of maintaining the British commonwealth of nations as the great instrument for peace and welfare in the world—that their speeches indicate that growing out of San Francisco has come a new feeling among the members of the house in their attitude and relationship to discussions on foreign affairs. Let me say that no greater contribution was made to a united front on the part of the Canadian people than when the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) chose to send to San Francisco a non-political delegation representing various parties in the house. Only one error was made. That error was that there was no representative of the Social Credit party at San Francisco, a party which has long espoused such high principles in so far as the empire is concerned.

I came back from San Francisco believing implicitly that the fear of war, both actual and economic, had more or less passed into the realm of history. I heard those great men there; I felt their attitude. I know what the attitude of the Canadian delegation was. Let me say that that delegation did honour to Canada in the contribution they made at San Francisco. I thought I knew the attitude of those other men who represented the different countries of the world. But, sir, when the atomic bomb fell on Japan on August 8 there was an end to an era of man's thinking on international affairs, and I believe an end to man's thinking on life as it had been; for

now all realize more than ever as the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar said this afternoon, isolationism no longer can be the cult or the belief of any political party or of any nation. Therefore I believe that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) should give serious consideration to an increase in the amount that will be expended by the national research council during the next year; because the atomic bomb not only has great dimensions of peril, but also has great dimensions in the improvement of living conditions and in the raising of economic standards everywhere in the world.

Coming from Saskatchewan I am very proud of the fact that a number of young scientists from that province have contributed to the work of the national research council and that prominent leadership was given to Canada by Dean MacKenzie of the university of Saskatchewan. These scientists now have the opportunity, with the knowledge that has been secured in the production of the atomic bomb, to improve conditions in Canada and elsewhere. Certainly, if we were able to spend billions of dollars for war, we should not be niggardly and spend only four and half million dollars in peace for the work of the council so that this council will be able to continue their work on the principles of atomic power to the end that our living standards may be materially improved in the days to come.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Would the hon. member permit a question at this stage? Before he finishes his fine address would he mind defining to the house just what he conceives to be the meaning of "isolationism"?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: It would take a long time to endeavour to define "isolationism." It represents to me, sir, a state of mind, a psychological reaction, a failure to realize what conditions are in the world. Those are the things that develop isolationism; those are the things that permit nations and individuals not to have full appreciation of what is going on in the world. That is why it is so important at this session of parliament that we do not permit ourselves to be lulled into a false sense of security by reason of what took place at the San Francisco conference, and thereby fail to assure that Canada's defence within this empire shall be properly preserved in the future; for if we wait for a year, two years, three years or five years, the impetus and the experience of this war will disappear and dissipate, and we may again return to that isolationism which characterized so many in the days before the war.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

I am not going into the details of the resolution, but I should like to secure from the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) at this time an answer to certain questions. These questions were outlined some days ago by the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church), at which time the Minister of Justice answered rather indefinitely that these matters—and I deduce this from his words—and their decisions had grave implications. I think the Canadian people have a right to know these things. They have a right to know whether this government intends to endeavour to carry on in the months ahead under the provisions of the War Measures Act. I am going to read only one or two sections of that act, but those sections indicate that, in fact, the resolution now before the house is in part founded upon the government view that the War Measures Act is still in effect. The resolution provides:

> That sums not exceeding $1,365,000,000 be granted to His Majesty towards defraying any expenses or making any advances or loans that may be incurred or granted by or under the authority of the governor in council during the year ending March 31, 1946, for—
>
> (a) the security, defence, peace, order and welfare of Canada;
>
> (b) the conduct of naval, military and air operations in or beyond Canada.

Those words "the security, defence, peace, order and welfare of Canada" apparently are abstracted from the War Measures Act. Let me read section 2 of that act, which provides:

> The issue of a proclamation by His Majesty, or under the authority of the governor in council shall be conclusive evidence that war, invasion or insurrection, real or apprehended, exists. . . until by the issue of a further proclamation it is declared that the war, invasion or insurrection no longer exists.

Section 3 gives the governor in council certain powers. Such things may be done by reason of the existence of real or apprehended war. To-day there is no real or apprehended war, in the opinion of the Canadian Bar Association, with which I think any reasonable person would agree. The section contains these words:

> . . . by reason of the existence of real or apprehended war, invasion, or insurrection deem necessary or advisable for the security, defence, peace, order and welfare of Canada. . . .

Those are the identical words of the resolution. After referring in the preceding sections to the powers which may be exercised by the governor in council in consequence of there being any real or threatened war or insurrection, section 6 goes on to say:

> The provisions of the three sections last preceding shall only be in force during war, invasion or insurrection, real or apprehended.

Does the government suggest that to-day we are in the midst of war? Does the minister suggest that it can continue th operation of the War Measures Act until such time, one year, two years, or three years or more hence, when they may by proclamation declare the war over? This is a matter of grave importance to the people of this country. Are powers being exercised by the government to-day which are beyond the compet nce of the government to carry into effect? The Canadian Bar Association, of which in recent years the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) was the distinguished president, has reviewed this matter at length. It was first discussed in August of last year, and in the report of the association this appears:

> . . . it would appear proper to insist on having immediately after the hostilities have ceased, a proclamation of the governor in council, to declare that the state of war has ended.

That is the considered opinion of a body which I am sure the Minister of Justice must concede understands the situation with respect to that act. It takes this view because it believes that no longer should laws be enacted by regulation or order in council but directly by parliament; by the freely chosen representatives of the people in parliament instead of by controllers and others in similar positions. Coming down to 1945, the Canadian Bar Association made this declaration:

> Your committee is of opinion that the state of war cannot and should not, even by the authority of a statute, be deemed to continue to exist when the war itself is over. Let us make the distinction here between the war emergency itself which is the fact of a state of war, and an economic emergency which, though a consequence following the war, is not the war emergency itself.

Therefore at this time I ask the Minister of Justice to enlighten this house and the country by answering certain questions which I believe are fair and reasonable. The first, to which I have already referred, is this: Is Canada still at war? In that regard, and to the determination of that question, I further ask the minister whether the law officers of the crown have given an opinion on that question. Has it been submitted to them, and what is the nature of the opinion they have given? The next question I wish to ask is this, in the words of the council of the Canadian Bar Association. Is it the intention of the government to continue from month to month to postpone the proclamation of peace in order to continue in effect artificial controls which, while excusable in war where necessary, have no place in a peace-time economy? The next question I ask is this. Are the defence of Canada regulations still in effect? In reading over the expenditures to be made this year, I find that further expenditures are anticipated in connection with the administration of the defence of Canada regulations between now and the end of March, 1946.

These are matters, sir, which are of vital interest. As far as Great Britain was concerned, after the first war and again in May of this year she endeavoured at the earliest possible moment after the end of war in Europe to put a stop to anything bordering on undemocratic controls and the exercise of legislative power by controllers or by the government operating under order in council. She brought into effect an act extending the life of the emergency powers act; and in the old act of 1920 it was provided that His Majesty might declare that a state of emergency continued to exist:

> . . . of such a nature, and of so extensive a scale, as to be calculated, by interfering with the supply and distribution of food, water, fuel or light, or with the means of locomotion, to deprive the community or any essential portion of the community, of the essentials of life.

They extended certain powers, but they also provided that no such proclamation should be in effect for more than one month, unless it was forthwith communicated to parliament, and that for such purpose parliament should be called into session within five days. They also provided that any regulations passed after the end of hostilities should be laid before parliament and should not continue in force after the expiration of seven days from the time they were so laid, unless a resolution was passed by both houses. I suggest, sir, that if the government is going to endeavour to continue to issue orders in council, it should immediately give assurance to the people of Canada that no orders will be passed while parliament is in session; that this array of 60,000 orders in council that we have had during the period of the war, and that are even to-day being issued while parliament is in session, should terminate; and that any orders in council passed should be passed only temporarily, and should be operative only temporarily unless accepted by parliament.

I mention in this connection that while parliament is sitting, and when the war is over in Europe and in Asia, the chairman of the wartime prices and trade board to-day in Vancouver told the people of Canada what is to happen in Canada for the next year. This is what he advised as to what is to take place—and when parliament is sitting:

> 1. Canadians can expect controls on textiles to continue at least until the end of the year.
> 2. Strict rationing of sugar is indicated for at least another eighteen months, perhaps longer.

In other words, we in parliament find in the newspapers what the minister fails to place before us while parliament is in session. Then, next:

> World shortages of food may dictate the "establishment or continuation of rationing and distribution controls well through the transition period".

Here we are in parliament, and this statement is made to the press.

The hon. member for Broadview endeavoured to get an answer to this question: Is the War Measures Act still in effect and are we still at war? And yet, while parliament sits on this 28th day of September, members ascertain from boards what the intention of the government is for the future.

And then, finally:

> So long as price controls remain, the board expects to hold the line on the 1941 price levels, upon which ceilings are based.

Those, sir, are the statements made by the distinguished head of the wartime prices and trade board, made before parliament has found out anything about it, and made while parliament was still in session.

Mr. ILSLEY: Mr. Speaker, the statements about rationing were obviously nothing more or less than statements about world shortages. You would have to ration, if you have world shortages—and that is all those statements amounted to. Then, the statement about holding the line at 1941 price levels has been made before, and made on behalf of the government and by members of the government.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: They have not been made by any member of the government since the end of hostilities. The government made its statements of policy in this house as to what the wartime prices and trade board and other control boards would do while the war was on. And yet to-day, after being in this house for a considerable period of time, we are still expected to get information of this kind outside of parliament from a board responsible only indirectly to parliament. I am sure the Minister of Finance does not agree that there should be any declaration of future policy of this country by any controller or any head of a board while parliament is in session.

Mr. ILSLEY: No; the chairman of the wartime prices and trade board was simply stating what the board would be doing, within the principles of government policy as already stated. The hon. member may think that rationing of sugar, for example, would have to be stated as a separate policy. But the rationing policy just follows inevitably if there is a bad shortage of sugar.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That does not follow inevitably. The board makes decisions under government policy; and that board has no power to pass orders in council in order to continue the policy, unless the War Measures Act is still in effect. That is why I wish to have an answer to that question.

Mr. ILSLEY: The board cannot pass it, even then.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: And neither can the governor in council, except in the case of an emergency, as defined in the Fort Francis case before the privy council.

Mr. ILSLEY: Surely the hon. gentleman does not deny that that emergency exists at this moment.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Bring the matter before parliament.

Mr. MACKENZIE: It is now.

Mr. ILSLEY: My hon. friend should be fair about it. If he will look at the speech from the throne he will find this paragraph:

> You will be asked to approve a measure to extend certain specified emergency powers to meet emergency conditions in the period of reconstruction.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That is perfectly all right; but I am asking this question now—not when another bill is brought up at a later time. At the present time what is the view of the Canadian government? Are we still at war, within the provisions of the War Measures Act, or are we not? That is the question I am asking.

Mr. ILSLEY: The answer is yes.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: What is that?

Mr. ILSLEY: The answer is yes.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: "The answer is yes?"

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That is the legal opinion that is given, is it?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That is the legal opinion given by law officers of the crown?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: So at last we have the opinion—and it took all that time! The hon. member for Broadview endeavoured to get that information the other day, but he could get no answer to the question. So the opinion given by the law officers of the crown is that the War Measures Act is still in effect and binding upon this country?

Mr. ILSLEY: Certainly.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am glad that—

Mr. HOWE: Did you have a different opinion?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I had the opinion of the Canadian Bar Association, an organization which has spent a good deal of time in studying this matter, and one which is composed of the most distinguished members of the bar of Canada, many of whom no doubt are well known to the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) as outstanding counsel. Let me say that their conclusion was the other way.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Where is that stated?

Mr. ABBOTT: Which member wrote the opinion?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I had a list of them with me, and I wish I had it here, because I believe some of them are embryo judges, Liberal supporters about to be appointed.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Or probably would-be Tory judges.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: The chairman of the committee was Gustave Monette, K.C., of Montreal.

Mr. ABBOTT: That is why I asked the question.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Surely the Minister of National Defence does not suggest that the following members of the bar, namely, Walter S. Johnson, K.C., Ariste Brossard, K.C., Kenneth M. Martin, K.C., J. E. Rutledge, K.C., Arthur N. Carter, K.C., R. M. Willes Chitty, K.C., W. P. Fillmore, K.C., J. M. Goldenberg, J. J. Saucier, A. C. DesBrisay, K.C., would allow the signing of a report with respect to their understanding of the law to be influenced because a certain man happened to be chairman? That is a strange suggestion to come from the Minister of National Defence, who is a distinguished lawyer—the suggestion that these lawyers would give an opinion which was anything other than the best legal opinion they could give.

Mr. ABBOTT: Oh, I am convinced of that.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: You are?

Mr. ABBOTT: I just asked who had written the opinion.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: As the minister possibly does not know, if he has not read the report—and it was made in August—the opinion was given by all of them.

Mr. ILSLEY: It is not a legal opinion; it was advice to the government in respect of policy.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: It was advice on a matter of law.

Mr. ILSLEY: I do not think so—at least not what the hon. member read.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Well, I have the opinion here, in which the authorities are cited. However, I shall not go into that, because apparently the Minister of Finance has not read it.

Mr. ILSLEY: I was just going by what I heard the hon. member say, when he pointed out that in the opinion of the gentlemen he has named the government should immediately after the cessation of hostilities issue a proclamation. It is advice to the government on a matter of policy.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: It indicates that a state of war did not continue beyond the end of hostilities. I conclude by asking the Minister of Justice to let the house and the country know whether or not the war appropriations that are to continue between now and May, 1946, and those appropriations that have nothing to do with the war are merely incidental to and the result of the war, are properly within the provisions of the War Measures Act.

Mr. HANSELL: I notice it is nearly five minutes to six o'clock and I would move the adjournment of the debate. Do I understand that the procedure is to go into committee?

Mr. ILSLEY: If convenient to hon. gentlemen I think it would be better if we did go into committee. We would then move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again. Then hon. members would have great freedom of discussion in committee.

Mr. HANSELL: Will the minister give us assurance now that we shall have an opportunity of discussion just as broad as has been carried on to-day? If so, I would forgo moving the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. ILSLEY: Oh, yes, just as broad.

Mr. BRACKEN: I had intended saying something on this measure. I do not see what delay or inconvenience will be caused if we do not go into committee until there has been some further discussion.

Mr. ILSLEY: That is all right.

Mr. HANSELL: If that is the case then I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie the house adjourned at 5.55 p.m.

Monday, October 1, 1945.

The house met at three o'clock.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

AMENDMENT OF ACT OF 1944-45

Hon. BROOKE CLAXTON (Minister of National Health and Welfare) moved for leave to introduce bill No. 9, to amend the Department of National Health and Welfare Act.

He said: The only change proposed by the amendment is to correct a typographical error in the act of last year as printed. It occurs in section 12 and involves the substitution of the word "eight" for the word "nine" in a cross reference to another act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

CANADA PRIZE ACT

PRIZE COURTS AND PRIZE LAW—EXCHEQUER COURT JURISDICTION

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce bill No. 10, to provide for a prize court and prize law in Canada.

He said: The purpose of the bill is to put in statutory form and perhaps make clearer and more definite what is the common law practice in respect to prize courts and prize law and to replace the order in council which has been in force under the War Measures Act in that regard. I am informed that during the first war the exchequer court as a colonial court of admiralty had jurisdiction as a prize court, and that expired when the old admiralty court act was repealed in 1934. During this war an order in council to give it this jurisdiction was passed under the War Measures Act. It is felt that the jurisdiction of the court should be prolonged beyond the time when the order in council under the War Measures Act will be in force, and this bill is to set out what is the prize law in Canada and to make the exchequer court the court to administer that law.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

AMENDMENT OF CAPITAL REVISION ACT, 1937—SECURITIES TRUST

Hon. LIONEL CHEVRIER (Minister of Transport) moved for leave to introduce bill No. 11, to amend the Canadian National Railways Capital Revision Act, 1937.

[Mr. Ilsley.]

He said: This is a routine and simple amendment of the Canadian Railways Capital Revision Act, 1937. Section 12 of that act provides for the appointment of trustees, and it is therein stated that three of the trustees shall be deputy ministers and two others shall be officers of the Canadian National Railways. By virtue of a reorganization in the directorate one of these positions in the Canadian National Railways, that of vice-president of finance, has been abolished. It is therefore sought by this amendment to set up by way of resolution of the board of directors the two officers who shall be trustees representing that body. There is also a technical amendment which has to do with the three deputy ministers.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

APPOINTMENT OF GEORGE A. TOUCHE AND COMPANY AS AUDITORS

Hon. LIONEL CHEVRIER (Minister of Transport) moved for leave to introduce bill No. 12, respecting the appointment of auditors for National Railways.

He said: This is an annual bill which provides for the appointment of auditors for the Canadian National Railways. Since the year 1932 the appointment of the auditors has been by bill in this manner, and for the year 1945 it is sought to appoint George A. Touche and Company as auditors for the Canadian National Railways.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

OLD AGE PENSIONS—NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

Mr. KNOWLES:

1. How many persons in each of the provinces and in the Northwest Territories were receiving old age pensions as at the latest date for which this information is available?

2. What was the average monthly payment in each province at said date?

3. Does this monthly average include any supplementary amounts paid by the provinces?

4. What supplementary amounts are paid, and what other special provisions are made, by the various provinces?

Mr. CLAXTON:

1. The number of persons receiving old age pensions as at June 30, 1945, is as follows:

Alberta	11,594
British Columbia	15,505
Manitoba	12,427
New Brunswick	12,335
Nova Scotia	14,135
Ontario	58,323
Prince Edward Island	1,881
Quebec	49,645
Saskatchewan	12,971
Northwest Territories	11

2. Alberta $24 13
British Columbia 24 38
Manitoba 24 47
New Brunswick 22 18
Nova Scotia 22 54
Ontario 24 45
Prince Edward Island 18 66
Quebec 23 94
Saskatchewan 24 63
Northwest Territories 24 09

3. No.

4. Supplementary amounts are paid as follows: Alberta, $5 a month to each pensioner; British Columbia, $5 a month to each pensioner; Manitoba, any amount up to $1.25 a month depending on the amount of pension granted; New Brunswick, nil; Nova Scotia, any amount up to $5 a month payable at the discretion of the pension authority, with maximum income limited to $365 a year; Ontario, fifteen per cent of pension based on a maximum pension of $20 a month; Prince Edward Island, nil; Quebec, nil; Saskatchewan, $3 a month to each pensioner.

Certain provinces provide free medical services for old age pensioners. At least three provinces, namely, British Columbia, Saskatchewan, and Ontario, have special plans for this purpose. Some of the other provinces work with the municipalities in order to provide medical care for persons who are unable to pay for it themselves.

Note: The information given in the above answer is based on information supplied by the provinces concerned. Provision by the provinces of supplementary allowances, medical care, etc., falls outside the scope of the dominion-provincial arrangements made under the Old Age Pensions Act.

PENSIONS FOR THE BLIND—NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

Mr. KNOWLES:

1. How many persons in each of the provinces and in the Northwest Territories were receiving blind pensions as at the latest date for which supplementary amounts paid by the provinces?

2. What was the average monthly payment in each province at said date?

3. Does this monthly average include any supplementary amounts paid by the province?

4. What supplementary amounts are paid, and what other special provisions are made, by the various provinces?

Mr. CLAXTON:

1. The number of persons receiving pensions in respect of blindness as at June 30, 1945, is as follows:

Alberta	256
British Columbia	338
Manitoba	350
New Brunswick	739
Nova Scotia	651
Ontario	1,491
Prince Edward Island	112
Quebec	2,445
Saskatchewan	342
Northwest Territories	....

2. Alberta $24 52
British Columbia 24 61
Manitoba 24 75
New Brunswick 24 57
Nova Scotia 24 20
Ontario 24 73
Prince Edward Island 22 47
Quebec 24 69
Saskatchewan 24 96
Northwest Territories ....

3. No.

4. Supplementary amounts are paid as follows: Alberta, $5 a month to each pensioner; British Columbia, $5 a month to each pensioner; Manitoba, any amount up to $1.25 a month depending on the amount of pension granted; New Brunswick, nil; Nova Scotia, any amount up to $5 a month payable at the discretion of the pension authority, with maximum income limited to $365 a year; Ontario, 15 per cent of pension based on a maximum pension of $20 a month; Prince Edward Island, nil; Quebec, nil; Saskatchewan, $3 a month to each pensioner.

Certain provinces provide free medical services for blind pensioners. At least three provinces, namely, British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Ontario, have special plans for this purpose. Some of the other provinces work with the municipalities in order to provide medical care for persons who are unable to pay for it themselves.

Note: The information given in the above answer is based on information supplied by the provinces concerned. Provision by the provinces of supplementary allowances, medical care, etc., falls outside the scope of the dominion-provincial arrangements made under the Old Age Pensions Act.

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES—PERSONNEL IN CANADA AND OVERSEAS, ETC.

Mr. ROSS (Souris):

1. What was the total number of Canadian troops taken to Europe, with annual figure 1939 to 1945?

2. The numbers recruited on that side?

3. Total fatal casualties in Europe?

4. Numbers discharged in the United Kingdom or elsewhere in Europe?

5. Numbers returned to Canada on courses or other temporary duty and who subsequently returned to Europe?

6. Numbers returned to Canada for category and other permanent reasons?

7. Numbers transferred to other allied forces?

8. Numbers remaining on strength in the Canadian army overseas in the United Kingdom, northwest Europe, and the Mediterranean, May 8, 1945?

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1.

Year of Embarkation	Number
1939	15,894
1940	43,221
1941	69,167
1942	66,604
1943	79,445
1944	62,896
1945 to 31 Aug.	35,264
Total	372,491

2. 1,340.

3. 19,917 as at Aug. 31, 1945 (including battle and non-battle casualties).

4. 1,554 to Aug. 31, 1945.

5. See answer to question 6.

6. 138,124 sailed from the European zone for Canada up to Aug. 31, 1945. The total break-down of those who returned to Canada on temporary duty and subsequent return to Europe is not available.

7. 672 as at Aug. 31, 1945 in European zone.

8. Strength as of May 8, 1945 is not available. Strength as at April 30, 1945 was:

United Kingdom	94,569
Northwest Europe	183,979
Mediterranean	4,045
Total	282,593

PAYMENTS ON 1943 WHEAT CROP

Mr. ROSS (Souris):

1. Has the 1943 wheat crop been disposed of by Canadian wheat board?

2. If so, when will payments be made to producers on participation certificates and what amount per bushel?

3. If 1943 wheat crop has not been cleared up, when is it anticipated that it will be sold and cleared up?

[Mr. Claxton.]

Mr. MacKINNON:

1. Yes.

2. Although all 1943 crop wheat has been disposed of by the board to shippers and mills, the mills have not yet completed their reports to the board as to whether the wheat was used for domestic, mutual aid or commercial flour sales.

Without this information the board cannot determine the amounts per bushel payable on the 1943 crop participation certificates.

Moreover, final payments in respect of the 1940, 1941 and 1942 crops are still being made, and it is estimated that from 65 to 75 thousand cheques have still to be issued covering producer's certificates which have been lost. A further payment will also be made during the current crop year in respect of barley equalization fees, and also for the export fees received in respect of Ontario winter wheat for last season.

These operations are all in addition to the current work of the board, which is extremely heavy, and it does not appear that the necessary equipment will be available for the purpose of making this payment until the other payments referred to have been released.

It is now anticipated that the 1943 crop payments will probably begin in June or July, 1946.

3. Answered by (1) and (2).

Mr. JAENICKE:

When does the Canadian wheat board expect to make the final payment to farmers in respect of the 1943 wheat crop?

Mr. MacKINNON: Answered by the answer above to the question of the hon. member for Souris.

PRISONERS OF WAR

Mr. REID:

1. How many nazi German prisoners of war are still in Canada?

2. How many prisoners of war of other nationalities are in Canada?

3. How many nazi German prisoners of war have been returned to Germany or their homeland since the surrender of Germany?

4. How many prisoners of war are located in internment camps, and how many are employed in agriculture and other industries?

5. What steps have been taken by the government to return all prisoners of war to their own countries?

Mr. ST. LAURENT:

1. There are at present 30,710 prisoners of war of the German armed forces held in Canada.

2. All prisoners of war in Canada are members of the German forces. However, they include some persons of other than German nationality, the majority of these being Austrian.

3. No prisoners of war have been returned to Germany or to any other homeland since the German surrender.

4. As of August 31, 13,073 prisoners of war were employed on farms or at work projects outside prisoner of war camps. The remaining 20,986 are held in the camps. A large proportion of the latter are employed in camp duties.

5. The repatriation of German prisoners of war is not a matter on which the Canadian government can take independent action but will have to be undertaken in concert with the allied control commission in Germany.

HOGS AND BEEF CATTLE

Mr. ROSS (Souris):

1. What was the number of hogs in Canada by provinces during 1939-1944 and 1945?

2. What was the number of beef cattle in Canada by provinces during 1939-1944 and 1945?

Mr. MacKINNON:

1. Numbers of All Hogs on Farms at June 1, 1939 to 1945

	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945
Prince Edward Island ..	43,500	47,700	48,200	57,800	65,000	65,700	60,500
Nova Scotia	41,900	49,200	44,300	53,900	65,500	69,300	58,700
New Brunswick	79,100	86,800	68,000	84,500	94,400	104,300	82,300
Quebec	758,900	958,200	808,000	859,300	978,900	1,001,000	843,700
Ontario	1,536,500	1,985,500	1,882,000	1,861,300	1,885,600	1,900,000	1,979,000
Manitoba	322,900	506,000	503,400	708,000	877,000	624,000	457,000
Saskatchewan	511,300	879,700	943,700	1,325,400	1,754,600	1,599,400	1,006,600
Alberta	1,024,900	1,414,600	1,705,600	2,093,000	2,337,700	2,278,900	1,469,300
British Columbia	44,800	74,000	78,200	82,000	89,800	98,200	68,500
CANADA	4,363,800	6,001,700	6,081,400	7,125,200	8,148,500	7,740,800	6,025,600

2. Number of Cattle (other than milk cows) on Farms as of June 1, 1939 to 1944

	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944
Prince Edward Island ..	50,500	46,600	48,000	51,800	54,300	58,700
Nova Scotia	112,700	105,100	96,800	99,900	108,200	122,900
New Brunswick	102,100	96,100	92,200	95,600	107,400	114,400
Quebec	813,400	766,600	758,800	784,300	886,200	958,700
Ontario	1,409,400	1,442,300	1,483,700	1,489,300	1,524,000	1,557,200
Manitoba	387,500	388,400	399,000	477,100	557,500	605,500
Saskatchewan	705,700	756,500	803,400	927,500	1,099,600	1,356,300
Alberta	920,400	928,800	978,500	1,102,200	1,251,000	1,357,300
British Columbia	191,800	199,700	233,000	236,500	282,300	282,000
CANADA	4,693,500	4,730,100	4,893,400	5,264,200	5,870,500	6,413,000

1945 figures will be available September 28.

MAITLAND, N.S. AIRPORT—PURCHASE OF LAND

Mr. STANFIELD:

1. What was the total cost of land purchased for the Maitland airport, Hants county, Nova Scotia?

2. What was the total cost of (a) draining, grading and roadways; (b) construction of runways; (c) buildings and improvements; (d) equipment?

3. What has been the total cost to date?

4. What is the estimated cost to complete?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West):

1. $29,405.00.

2. (a) $400,138,83; (b) $850,705.36; (c) $1,079,594.41; (d) Equipment—heating and kitchen equipment included in (c) above.

3. $2,505,667.25.

4. $800,000.00.

EMERGENCY SHELTER REGULATIONS—BRITISH COLUMBIA

Mr. REID:

1. Who is the chief official in British Columbia in charge of emergency shelter regulations?

2. How long had he lived in the province before being appointed to the position of administrator of emergency shelter regulations?

3. At whose suggestion was the municipality of Surrey included in the area under the emergency shelter regulations?

4. Was any advice sought from local authorities or other bodies before including the municipality of Surrey?

5. How many officials have been appointed in charge of emergency shelter regulations?

6. What has the cost of each of these offices been up to the end of August?

Mr. MAYHEW:

1. For Victoria, D. K. Kennedy; for Vancouver, Air Vice Marshal L. F. Stevenson.

2. Mr. Kennedy, 34 years; Air Vice Marshal Stevenson, 7 years.

3. The Administrator of emergency shelter for Vancouver.

4. No.

5. Sixteen officials.

6.

Office	Amount paid by wartime prices and trade board	Amount paid by Dept. of Public Works
Emergency Shelter Co-ordination (Ottawa Hdqs.)	$207,000*	$ 500
Ottawa	24,000	2,000
Hull	7,500	4,500
Toronto	36,000	2,500
Hamilton	10,500	1,000
Winnipeg	950	Nil
Vancouver	29,000	2,000
Victoria	11,500	Nil

*This total includes approximately $189,000 for advertising emergency shelter regulations.

CHARTERED BANKS—TRANSFERS TO CONTINGENT RESERVE FUND

Mr. QUELCH:

1. What was the total of the transfers made to contingent reserve fund from the earnings of each of the chartered banks in excess of their reasonable requirements for each of the years 1940 to 1944?

2. What was the amount that each bank was called upon to pay in additional taxation as a result of these excess transfers in each of the years 1940 to 1944?

Mr. MAYHEW:

1. (a) 1940, nil; (b) 1941, nil; (c) 1942, nil; (d) 1943, in the case of two chartered banks the amount added to their general contingency reserves during 1943 was "in excess of the reasonable requirements of the bank having regard to all the circumstances." At the time these banks published their annual financial statements for 1944 the exact amounts involved had not yet been determined and each bank made an estimate in round figures of the amount to be transferred from general contingency reserves, which amount in the case of one bank was $2,200,000 and in the case of the other $412,000. Subsequently the amounts of the required transfers from general contingency reserves were determined, which amount in the case of the one bank was $1,965,566.14 and in the case of the other $324,000; (e) 1944, nil.

2. (a) 1940, nil; (b) 1941, nil; (c) 1942, nil; (d) 1943, as the result of the above transfer from general contingency reserves the one bank paid additional taxes of $1,965,566.14 plus interest of $57,329 and the other bank additional taxes of $324,000 plus interest of $9,542.50; (e) 1944, nil.

WHEAT PRICES

Mr. FAIR:

What is the average price received each year by the Canadian wheat board for No. 1 northern wheat f.o.b. Fort William for the crops of 1935-36 to 1943-44 respectively?

Mr. MacKINNON:

1935 crop, 85·09577 cents; 1936 crop, no deliveries to the board; 1937 crop, no deliveries to the board; 1938 crop, 61·2662 cents; 1939 crop, 77·29546 cents; 1940 crop, 84·32204 cents; 1941 crop, 91·59995 cents; 1942 crop, $1.09·64994; 1943 crop, not available.*

* The prices for the 1943 crop cannot be determined until the final reports are received from all agents of the board and the ultimate disposition and class of the grain is shown.

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE

Mr. FRASER:

1. Is the Royal Military College, Kingston, to be opened again as a military college?

2. If so, when?

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is intended to resume the training of cadets in 1946 under conditions which are now under consideration.

MEAT AVAILABLE FOR EXPORT

Mr. SENN:

1. What is the estimated amount of meat Canada will be able to ship, (a) to Great Britain; (b) to other European countries, in the next twelve months?

2. What proportion of this amount will be, (a) pork and pork products; (b) beef and beef products; (c) mutton and lamb?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. It is impossible to provide information on meat exports for the next twelve months since the shipping programme operates on a calendar year basis.

Commitments to the British Ministry of Food for beef and pork are for minimum quantities, and for the year 1946 these are: Beef, 60,000,000 pounds; pork, 450,000,000 pounds.

It is impossible to estimate what the actual deliveries will be with any degree of accuracy so far in advance.

Following the tri-partite food conference in the spring of this year, Canada undertook that in addition to the amount previously contracted for she would endeavour to provide an additional quantity of meat to bring her total shipments for 1945 to the United Kingdom and liberated European countries up to at least the following amounts: Beef, 225,000,000 pounds; pork, 450,000,000 pounds; canned meats, 114,000,000 pounds; total, 789,000,000 pounds.

2. Answered by No. 1.

UNRRA

Mr. REID:

1. What nations signified their willingness and agreed to assist the people of devastated countries in Europe under the organization known as UNRRA?

2. What countries up to the present time have contributed and in what amounts?

3. What countries have representation on the organization who are handling the collecting and distribution of the various supplies of food, clothing, other supplies, etc.?

4. Have any of the countries who have not so far contributed any direct representation in the distribution of food, clothing, and other supplies, etc.?

5. If so, what countries?

Mr. ST. LAURENT:

1 and 2.

Government	Total contributions authorized or in process of authorization
Australia	$ 38,400,000
Belgium*	175,000
Bolivia	95,238
Brazil	30,000,000
Canada	69,369,369
Chile	2,153,312
China*	875,000
Colombia	2,356,493
Costa Rica	400,000
Cuba	35,000
Czechoslovakia*	175,000
Denmark*	18,750
Dominican Republic	350,000
Ecuador	150,000
Egypt	4,255,833
El Salvador	128,750
Ethiopia*	8,750
France*	700,000
Greece*	87,500
Guatemala	8,750
Haiti	48,750
Honduras	58,750
Iceland	717,975
India	24,042,072
Iran	17,500
Iraq	17,500
Liberia	8,750
Luxembourg*	8,750
Mexico	3,601,500
Netherlands*	262,500
New Zealand	8,476,000
Nicaragua	128,750
Norway*	52,500
Panama	408,750
Paraguay	38,449
Peru	1,000,000
Philippines*	8,750
Poland*	175,000
Union of South Africa	4,130,000
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*	1,750,000
United Kingdom	322,400,000
United States of America	1,350,000,000
Uruguay	520,000
Venezuela	1,017,500
Yugoslavia*	122,500

* Liberated country. The council has recommended that contributions for operations be made primarily by member governments whose home territory has not been occupied by the enemy. Liberated countries are only assessed for administrative expenses.

At the recent council meeting in London the Byelo-Russian S.S.R. and the Ukrainian S.S.R. were added to the membership listed above, bringing the total membership up to 47, of which 16 members represent countries recently liberated.

3. All countries listed under 1 and 2 and only they, are represented on the Council of UNRRA.

4 and 5. Answered by Nos. 1 and 2.

CANADIAN ARMY—COURTS-MARTIAL

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

1. How many convictions were registered by courts-martial in the army between 1939 and September 1, 1945, wherein the penalty was (a) death; (b) imprisonment from one year to three years inclusive; (c) imprisonment of more than three years?

2. In how many cases was the verdict of a court-martial reversed or varied in each year during the period 1940 to 1945 inclusive?

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. (a) Three, the death penalty being carried out in one case only, the other two being commuted to penal servitude; (b) 2,776; (c) 302.

2. 1940, 18; 1941, 85; 1942, 148; 1943, 259; 1944, 270; 178 (From 1 January, 1945 to 1 September, 1945). Total, 958.

CANADIAN ARMY—OFFICERS LOANED TO BRITISH ARMY

Mr. HAZEN:

1. How many officers of the Canadian army were loaned to the British army during the war?

2. How many of these officers were casualties?

3. How many of them are now with the British army?

4. How many have been discharged since V-E day?

5. What steps have been taken to have Canadian officers, who are now with the British army on loan and who want to be discharged, returned to the Canadian army?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Below is given the information insofar as the loan of officers under the Canadian loan plan is concerned. In addition, other officers have been on loan at various times and for varying periods to the British army. It would take a great deal of research on the part of Canadian military headquarters to determine the exact number of officers who have at some period been loaned to the British army for such duties as operational planning, civil affairs, medical services, etc.

1. Under Canadian loan plan, 673.

2. (a) Battle casualties, 291; (b) ordinary casualties, 56.

3. 175.

4. Struck off strength in Canada, 34.

5. All officers were circulated to find out their wishes after V-E day. Those who expressed a desire to return to Canadian control are being brought back to the Canadian army. (a) if their points are sufficiently high for repatriation then they are returned to Canada on the same basis as if they were serving with Canadian forces, or (b) as they can be absorbed into the Canadian army.

CARGO SHIPS

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland):

1. How many "4,700" ton class cargo ships have been ordered built in Canada during the war?

2. (a) At what yards were orders placed; (b) on what date was each keel laid and ship completed for service; (c) what was the cost of each completed; (d) for whom were they built?

3. Have any been sold? If so, (a) to whom; (b) what was the price for each and terms of payment?

4. How many have been managed or operated by the Park Steamship Company, stating the Canadian agents, commissions and fees paid?

5. Who are the other managing and operating firms and agents in Canada?

[Mr. Lapointe.]

Mr. HOWE:

1. Forty-three.

2. (a)

Company	No. of Ships
Geo. T. Davie & Sons, Ltd., Lauzon, Levis, P.Q.	7
Quebec Shipyards (Morton Division), Quebec, P.Q.	4
Foundation Maritime Ltd., Pictou, N.S.	24
St. John Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co., Ltd., Saint John, N.B.	8

(b) Ship No.—Keel Laid—Delivery Made

Geo. T. Davie & Sons, Ltd.

4301 January 24, 1942; May 15, 1943.
4302 January 24, 1942; June 14, 1943.
4303 January 24, 1942; August 5, 1943.
4304 May 8, 1944; November 24, 1944.
4305 May 31, 1944; December 20, 1944.
4306 October 3, 1944; June 4, 1945.
4307 November 8, 1944; August 8, 1945.

Quebec Shipyards (Morton Division)

4201 May 15, 1944; June 13, 1945.
4202 June 1, 1944; July 12, 1945.
4203 November 10, 1944; August 29, 1945.
4204 November 28, 1944; September, 1945 Expected date.

Foundation Maritime Limited

4401 February 28, 1942; April 27, 1943.
4402 February 28, 1942; June 2, 1943.
4403 February 28, 1942; July 8, 1943.
4404 April 15, 1942; August 11, 1943.
4405 January 2, 1943; October 6, 1943.
4406 January 7, 1943; October 21, 1943.
4407 March 21, 1943; December 7, 1943.
4408 March 21, 1943; December 13, 1943.
4409 July 5, 1943; January 19, 1944.
4410 August 7, 1943; March 29, 1944.
4411 September 17, 1943; April 24, 1944.
4412 October 20, 1943; May 13, 1944.
4413 November 26, 1943; June 3, 1944.
4414 December 23, 1943; June 30, 1944.
4415 January 31, 1944; July 25, 1944.
4416 February 26, 1944; August 28, 1944.
4417 March 28, 1944; September 26, 1944.
4418 April 26, 1944; October 25, 1944.
4419 May 25, 1944; November 24, 1944.
4420 June 15, 1944; December 22, 1944.
4421 August 30, 1944; April 13, 1945.
4422 September 29, 1944; April 17, 1945.
4423 December 1, 1944; May 31, 1945.
4424 January 16, 1945; July 5, 1945.

Ship No.	Keel laid	Delivery made
St. John Dry Dock and Shipbuilding Co. Ltd.		
4101	January 15, 1942;	February 15, 1943.
4102	January 28, 1942;	April 29, 1943.
4103	October 9, 1942;	January 21, 1944.
4104	January 7, 1943;	April 17, 1944.
4105	September 1, 1943;	September 2, 1944.
4106	December 18, 1943;	December 30, 1944.
4107	June 15, 1944;	June 18, 1945.
4108	October 13, 1944;	October 15, 1945 Expected date.

2. (c)

Ship No.	Cost—To Nearest Thousand
Gray Type	
Foundation Maritime Ltd.	
4401	$1,766,000
4402	1,558,000
4403	1,613,000
4404	1,694,000
4405	1,549,000
4406	1,429,000
4407	1,431,000
4408	1,408,000
4409	1,275,000
4410	1,296,000
4411	1,236,000
4412	1,214,000
4413	1,139,000
4414	1,112,000
4415	1,050,000
4416	1,046,000
4417	1,061,000
4418	1,051,000
Geo. T. Davie & Sons, Ltd.	
4301	1,086,000*
4302	1,100,000*
4303	1,100,000*
St. John Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co. Ltd.	
4101	1,206,000*
4102	1,220,000*
4103	1,126,000*
4104	1,131,000*
4105	1,102,000
4106	1,134,000
Revised Gray Type	
Foundation Maritime Ltd.	
4419	1,062,000
4420	1,043,000
4421	1,059,000
4422	1,067,000
Geo. T. Davie & Sons, Ltd.	
4304	1,144,000
4305	1,081,000
St. John Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co. Ltd.	
4107	1,153,000
4108	Costs not yet completed.
Quebec Shipyards (Morton Division)	
4201 } 4202 }	Costs not yet completed.
Dominion Type	
Foundation Maritime Ltd.	
4423	1,128,000
4424	1,119,000
Geo. T. Davie & Sons, Ltd.	
4306	1,119,000
4307	1,104,000
Quebec Shipyards (Morton Division)	
4203 } 4204 }	Costs not yet completed.

*Fixed Price basis contracts.

2. (d) Department of Munitions and Supply.

3. No.

4. As of March 31, 1945.

	Management Fees and Commissions paid.
Canadian National Steamships—11 vessels	$231,174.05
Montreal Shipping Co. Ltd.—5 vessels	70,671.23
Pickford & Black Limited—4 vessels	69,575.76
Inter-Provincial Steamships Co. Ltd.—1 vessel	450.68
H. E. Kane & Co. Ltd.—1 vessel	412.33
Saguenay Terminals Ltd.—2 vessels	24,533.39
Union Steamships Ltd.—2 vessels	34,195.50

5. There were no other managing operators operating 4,700 ton vessels except those shown in reply to No. 4.

CANADIAN HOME DEFENCE ARMY

Mr. HAZEN:

1. How many officers and men were in the Canadian home defence army on August 14, 1945?

2. Where were they stationed on that date?

3. How many of them have received promotions since that date?

4. What is the present strength of the Canadian home defence army?

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. As at August 15, 1945, the nearest date to August 14, 1945, on which a strength return was rendered to national defence headquarters:

N.R.M.A. Officers—Nil. There are no N.R.M.A. Officers.

N.R.M.A. Other Ranks—35,950 in Canada and adjacent territories, including 8,235 on extended leave.

2. National Defence Headquarters	186	
Military District No. 1	898	
Military District No. 2	1,658	
Camp Borden	627	
Military District No. 3	1,101	
Petawawa Camp	727	
Military District No. 4	4,734	
Military District No. 5	4,214	
Military District No. 6	3,976	
Military District No. 7	981	
Military District No. 10	1,114	
Pacific Command	4,053	
Military District No. 12	1,076	
Military District No. 13	976	
Total in Canada		26,321
Newfoundland	594	
Labrador	85	
Jamaica	446	
Nassau	120	
Bermuda	149	
Total in adjacent territories		1,394
Total other than on extended leave		27,715
Extended leave		8,235
Total		35,950

3. Promotions of 328 N.R.M.A. personnel appeared in Part II Orders published subsequent to August 15, 1945 and received at National Defence Headquarters up to September 12, 1945.

4. As of August 29, 1945, the last date on which the strength return of N.R.M.A. personnel has been compiled:

35,276 in the army in Canada and adjacent territories including 8,422 on extended leave.

BRITISH COLUMBIA CANNED SALMON

Mr. FRASER:

1. What quantities of British Columbia canned salmon were bought by the Department of Munitions and Supply in 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944?

[Mr. Hazen.]

2. What quantity does the Department of Munitions and Supply expect to purchase this year?

3. How was this salmon distributed during 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945?

Mr. HOWE:

1. 1940, 4,908 cases; 1941, 4,349 cases; 1942 3,180 cases; 1943, 13,248 cases; 1944, 28,410 cases; 1945, 3,271 cases to July 31, 1945.

The figures for 1942, 1943 and 1944 cover all purchases of canned salmon by the department. The figures for 1940 and 1941 cover all individual purchases but do not include quantities of canned salmon that may have been purchased with miscellaneous grocery items.

2. The Department of Fisheries were requested by the Department of Munitions and Supply to set aside 12,000 cases for distribution to the armed services. These figures have since been revised in view of the cessation of hostilities to 8,670 cases.

3. Distribution was as follows:

1940

Ottawa, 1,871 cases; Montreal, 153 cases; Halifax, 2,343 cases; Vancouver, 313 cases; Victoria, 228 cases; total, 4,908 cases.

1941

Ottawa, 1,159 cases; Montreal, 457 cases; Halifax, 1,977 cases; Vancouver, 349 cases; Victoria, 296 cases; Newfoundland, 111 cases; total, 4,349 cases.

1942

Montreal, 167 cases; Halifax, 1,935 cases; Vancouver, 10 cases; Victoria, 818 cases; Newfoundland, 250 cases; total, 3,180 cases.

1943

Toronto, 312 cases; Montreal, 9 cases; Halifax, 3,481 cases; Winnipeg, 1,306 cases; Vancouver, 1,471 cases; Victoria, 2,413 cases; Regina, 641 cases; Calgary, 1,585 cases; Newfoundland, 2,030 cases; total, 13,248 cases.

1944

Toronto, 5,453 cases; Ottawa, 5,286 cases; Montreal, 2,372 cases; Quebec, 1,482 cases; Halifax, 6,022 cases; Winnipeg, 1,332 cases; Vancouver, 1,883 cases; Victoria, 1,796 cases; Regina, 1,142 cases; Calgary, 1,642 cases; total, 28,410 cases.

1945—to July 31.

Toronto, 1,000 cases; Ottawa, 750 cases; Montreal, 750 cases; Winnipeg, 200 cases; Vancouver, 150 cases; Regina, 150 cases; Edmonton, 74 cases; Calgary, 197 cases; total. 3,271 cases.

CLOVER SEED—PRODUCTION AND EXPORTS

Mr. SENN:

1. What was the total production in Canada of, (a) alsike seed; (b) red clover seed, for the years 1942, 1943, 1944?

2. To what countries have exports of, (a) alsike seed; (b) red clover seed, been sent from Canada in each of the years 1942, 1943, 1944, and how much to each country?

Mr. MacKINNON:

1.

	Alsike seed	Red clover seed
	lb.	lb.
1942	913,000	1,598,000
1943	4,760,000	7,297,000
1944	1,905,000	8,960,000

2. Canadian exports by countries of clover seed during the calendar years 1942, 1943, 1944.

	Clover seed, alsike		
	1942	1943	1944
	lb.	lb.	lb.
United Kingdom	1,058,340	—	658,300
Eire	9,600	—	—
Newfoundland	60	—	270
Totals	1,068,000	—	658,570
	Clover seed, red		
United Kingdom	1,422,780	—	100,050
Newfoundland	300	—	660
United States	60	22,740	—
Totals	1,423,140	22,740	100,710

PRESENTATION TO EX-MEMBERS OF CHAIRS

Mr. HANSELL:

Will the government give consideration to presenting ex-members of parliament with chairs which they occupied in the house, in order that they may have a suitable memento of their services as members?

Mr. ILSLEY: The suggestion is one to which the government does not regard it advisable to accede.

PURCHASE OF LAND UNDER VETERANS' LAND ACT

Mr. WRIGHT:

1. How many parcels of land have been purchased under the Veterans' Land Act in areas in which P.F.A.A. assistance was paid in the year 1937-38?

2. What is the total acreage involved?

Mr. WRIGHT: After consultation with the department I would ask that this question be withdrawn for rewording.

Question dropped.

FOOD AND TOBACCO SHIPMENTS TO BRITAIN

Mr. SENN:

1. How many pounds of, (a) pork and pork products; (b) beef and beef products; (c) mutton and lamb; (d) poultry; (e) tobacco; (f) cheese, have been shipped from Canada to Great Britain in each of the years 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945?

2. How many dozens of eggs in the shell or in powdered form have been shipped from Canada to Great Britain in each of the years 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945?

Mr. MacKINNON:

1 and 2.

Canadian exports to the United Kingdom of specified products during the calendar years 1941 to 1944, and the period from January 1 to August 31, 1945

Item	Unit qty.	1941 qty.	1942 qty.	1943 qty.	1944 qty.	Jan. 1 to Aug. 31, 1945 qty.
Pork, fresh, chilled or frozen	lb.	....	....	14,912,400	10,375,100	....
Bacon and hams, shoulders and sides	lb.	460,800,200	524,951,900	560,309,300	692,310,300	399,851,300
Lard	lb.	4,426,700	....	....	8,921,300	1,443,400
Beef, fresh, chilled and frozen	lb.	....	....	385,600	98,080,000	104,772,700
Mutton and lamb, fresh, chilled or frozen	lb.	....	....	....	1,135,600	....
Poultry	lb.	....	....	58,230	2,165,048	....
Tobacco	lb.	3,637,421	10,347,030	9,743,526	8,528,844	12,180,744
Cheese	lb.	89,089,100	131,374,000	126,604,700	128,872,900	56,040,000
Eggs in the shell	doz.	15,257,279	4,374,640	....	....	27,317,858
Eggs, dried	lb.	....	7,661,817	13,449,395	18,951,651	18,228,451

DEVELOPMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. KNOWLES:

1. What sources in Canada of uranium and other materials used in the development of atomic energy are owned or controlled by the federal government?

2. Are there in Canada any known sources of uranium or other materials used in the development of atomic energy which are privately owned? If so, where are they located, and by whom are they owned?

3. Are there in Canada any plants engaged in the development of atomic energy which are not owned by the government? If so, what plants, and by whom are they owned?

4. Has the government made any contracts or agreements respecting the development of atomic energy, (a) with Canadian Industries Limited and/or Defence Industries Limited; (b) with any other private firms?

5. Are there any non-Canadian private firms with investments or other interests in, (a) the production in Canada of materials used as indicated above; (b) plants in Canada engaged in the development of atomic energy? If so, what firms, and what are their Canadian interests?

Mr. HOWE:

1. Eldorado Mining and Refining Limited.

2. No.

3. No.

4. Defence Industries Limited is providing engineering services at no fee or profit in connection with the construction of the plant under the direction of the national research council.

5. (a) No.
(b) No.

WINNIPEG AIRPORT—MACDONALD BROS. AIRCRAFT LIMITED

Mr. KNOWLES:

1. Have any arrangements been made for the sale of the buildings built by the government for MacDonald Bros. Aircraft Limited, at the airport in Winnipeg?

2. If so, to whom and at what price or prices?

3. If not, are any negotiations for such sale under way, and with whom?

Mr. HOWE:

1. Certain property located on Robinson street, Winnipeg, has been sold by War Assets Corporation to MacDonald Bros. Aircraft, Limited. This property consists of an extension or additions to the original buildings owned by MacDonald Bros. Aircraft, Limited. No other buildings have been sold.

2. (a) Answered by 1.
(b) $25,000.

3. Negotiations between War Assets Corporation and MacDonald Bros. Aircraft, Limited have been under way concerning the purchase by the latter of certain other buildings. Advice was received on September 14, 1945, that the company does not intend to proceed with this purchase.

[Mr. MacKinnon.]

Mr. KNOWLES:

1. What was the peak number of workers during the war employed by MacDonald Bros. Aircraft Limited of Winnipeg (a) at its airport properties; (b) at Robinson street, and what was the period of said peak employment?

2. What was the number employed at both (a) and (b) above as at the end of each month thus far this year?

3. How many former employees of MacDonald Bros. Aircraft Limited enlisted in the armed services, and how many of the same have secured reemployment with this firm?

Mr. MITCHELL:

1. Peak number of workers during the war employed by MacDonald Bros. Aircraft Limited of Winnipeg and period of said peak employment, (a) at its airport properties—3,506 during January, 1944; (b) at Robinson street—1,157 during October, 1944.

2. Number of workers employed at end of each month thus far this year:

(a) at airport properties: January, 1,401; February, 1,092; March, 799; April, 804; May, 805; June, 711; July, 628; August, 273; (b) at Robinson street: January, 572; February, 482; March, 461; April, 448; May, 418; June, 400; July, 397; August, 132.

3. Number of former employees who enlisted in the armed services at airport properties, 521; at Robinson street, 376; total, 897.

Number of former employees who secured reemployment with this firm at airport properties, 20; at Robinson street, 15; total, 35.

*PACIFIC COAST MILITIA RIFLES—RIFLES USED IN WAR AGAINST JAPAN

Mr. PEARKES:

1. Has the Minister of National Defence received a request, from or on behalf of the Pacific coast militia rangers, that they be presented with, or permitted to purchase at a nominal price, the rifles they used during the war against Japan?

2. If so, what action has been taken by the government in this matter?

Mr. ABBOTT: Perhaps I may be permitted to answer this question verbally. The Minister of National Defence has received a great many requests from hon. members on this side of the house asking that the members of this force be allowed to retain their rifles or to purchase them for a nominal consideration. The force, as hon. members from British Columbia know, has rendered very valuable service. They served voluntarily and without pay. In some cases they were issued with service rifles and in some cases with sporting rifles, 30-30 carbines. The matter has been under consideration for some time. It was felt that for fairly obvious reasons they

could not be allowed to retain the service rifles; but I recommended a short time ago that they should be allowed to purchase the sporting rifles at a nominal price. I made that recommendation to my colleague, the Minister of Munitions and Supply, with a view to his passing it on to War Assets Corporation, and he agrees that that can be done. The details will now be worked out and arrangements made to allow them to purchase those rifles at a nominal price.

WINNIPEG AIRPORT—MACDONALD BROS. AIRCRAFT LTD.

Mr. KNOWLES:

1. What is the total amount of money invested by the government in plant and equipment at the airport establishment of MacDonald Bros. Aircraft Limited, Winnipeg?
2. What is the total value of contracts awarded this firm during the course of the war?
3. On what basis were these contracts awarded?
4. What is the total amount of profit received by this firm on the contracts indicated above?
5. Is MacDonald Bros. Aircraft Limited at present working on any government contracts? If so, of what nature and what is their value?

Mr. HOWE:

1. Airport, St. James, Man., $1,527,143.52; Robinson St. Plant, Winnipeg, Man., $196,530.72; total, $1,723,674.24.

2. Total sales, exclusive of sales tax, $20,872,957.99.

3. Contracts were awarded on "a fair and reasonable profit" basis the rate of profit to be determined by the minister after government audit.

4. Allowed costs, $19,405,977.09; amount of profit, $967,408.87; rate of profit, 4·9851 per cent; excess profit fully refunded to the government, $499,572.03.

5. No.

SICK MARINERS

Mr. MacINNIS:

1. How many vessels paid dues into the sick mariners' fund for each of the calendar years 1938, 1942 and 1944?
2. What was the total amount of money collected in dues from the vessels for each of the above years?
3. Has the sick mariners' fund any other source of income and if so, what amount was received by the fund from such source or sources in the calendar year 1944?
4. What was the total expenditure of the fund in each of the calendar years, 1938, 1942 and 1944?
5. What was the balance in the fund as at December 31, 1944?

Mr. CLAXTON:

1. There is no sick mariners' fund. Duty or dues collected under the authority of Part V of the Canada Shipping Act are credited to the revenue account, consolidated revenue fund. The cost of treatment of sick mariners and of administration of Part V of the Act is charged to funds appropriated each year by Parliament. The total number of vessels which paid dues for the calendar years 1938, 1942 and 1944 were 3,720, 4,427 and 4,285, respectively.

2. 1938, $210,594.97; 1942, $276,373.64; 1944, $201,150.20.

3. There is no other revenue accruing to the government under the authority of part V of the Canada Shipping Act.

4. Total expenditures for the calendar year: 1938, $187,090.98; 1942, $349,593.77; 1944, $239,332.36.

5. See answer to No. 1.

*ADRIAN ARCAND

Mr. IRVINE:

When is Mr. Adrian Arcand to be tried for alleged nazi activities prior to his internment in 1940?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: In view of the large number of inquiries that have come to the department with regard to this question I think I should read aloud the answer that is being made to the question.

The opinions of the deputy minister of justice and of Mr. Gerald Fauteux, K.C., special prosecutor, now tabled, are that it is not advisable that federal authorities proceed further with charges against Adrian Arcand based on his activities prior to his internment. I beg leave to table the opinions where the matter is discussed, and the reasons for the opinions are given. I am making a certain number of mimeographed copies of these opinions available to the gentlemen of the press. If any hon. member wishes to have a copy I shall be glad to furnish it.

Mr. COLDWELL: In view of the public interest would it not be possible to put the opinions on *Hansard*? I do not know how long they are, but the minister says he has had a large number of requests for them.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I have had a large number of inquiries. It covers five or six pages. I have no objection to its being printed as an appendix—

Mr. COLDWELL: Make it part of the answer.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: —or making it part of the answer to the question.

Mr. COLDWELL: I think that would be better.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Then with the consent of the house the opinions will be made part of the answer to the question.

I have considered the advisability of taking further criminal proceedings against Adrien Arcand, who in May, 1940, was charged, by way of indictment, under sections 39 and 39A of the defence of Canada regulations with having spread and published reports and statements intended or likely to cause disaffection or to be prejudicial to the safety of the state or the efficient prosecution of the war. Before the preliminary inquiry was completed and the accused could be committed for trial, the judge directed that the situation disclosed by the evidence should be brought to the attention of the attorney general of Quebec. The latter in turn communicated with the Minister of Justice, who, with a view to preventing Arcand from acting in a manner prejudicial to the public safety or the safety of the state, directed that he should be detained, and he was so detained until July, 1945.

It may now be stated that Arcand was the recognized leader of an organization known as the national unity party, declared by the defence of Canada regulations to be illegal. The national unity party had objects and ideals very similar to those of the fascist and nazi parties, and there is evidence of some connecting link between members of those parties and Arcand.

Whether or not the national unity party had any real numerical strength or potential possibilities, the prompt action taken by the Minister of Justice effectively quelled the movement, and the purpose of Arcand and the misguided people whom he sought to influence wholly failed. There is no evidence that his activities or those of the party in fact did any injury or in the slightest degree prejudiced the successful prosecution of the war. My information is that since his release from internment Arcand has not been engaged in any political activity and no complaints have been received with reference to his conduct.

To the question whether further criminal proceedings should be taken against Arcand, the following observations of a legal nature would seem to be relevant:

First, responsibility for the prosecution of indictable offences rests with the provincial attorney general, and, while it would be open to federal authorities to proceed with the charges under the defence of Canada regulations with the object of having Arcand committed for trial, I would not advise this course without first consulting the attorney general of the province, since he must assume responsibility for the trial if the accused is committed.

Secondly, defence of Canada regulations 39 and 39A have been revoked, and, while such revocation does not relieve from liability a person who committed an offence prior to revocation, nevertheless in the case of such a stale offence as this the fact of revocation might be expected to affect the course of the trial.

Thirdly, the maximum sentence which could be imposed for the offences charged is five years' imprisonment. Arcand has already been subjected to confinement for a period in excess of five years.

Fourthly, a proposal to prosecute for a seditious offence under the criminal code would be subject to the same considerations as apply in the case of the charges under the defence of Canada regulations, namely, that the provincial attorney general would be responsible since the proceedings would be by way of indictment, and that the offence is stale, and that the accused has already suffered a lengthy period of confinement.

Fifthly, Arcand could not be tried for treason for the reason that any such offence has long since been prescribed by statute. In this connection it should be remarked that the Treachery Act of Canada was only assented to on the 7th of August, 1940, after Arcand was interned, and so would not apply to Arcand's activities prior to internment.

Having regard to the foregoing, I would not advise that further criminal proceedings be undertaken by federal authorities, and in this respect I concur in the view recently expressed by Mr. Gérald Fauteux, K.C., who acted as crown prosecutor at the time the charge was laid against Arcand.

F. P. Varcoe,
Deputy Minister of Justice.

Copy:MJC:14:9:45

Fauteux and Mathieu
Advocates
Gérald Fauteux, K.C.
Auguste Mathieu, K.C.

Transportation Building
132 St. James Street West
Suite 420

Montreal, September 7, 1945.
Canada.

Mr. F. P. Varcoe, K.C.,
Deputy Minister of Justice,
Ottawa.

Re: Adrien Arcand, Jos. C. Farr et al
—Further prosecutions.

Dear Mr. Varcoe,

I have examined the brief submitted for opinion, in relation with the above matter.

This brief, I understand, after a recent interview with Inspector C. W. Harvison of the R.C.M. Police is definitely a general outline of the case, and cannot be taken as definite and exhaustive as far as evidence is concerned.

Furthermore, I had a conference yesterday, in Ottawa, with Mr. Robert Forsyth, K.C., of your department, with whom I discussed the matter, and who, I may say, agrees with the views which I now beg to express as follows:

1. The matter during the war:

In the spring of 1940, and as the result of the execution of a number of search warrants, truckloads of documents were seized in various places and in various provinces in Canada.

At that time, more than sufficient evidence was gathered to justify a prosecution under sections 39 and 39A of the defence of Canada regulations. And as a matter of fact, on the 29th of May, 1940, a number of warrants were issued for the arrest of the leaders of the so-called "national social christian party" and "national unity party of Canada".

According to their own publications, their programme, I quote:

"in its main lines, and even in many details, is identical to the programme of the principal corporatist organizations of other countries:

"Fascists of Italy,
Nazis of Germany,
Cuzists of Rumania,
Francists of France,
Fascists of Great Britain,
Guardists of Australia,

Nara-ists of Poland,
Nationalists of Switzerland,
Gadja-ists of Yugoslavia,
Rexists of Belgium,
Fascists of Denmark, Sweden, Norway,
Bulgaria, the Netherlands, Portugal, etc."

The procedures before the court were by way of indictment. In the course of the preliminary inquiry, the presiding judge, after the filing of a number of exhibits, interrupted the procedure, called the attorneys for the prosecution and the defence, for a short conference in his chamber, and immediately after resuming the procedures in court, declared that there was prima facie evidence of a conspiracy against the safety of the state, and suggested that the matter be immediately referred to the attorney general of the province; the inquiry was then adjourned to the following week. This action of the court brought no protests from the defence counsels. (sic)

Accordingly, the matter was immediately referred to the attorney general who, in turn, advised the then Minister of Justice of same and of the extension of the alleged conspiracy beyond the limits of the province of Quebec. An order for internment under section 21 of the D.O.C.R. followed.

The preliminary inquiry was then adjourned sine die.

Later, the question of prosecution for offences under the criminal code of Canada was considered. It was thought that any trial under circumstances then prevailing, would have possibly led to certain agitation and perhaps, and to an unmeasurable extent, defeated the very purpose which the defence of Canada regulations were meant to achieve.

The national emergency prevailing at that time could hardly be met otherwise than by emergency steps which, as stated, were immediately taken.

2. The matter since the cessation of hostilities:

I have been asked to express an opinion on the actual possibility of prosecutions.

For that purpose, I have considered the Treachery Act and the criminal code of Canada.

(a) With regard to the Treachery Act:

To supplement for the inadequacy of legislation on treason, Canada, like England, has adopted at the beginning of this war, the Treachery Act, 4 George VI, chapter 43. This act was assented to on the 7th of August, 1940, consequently after the internment of Arcand and others. The statute having no retroactive effect, cannot therefore have any application in the matter.

(b) The Criminal Code of Canada:

1. Treason and treasonable offences:

I cannot say that the activities of the above group could not reveal evidence of treason or treasonable offences. To express a final and definite opinion, as to a conviction without doubt, would necessitate a more complete and minute examination of the mass of documents seized.

The provisions of our code on treason and treasonable offences have their source in the English statute known as the Treason Act assented to in the year 1351, and are far from suiting modern conditions.

Their enforcement is not, consequently, without difficulty.

For practical purposes, however, our Canadian law as well as the English law provide for a limitation of action, and in both countries, it has always been and still is impossible to prosecute after three years.

Under such circumstances, prosecution for treason or treasonable offences cannot be entered.

2. Drilling:

Drilling was also in the programme of these organizations, and for that reason, provisions of section 99 were examined.

The operation of that section depends upon the existence of an order in council prohibiting training or drilling to the use of arms or for the purpose of practising military exercises, movements or evolutions. I am not aware of the existence of an order in council covering the case.

Be it as it may, these provisions are also subject to a limitation, under section 1140, paragraph "b", subparagraphs "i" and "ii".

In such cases, prosecution may be commenced within six months after the commission of the offence.

S. 133—

3. Seditious offences: S. 134—

I have also given consideration to the question of sedition. Of that, there is evidence. And in such matters, there is no limitation of action.

To decide whether it is in the best interest of Canada and particularly of justice to the accused as well, you may like to consider the exculpatory clause of section 133A—which I do not believe has, in fact, any application in the matter, but is, in law, nevertheless opened to the accused for their defence at trial—and also the fact that the maximum penalty for the offence is two years imprisonment, while the leaders of the movement have actually been deprived of their liberty for a period of five years, more or less.

Our legislation being inspired by the same principles of justice animating the English legislation, you may also consider that the leaders of a like movement in Great Britain, particularly Sir Oswald Mosley, have not been prosecuted after suffering internment.

Our penal laws operate by punishment, the purpose of which is double, to wit: punishment to individuals and deterrent for other people.

In view of the length of internment which is more than twice the authorized maximum sentence for sedition, I doubt what more could be achieved in prosecuting for sedition.

And the judgment given by the civilized nations on the ideologies professed by these groups is and shall ever be far more impressive than a judgment of one of our local courts of Quebec or Ontario against a limited number of individuals irreasonably attracted by and promoting these now universally condemned ideologies and purposes.

It is again a timely question whether the publicity attached to trials by the will of the legislator, would not, in this case, be used to serve a purpose much beyond its true object.

Personally, and if I may be permitted to express an opinion as to the advisability of proceeding for sedition, I honestly believe that

the national interest and the Canadian justice would equally be served adequately by following the policy adopted in the very country from which flows our legislation in similar matters.

Yours very truly,

Gérald Fauteux.

GF/NA

P.S.—I have been asked by phone, to further express my opinion on the possibility of a prosecution under sections 39 and 39A of the D.O.C.R. There is no doubt that in view of section 66 of the D.O.C.R., such prosecution can still obtain. I beg to draw your attention on paragraph 2 of section 39B affording a defence more or less similar as under section 133A of the Criminal Code.

G. F.

BUILDINGS ERECTED AT CANADIAN CAR & FOUNDRY PLANT, AMHERST, N.S.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland):

1. What buildings or other structures were erected during the war by the government at the plant of the Canadian Car & Foundry Company Limited, Amherst, Nova Scotia?

2. What was the cost of each such building?

3. Were these buildings under lease to the company and, if so, for what period and at what rental charges?

4. Have any such buildings been offered for sale to the company or to other parties, if so, state the price for each?

5. Is it proposed to offer these buildings for sale through War Assets Corporation or other agency of the government? If so, when?

6. Has the government and the company made proposals to lease any of these buildings for storage of naval supplies and equipment or other materials? If so, for what period and what rental charges?

7. Were the municipal authorities at Amherst consulted in regard to any proposals for sales or leases?

Mr. HOWE:

1. The following buildings were erected during the war by the government at the plant of the Canadian Car & Foundry Company Limited, Amherst, Nova Scotia, and the cost was as follows: Aircraft overhaul depot, $134,206.30; Guard house building, $2,953.00; Cafeteria building, $30,825.00.

2. Answered by 1.

3. No.

4. Yes, to Canadian Car & Foundry Company Limited who intimated their desire to negotiate for the buildings and equipment. Another party has shown an interest in leasing the property with option to purchase. It would be prejudicial to the successful sale of this property to disclose the price offered or the negotiations in detail with either party.

5. It is not proposed at present to advertise these properties in the open market if a proper sale can be negotiated with the present occupants.

6. No proposals to lease for storage has been or will be considered until every effort has been made to sell or lease for industrial purposes.

7. No.

ALTERNATIVE SERVICE WORK CAMPS

Mr. COLDWELL:

1. Are persons detained to-day in alternative service work camps?

2. If so, what is the number?

3. What plans, if any, are going forward for the release of such persons?

4. What reasons are given for the continued detention of such persons?

Mr. MITCHELL:

1. Yes.

2. 290.

3. It is kept constantly before the men who are occupying alternative service work camps that arrangements will be made to transfer them from the camp at once if they will agree to enter into a contract whereby they will be making contribution to the national welfare.

4. Their refusal to conform to those alternative service regulations under which they may be directed to employment other than in camps.

PAMPHLET "JUSTICE FOR POLAND"

Mr. COLDWELL:

1. Has the government distributed any copies of the pamphlet "Justice for Poland" to any army units or personnel?

2. If so, what quantities are involved and when were they distributed?

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

MALTON AIRCRAFT PLANT

Mr. COLDWELL:

1. Has a contract been concluded for the sale by the government of the Malton aircraft plant?

2. If so, who is the purchaser and what is the purchase price?

3. What are the other terms or conditions of sale?

Mr. HOWE:

1. No formal contract has yet been signed for the sale of Victory Aircraft Company Limited to the Hawker-Siddeley Aircraft Company. Negotiations, which were started prior to V-J day, are however continuing and are substantially complete.

2. (a) Answered by 1; (b) It would be prejudicial to the sale to disclose the price, terms and conditions until the contract has been concluded.

3. Answered by 2 (b).

NEW FLAG ON PARLIAMENT BUILDING TOWER

Mr. CHURCH:

1. On whose instructions is a new flag being flown from the tower of the houses of parliament; who authorized it, and when?

2. Who is in charge of such matters, and of this building?

3. Was such an innovation ever authorized by parliament? If so, when?

4. Who authorized and gave the order to haul down the Union Jack?

5. Have instructions been issued for similar action on other government buildings throughout Canada? If so, at what cost?

6. Why is this innovation carried out without the knowledge or consent of parliament now in session?

Mr. ILSLEY:

1. The red ensign is being flown from the tower of the houses of parliament under authority of order in council P.C. 5888, passed on September 5, 1945, copy of which appears below.

2. The Department of Public Works.

3. The red ensign flew from the tower of the houses of parliament from the days of confederation until 1904.

4, 5, and 6. Answered by No. 1.

At the Government House at Ottawa

Wednesday, the 5th day of September, 1945.

Present:

His Excellency

The Governor General in Council:

Whereas the Right Honourable W. L. Mackenzie King, the Prime Minister, reports that by order in council P.C. 134 of January 26, 1924, authority is given for displaying the Red Ensign with the shield of the coat of arms of Canada in the fly (commonly known as "the Canadian Red Ensign") on suitable occasions from all buildings owned or occupied by the Canadian government and situated without Canada;

That the Canadian Red Ensign was employed by Canadian forces during the present war; and

That, until such time as action is taken by parliament for the formal adoption of a national flag, it is desirable to authorize the flying of the Canadian Red Ensign on federal government buildings within as well as without Canada, and to remove any doubt as to the propriety of flying the Canadian Red Ensign wherever place or occasion may make it desirable to fly a distinctive Canadian flag;

Therefore, His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the Prime Minister, is pleased to order and doth hereby order that the Red Ensign with the shield of the coat of arms of Canada in the fly (hereinafter referred to as "the Canadian Red Ensign") may be flown from buildings owned or occupied by the federal government within and without Canada;

His Excellency in Council, on the same recommendation, is further pleased to declare and doth hereby declare that it shall be appropriate to fly the Canadian Red Ensign within and without Canada wherever place or occasion may make it desirable to fly a distinctive Canadian flag.

Nothing herein shall be deemed to alter in any way the provisions now in force with respect to the flying of the Blue Ensign with the shield of the coat of arms of Canada in the fly on Canadian naval vessels and other government vessels, nor with respect to the flying of the Canadian Red Ensign on Canadian merchant vessels.

A. D. P. Heeney,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

VETERANS' LAND ACT

Mr. PROBE:

1. How many applications have been made as of September 1, 1945, for benefits under the terms of the Veterans' Land Act, 1942, for (a) small holdings; (b) full time farming; (c) combined small holdings and commercial fishing?

2. How many applications in each of these categories have been approved as of September 1, 1945?

3. How many veteran families were actually enjoying possession of their holdings provided under Veterans' Land Act, 1942, in each of the above categories as on September 1, 1945?

4. How many houses intended for occupation on small holdings under terms of Veterans' Land Act have been completed or building begun as at September 1, 1945, (a) in Ottawa district; (b) Regina, Saskatchewan, district?

5. How many of the small holdings being provided in Ottawa and Regina districts have actually been sold on Veterans' Land Act basis to veterans as of September 1, 1945?

6. What is the basis on which the allocation of the small holdings thus far secured by Veterans' Land Act in Ottawa and Regina districts is made?

7. How many unfilled applications for small holdings benefits under Veterans' Land Act are there as of September 1, 1945, in Ottawa and in Regina?

Mr. TUCKER:

1. Statistical records do not divide applications for qualification into the types of establishment proposed by veterans as original proposals are frequently changed during interview with regional advisory committees. The total number of applications for qualification is 11,343.

2. Number qualified (a) 3,175; (b) 1,694; (c) 60.

3. The number of applications for financial assistance that were approved is (a) 657, (b) 451, (c) 15. A total of 1,123. Reports obtained from all district offices indicate that a total of 811 had signed settlement agreements.

4. (a) Under contract, 140; Construction under way, 82; (b) Under contract, 25; Construction under way, 20.

5. No small holdings, where homes are under construction on subdivided areas in the vicinity of Ottawa or Regina, have been

sold to veterans. The number of approved applications for financial assistance submitted by veterans who have been qualified for small holdings in the Smiths Falls region, which included Ottawa, is 22, and in the Regina region 8.

6. A system of allocation of small holdings within subdivided areas is under consideration. The system of allocation adopted will depend on the demand by way of specific application from veterans for homes within particular subdivisions.

The small holdings thus far sold to veterans have been purchase proposals submitted by qualified veterans which, on examination, were found to be suitable and within the scope of the act and regulations.

7. Number qualified for small holdings: (a) Smiths Falls region including Ottawa, 155; (b) Regina region, 30.

Applications for financial assistance to become established on small holdings: (a) Smiths Falls region including Ottawa, 56; (b) Regina region, 9.

Number approved: (a) Smiths Falls region including Ottawa, 22; (b) Regina region, 8.

Number declined: (a) Smiths Falls region including Ottawa, 6; (b) Regina region, 0.

ARMED SERVICES PERSONNEL ON RAILWAY MAINTENANCE DUTY

Mr. PROBE:

1. Were members of the armed forces, while still in the services, detailed for duty on railway maintenance with any railway company in Canada?

2. Have members of the armed services been given leave of absence for the purpose of working on railway maintenance for any railway companies in Canada?

3. If so, (a) how many service personnel were released to each railway for maintenance work; (b) on what basis and at what rates of pay were they engaged on railway maintenance work in Canada?

4. Were the wages which were received by these men paid them by the railway company or were they paid by the Department of National Defence?

5. If paid by the Department of National Defence, did the railway company concerned make up the difference between service pay and the usual pay for that type of work, and to whom was the difference paid?

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3.

	1944	1945
(a) Canadian Pacific.....	250	346
Canadian National...	150	725

(b) (i) Prior to Sept. 8, 1945, soldiers were detailed to perform this work as a duty under the provisions of P.C. 6434 dated August 13, 1945.

[Mr. Tucker.]

(ii) Subsequent to Sept. 7, 1945, soldiers who volunteered to do this work have been granted leave without pay and allowances.

(iii) The wages paid by the railways for the soldier's services: (a) C.N.R., 53 cents an hour less $5.75 a week for board and lodging provided by the railway; C.P.R., 53 cents an hour less $6 a week for board and lodging provided by the railway.

(iv) Prior to Dec. 1, 1944, when P.C. 9148 of 1944 was passed, soldiers detailed for duty on railway track maintenance received their army pay and allowances plus any difference between such pay and allowances and the wages paid by the railways, after deduction of the cost of board and lodging. If, owing to bad weather or other reasons, the amount due from the railway for his services, was less than his pay and allowances, the soldier still received his army pay and allowances.

(v) Subsequent to Nov. 30, 1944, under the provisions of P.C. 9148 of 1944, soldiers detailed for industrial duty in the national interest received only their army pay and allowances including dependents allowance.

(vi) Subsequent to Sept. 7, 1945, a soldier who voluntarily proceeds on leave without pay and allowances including dependents allowance for the purpose of accepting employment with a railway on railway track maintenance receives the wages paid by the railway for such work.

4. At all times the railways paid wages of fifty-three cents (53 cents) an hour, less cost of board and lodging, in respect of all soldiers detailed for duty on railway track maintenance. The total amount payable by each railway was paid to the receiver general of Canada.

Up to, and including Nov. 30, 1944, a soldier engaged in railway track maintenance received full pay and allowances or, alternatively, the wages earned by him for the period and paid by the railway as above, whichever was greater. In either case the amount was paid to the soldier through his army pay account.

Subsequent to Nov. 30, 1944, until Sept. 7, 1945, in accordance with P.C. 9148, dated Dec. 5, 1944, men on industrial duty received only army pay and allowances.

On Sept. 7, 1945, industrial duty, as such, was discontinued. Thereafter soldiers were engaged in civilian industry on a voluntary basis only. They were given leave without pay and allowances from the army and were paid wages at current rates direct by the railways.

5. Answered by No. 4.

PRISONERS OF WAR—GERMAN AND JAPANESE IN CANADA

Mr. PROBE:

1. On what basis and at what rates of pay are German and Japanese prisoners of war at present working for corporations or for individuals in Canada?

2. In what general types of work are these enemy prisoners engaged?

3. Are civilians available in Canada for the type of work now being done by enemy prisoners of war?

4. Is the pay allotted by individuals or by corporations for prisoner of war services paid to the prisoners themselves or to the government of Canada?

5. How many, (a) Japanese; (b) Germans, were absent from prisoner of war camps in employment to corporations or individuals in Canada as of September 1, 1945?

Mr. MITCHELL:

1. There are no Japanese prisoners of war in Canada. German prisoners of war so engaged are employed under contract entered into between the Minister of Labour and the employer. The rate of pay which the private employer pays the government for use of prisoners varies with the type of employment, and is based on the estimated value of the prisoners' services in terms of the established rates payable to civilians in like employment.

2. In essential employment for which civilian labour is not available and in areas where security conditions permit. The great majority of prisoners are employed in woods operations or in agricultural work. A small number are employed as unskilled labour in other industries.

3. No.

4. Paid to the government of Canada.

5. (a) See answer to 1; (b) 13,464 prisoners housed in work hostels or on individual farms; 196 prisoners going out to work daily from internment camps.

WAR ASSETS CORPORATION—JEEPS

Mr. McCUAIG:

1. Has War Assets Corporation sold any jeeps up to this date?

2. What is the corporation's policy for disposing of jeeps?

3. Will jeeps be made available for purchase by the public; if so, how and when?

Mr. HOWE:

1. No.

2. The general policy of War Assets Corporation in disposal of motor vehicles is to dispose of them through recognized dealers. When jeeps have been declared surplus by the Department of National Defence and are made available to the corporation, they will come within this general policy.

3. (a) Yes, if and when they are declared surplus and are turned over to the War Assets Corporation for disposal; (b) Answered by 2, and 3 (a); (c) answered by 2, and 3 (a).

VOLUNTEERS FOR GENERAL SERVICE—COMMISSIONS

Mr. McCUAIG:

1. What is the number of persons who volunteered (general service) for the army from each military district in Canada between September 3, 1939, and June 1, 1945?

2. What is the number of persons who were brought into the army under the N.R.M.A. from each military district from the time of its coming into force and June 1, 1945?

3. What is the number of persons granted commissions in the army from each military district between September 1, 1939, and June 1, 1945?

4. What is the number of "other ranks" serving abroad who were granted commissions, giving the military district of enlistment?

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1.

Military District	Number
1	48,250
2	145,583
3	55,495
4	72,597
5	22,183
6	49,487
7	32,268
10	54,061
Pacific command	54,746
12	44,684
13	46,919
Outside of Canada	1,415
Total	627,688

The above figures include officers and other ranks, male and female, and also include N.R.M.A. soldiers who enlisted for general service.

2.

Military District	Number
1	11,631
2	25,037
3	6,098
4	38,519
5	16,391
6	7,210
7	7,139
10	12321
Pacific command	10,703
12	12,221
13	10,714
Total	157,984

3.

Military District	Number
1	3,099
2	10,379
3	5,392
4	6,739
5	1,844
6	2,778
7	1,912
10	3,478
Pacific command	4,291
12	2,426
13	2,737
Outside of Canada	261
Total	45,336

The figures above include males and females. In the case of other ranks granted commissions in Canada and overseas, the allocation by military district is according to the military district of original enlistment.

4.

Military District	Number
1	352
2	1,041
3	622
4	627
5	140
6	215
7	149
10	517
Pacific command	662
12	361
13	479
Outside of Canada	57
Total	5,222

The above figures include all personnel, male or female, granted commissions who at the time of being commissioned, had had service overseas in the present war. The figures are for the period up to June 1, 1945.

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE IN PARIS

Mr. LAPALME:

1. On what date will the international conference of labour be held in Paris?

2. Is Canada to be represented?

3. If so, who is to represent Canada at this conference?

4. Are provincial ministers of labour invited to attend an international conference of labour?

5. If so, are the expenses of such ministers paid by the federal government?

Mr. ST. LAURENT:

1. October 15, 1945.

2. Yes.

3. Canada will be represented by a delegation of representatives of the federal government and of Canadian employers and workers

[Mr. Lapointe.]

Mr. J. G. Turgeon and Mr. Alfred Rive will be the Canadian government delegates, with Mr. V. C. Phelan as alternate.

4. The provincial governments have been invited to send representatives to accompany the delegation at the expense of the provinces, as has been the practice since the I.L.O. was set up.

5. No.

HOUSING—LIMITS ON DWELLING UNITS ERECTED BY ANY ONE BUILDER

Mr. NICHOLSON:

What limits, if any, are placed on the number of dwelling units approved by the construction controller for erection by any one builder?

Mr. HOWE: Licences for houses to be erected by an individual builder are governed by the following policy of construction control: (a) for low cost houses being erected as part of an integrated housing project there is no limit; (b) for other low cost houses the limit is 50 units; (c) for higher cost houses, the limit is 5 units.

FEDERAL DISTRICT PROJECT

Mr. NICHOLSON:

1. Who are the technical advisers chosen by the government for the federal district project, and how were they chosen?

2. What opportunity is to be afforded for review and discussion of proposals for the federal district project, (a) by public hearings, (b) by representations from the city of Ottawa and other people residing in the proposed district; (c) by debate in parliament; (d) by authorities set up answerable through a minister to parliament?

Mr. MACKENZIE:

1. The federal district commission is, by statute, the government agency directly responsible for development of the district of the national capital. Its administrative organization includes several technical experts. The technical services of the Department of Public Works are also made use of by the government in this connection.

The chief technical consultant, chosen by the government to advise with regard to the development of the national capital and its surrounding area as a national war memorial, is Mr. Jacques Greber, architect and town planning expert of Paris, France, who was previously employed by the government in this capacity. In addition to the permanent technical experts of the commission and of the Department of Public Works and Mr. Greber, it is probable that it will be necessary

to obtain additional expert assistance from time to time with regard to particular aspects of the project.

In the past, various technical experts have been called in to advise the government as to planning and reports have been made such as the Todd and White report of 1912, the Holt commission (federal plan commission) report of 1915, the Ewart plan of 1920, the Wright and Adams report of 1920, and the first Greber report of 1937.

2. (a) Opportunity has already been afforded for review and discussion of proposals by public hearings at the proceedings of the joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons, appointed in 1944 to review special problems arising out of the location of the seat of government in the city of Ottawa. The committee considered the question of development of the Ottawa area. At that time representations were made by the city of Ottawa.

(b) Answered in part by above. By order in council P.C. 5634 of August 16, 1945, the federal district commission was authorized to appoint committees to discuss development of the district of the national capital with representatives of municipalities, or private persons, or any other body, within the district.

(c) The same opportunities for discussion of the work of the federal district commission, including that relating to the general plans for the development of the federal district, will be afforded as is given other projects in which the government of Canada is interested.

(d) By order in council P.C. 5943 of September 7, 1945, the Prime Minister, as President of the Privy Council, will report to parliament for the federal district commission.

NAVAL SERVICES—COFFEE

Mr. LENNARD:

1. From whom was the coffee purchased that have been supplied to the naval services over the past five years?
2. What price was paid per pound?
3. What grade or quality was demanded?
4. What coffee substitutes were supplied naval services during the same period?
5. What was the price per pound?
6. From whom was this purchased?

Mr. HOWE:

1. G. E. Barbour Co., North Market Wharf, Saint John, N.B.; Wilson & Keith, 429 Sparks street, Ottawa, Ontario; T. H. Estabrooks, Saint John, N.B.; Bakewell's Tea and Coffee Co., Edmonton, Alberta; W. H. Schwartz & Son, Halifax, N.S.; Gateway Grocers Ltd., Fort William, Ontario; Pure Gold Mfg. Co., Toronto, Ontario; T. B. Hayhoe & Co., Toronto, Ontario; Club Coffee Co., Toronto, Ontario; Dickson Importing Co., Regina, Sask.; Boudrias Freres, Montreal, P.Q.; General Foods Ltd., 1800 Stirling Tower, Toronto, Ontario; Standard Brands, Montreal, P.Q.; Kearney Bros. Ltd., 147 St. Peter street, Montreal, P.Q.; Gamble Robinson, Ottawa, Ontario; Kelly Douglas Co., Vancouver, B.C.; Hudson's Bay Co., 325 Water street, Vancouver, B.C.; Can. Spice Mills, Quebec, P.Q.; Burnyeats Ltd., 157 Alexandria street, Vancouver, B.C.; Blue Ribbon Company Ltd., McFarland Bldg., Edmonton, Alta.; A. Jameson Coffee Co., Vancouver, B.C.; T. & M. Winter Ltd., St. John's, Nfld.; Harvey & Co. Ltd., St. John's, Nfld.; Steers Ltd., St. John's, Nfld.

2. Prices ranged from 26½ cents to 35 cents per pound.

3. According to naval specification V.14, sample of each shipment being analyzed through Department of Munitions and Supply.

4. None.

5 and 6. Answered by No. 4.

ESTEVAN AIR TRAINING CENTRE

Mr. McCULLOUGH (Assiniboia):

1. How many men, if any, are still employed by the government at the former air training centre situated six miles south of Estevan?
2. What makes of planes and how many of each have been dismantled at this place up to the present time?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West):

1. Two (2) officers and forty-four (44) other ranks.

2. Seventy-four (74) Anson aircraft.

WARTIME OILS LIMITED

Mr. MARSHALL:

1. Is the company known as Wartime Oils Limited still in active operation; where is their head office and what size of staff is employed?
2. What are the names of the directors, their occupations and places of residence?
3. For what sum was this company capitalized and what amounts have been advanced to it from the public treasury since it came into being?
4. What are the names of the companies, their general fields of operation and the sums of money advanced to each for oil drilling and exploration in Canada by Wartime Oils Limited up to March 31, 1945?
5. What method of recovery is adopted to recover advances made to these companies?

Mr. HOWE:

1. No. The company was wound up as of March 31, 1945. The affairs of the company are now carried on by the field manager, Mr. C. J. Stewart and one stenographer, at the head office in Calgary.

2. The officers of the company were: president, Judge A. A. Carpenter, barrister, Edmonton, Alta.; vice-president, Grant Spratt, vice-president Anglo Canadian Company Limited,

Calgary, Alta.; directors, Colonel L. D. M. Baxter, president Osler, Hammond & Nanton Limited, Winnipeg, Man.; A. H. Mayland, president, Gas & Oil Products Limited, Calgary, Alta.; secretary-treasurer, K. J. Morrison, chartered accountant, Calgary, Alta.

3. This was a crown company, all of the shares being held in trust for His Majesty the King. Up to March 31, 1945, there had been advanced under drilling contracts the sum of $3,979,011.72.

4. All of the financing done by this company was for the drilling of wells in the marginal area on the west flank of Turner valley, in the province of Alberta. Advances as of June 30, 1945, by wells were as follows:

Well	Total Advance
Anglo No. 10	$184,118 41
Anglo No. 12	174,370 04
Anglo No. 13	183,489 81
Anglo No. 14	178,307 62
Calmont No. 1A	181,498 60
Calmont No. 2A	155,764 80
Chinook No. 1	193,601 00
Chinook No. 2	194,294 58
Lion-Sunray No. 3	202,894 80
Okalta No. 12	180,607 19
Okalta No. 13	177,786 07
Okalta No. 14	173,354 66
Okalta No. 15	191,538 78
Okalta No. 16	256,967 24
Okalta No. 17	167,388 17
Okalta No. 19	159,341 60
Okalta No. 20	213,044 22
Okalta No. 21	172,932 82
Pacific No. 6	201,002 41
Pacific No. 7	177,850 61
Valley No. 1	176,109 85
Valley No. 2	151,045 97

5. The total production from all wells drilled under financing by Wartime Oils, less one-half of the landholders royalty, less production costs, is paid to the company in reduction of advances made. Up to March 31, 1945, there had been repaid to the company the sum of $608,400.00.

CANADIAN FIRE FIGHTERS CORPS

Mr. MacINNIS:

1. What was the total number of men sent from Canada to the United Kingdom in the Canadian fire fighters corps?

2. What was the average (approximate) length of service for the men in this corps?

3. How many were killed, wounded, injured or died of injuries or illness while overseas?

Mr. McCANN:

1. 408.

2. 2 years, 8 months and 14 days.

3. 3 killed, 5 wounded and 3 seriously injured.

[Mr. Howe.]

HUDSON BAY WATERS AND AIR SURVEY

Mr. KNIGHT:

1. Did the United States government at any time in the years of the late war make a survey of the waters and of the air over the waters of Hudson's Bay and its outlets?

2. If so, did the Canadian government receive a copy of a report resulting from such survey?

Mr. ST. LAURENT:

1. Yes. The United States army air forces, with the permission of the Canadian government, conducted aerial surveys of the northern and eastern approaches to the bay and along the west shore of the bay itself during the summers of 1942, 1943, and 1944.

2. The Canadian government has been provided with copies of all aerial photographs taken in the course of these surveys.

WASCANA CREEK, SASK., WATER CONSERVATION PROJECT

Mr. McKAY:

1. Have submissions been received by the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act officials relative to a water conservation project along Wascana creek in the area between Tyvan and Regina, Saskatchewan?

2. If so, what action has been taken thereon?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. Yes.

2. Agricultural investigations and reconnaissance surveys are being made.

LIVE STOCK—SLAUGHTERING CAPACITY OF INSPECTED PLANTS

Mr. McLURE:

1. What is the estimated slaughtering capacity of cattle, hogs, sheep and lambs in all the inspected plants in Canada?

2. Is any attempt made by the Canadian meat board for the orderly receivings and marketings so as to avoid a glut on one cattle market and a scarcity on another?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. The estimated slaughter capacity of inspected packing plants in Canada is as follows: cattle, 45,000 a week; calves, 25,000 a week; sheep and lambs, 40,000 a week; hogs, 200,000 a week.

2. Arrangements have been made whereby the officials of the marketing service of the dominion Department of Agriculture located at the main stockyards throughout Canada, keep the department at Ottawa informed daily with respect to live stock receipts and expected arrivals and on the basis of this information the trade is kept informed with respect to the slaughter capacity at the various packing house centres.

VALCARTIER CAMP

Mr. DORION:

1. What contracts were awarded by the Department of Munitions and Supply, from September 1, 1939, to April 1, 1945, for the erection of buildings, permanent or temporary, at Valcartier camp?

2. What tenders were received by the Department of Munitions and Supply for each such contracts?

Mr. HOWE: 1. Contracts were awarded by the Department of Munitions and Supply, from November 4, 1940 to April 1, 1945, for the erection of buildings, permanent or temporary, at Valcartier camp as follows:

(No contracts were awarded by Department of Munitions and Supply prior to November 4, 1940.

No.	Contract No.	Description of Work	Name of Contractor	Date of Award	Value of Award
1	23-V1- 3	Construction of six Magazines	Compagnie de Construction Laviolette Ltee, Three Rivers, P.Q.	Nov. 4/40	$90,965.00
2	23-V1-32	Construction of Nurses' Quarters.	Magloire Cauchon Ltd., Quebec, P.Q.	Jan. 29/42	10,939.00
3	23-V1-33	Construction of Lecture Huts, Training Centre .	Magloire Cauchon Ltd., Quebec, P.Q.	Feb. 5/42	13,636.00
4	23-V1 34	Construction Textile Refitting Shop	A. DesLauriers & Fils Ltee, Quebec, P.Q.	Mar. 17/42	6,622.00
5	23-V1-37	Construction Additional Hospital Accommodation .	Lemelin & Walters, St. Romuald, P.Q.	Apr. 24/42	16,981.00
6	23-V1-42	Construction of Fire Hall	Magloire Cauchon Ltd., Quebec, P.Q.	July 28/42	12,917.00
7	23-V1-45	Construction Military Post Office .	Syndicat de Construction Moderne, Ltd., Quebec, P.Q.	Sept. 22/42	9,528.00
8	23-V1-47	Construction Additional Accommodation	Page Equipment & Construction Co., Ltd., Three Rivers, P.Q. ..	Sept. 24/42	265,552.00
9	23-V1-49	Construction of Addition to Detention Barracks ...	Page Equipment & Construction Co., Ltd., Three Rivers, P.Q. ..	Nov. 7/42	27,747.00
10	23-V1-52	Construction O.M.E. Workshop	Magloire Cauchon Ltd., Quebec, P.Q.	Mar. 13/43	73,689.00
11	23-V1-54	Construction Officers' Mess Bldg..	S. F. Walters, Quebec, P.Q.	Mar. 12/43	11,672.00
12	23-V1-58	Construction Isolation Magazine and Transit Shed.	Magloire Cauchon Ltd., Quebec, P.Q.	Apr. 21/44	19,695.00
13	23-V1-60	Construction six Firing Shelters ..	Syndicat de Construction Moderne, Ltd., Quebec, P.Q.	Sept. 22/44	8,733.00
14	23-V1-63	Construction of Two Buildings ..	Magloire Cauchon Ltd., Quebec, P.Q.	Mar. 23/45	20,820.00

2. Following is the contract number, date of tenders invited, method used, number of contractors invited to tender and number of tenders received. It has been the policy of the department to not give the names of unsuccessful tenderers or the amounts tendered. In 13 out of 14 contracts the lowest tenderer was awarded the contract. In the case of the other contract a very small amount of money separated the lowest tenderer from the second lowest tenderer. The work of the lowest tenderer on a previous job had not been satisfactory and the contract was, therefore, awarded to the second lowest tenderer whose work had been proven on previous projects.

No.	Contract No.	Date of Tender Call	Method Advertised or Invitation	Number Invited	Number Received
1	23-V1-3	October 18/40	Invitation	10	5
2	23-V1-32	December 23/41	"	8	4
3	23-V1-33	January 9/42	"	8	4
4	23-V1-34	February 18/42	"	7	5
5	23-V1-37	March 27/42	"	8	6
6	23-V1-42	July 3/42	"	7	4
7	23-V1-45	August 25/42	"	7	3
8	23-V1-47	August 19/42	"	8	2
9	23-V1-49	October 6/42	"	9	3
10	23-V1-52	January 25/43.....	"	9	7
11	23-V1-54	February 11/43	"	6	5
12	23-V1-58	February 14/44	"	12	9
13	23-V1-60	August 16/44	"	10	5
14	23-V1-63	March 1/45	"	8	7

DISPOSITION OF WAR MATERIALS

Mr. KNOWLES:

1. What properties or assets, the ownership and control of which was vested in the crown, as set out in the report issued by the Department of Munitions and Supply on Government-Financed Expansion of Industrial Capacity in Canada as at December 31, 1944, have been sold or disposed of in any way?

2. To whom was each such property or asset sold, and at what price?

3. Which of the above sales were arranged and/or consummated, (a) by War Assets Corporation; (b) by the minister or the Department of Munitions and Supply?

Mr. BLACKMORE:

1. Up to September 15, 1945, how many military (a) jeeps; (b) cars; (c) trucks; (d) machines of other kinds, have been sold by the government to farmers or other private users in each of the nine provinces of Canada?

2. How many military buildings, such as barrack buildings, training school buildings, have been so sold, up to September 15, 1945?

Mr. HOWE: These two questions refer to the internal management of War Assets Corporation. It is proposed that a committee of the house will investigate this corporation, and call before it officers both of the corporation and of the department to go into these matters thoroughly. I may point out that it is customary, where a committee of the house does investigate a corporation such as the Canadian National Railways or the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, that questions are not asked in the house but rather are asked in the committee. Therefore I would request that these two questions be dropped and asked again in committee, where ainswers can be given by officers of the corporation, rather than in the house.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I just bring up one point? In the first place, this committee has not been set up; no notice has been placed upon the order paper so far that it will be set up, and until government policy in that regard has been made known, surely members of the house have a right to ask questions, rather than to follow the procedure now outlined by the minister.

Mr. HOWE: Technically, that is true, but I understand the committee will be announced this week. I could ask that the questions stand, and bring up this point later on. A tremendous amount of work would be involved and the answers to the questions probably would not be satisfactory unless they could be accompanied by an explanation by the officers of the crown company. Another factor is that these questions deal with current transactions, such as the sale of properties. Questions asked in the house are very disturbing to the interests of the government in carrying out such sales. There is no one so skittish as a man about to spend

a million dollars in the purchase of a new factory. We have had a good many disappointments, and we do not like to give reports on transactions of that kind until we actually have the agreement signed. Therefore these questions might stand.

Mr. KNOWLES: Do I understand from the minister that it is the intention of the government to set up a special committee to which these matters will be referred?

Mr. HOWE: Provision will be made for setting up the war expenditures committee with reference which will include War Assets Corporation. I presume a special sub-committee will be set up for that purpose.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I ask if we are to have a repeat performance of what went on during the last few years in the war expenditures committee, with the committee sitting in secret?

Mr. HOWE: I always thought that was up to the committee itself.

Mr. KNOWLES: Since the minister is agreeable it might meet the desire of all concerned if these questions were allowed to stand for another few days.

Mr. SPEAKER: Questions stand.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON VETERANS' QUALIFICATIONS

Mr. McLURE:

1. Has the royal commission on veterans' qualifications been abolished; if so, when?
2. When was said commission appointed?
3. Who were or are the members of said commission?
4. What were their salaries?
5. What were its duties as a commission?
6. In what provinces did they hold sittings?
7. Did they finish their sittings in the province of Prince Edward Island?
8. If not, why were they recalled from Charlottetown to Ottawa?

Mr. MITCHELL:

1. No.

2. By order in council P.C. 2486 on April 10, 1945.

3. Wilfrid Bovey, Esq., member of Legislative Council of Quebec, Montreal, P.Q.; D. S. Lyons, Esq., Montreal, P.Q.; Hector Dupuis, Esq., Montreal, P.Q.; J. C. G. Herwig, Esq., Ottawa, Ontario; S. R. Ross, Esq., Windsor, Ontario; F. W. Smelts, Esq., Vancouver, B.C.

4. Each member receives a fee of $20 per diem for each day engaged in the work of the commission, with the exception of Messrs. Smelts and Dupuis who receive no remuneration additional to that payable to them as regional directors of national selective service. All members are paid actual and necessary travelling expenses while absent from their places of residence.

5. To examine into the problems involved and appropriate measures which may be taken to enable members of the armed forces to obtain appropriate credit in re-entering civilian occupations upon discharge, for trades, technical or other educational training or experience gained while in the armed forces and to report to the Minister of Labour thereon together with their recommendations as to what measures are advisable and appropriate in cooperation with the provinces, employers, or trades and labour organizations or otherwise to this end.

6. All provinces.

7. Yes.

8. See answer to No. 7.

HAZELTON, B.C., POSTMASTERSHIP

Mr. ARCHIBALD:

1. Who is the present postmaster at Hazelton, British Columbia?
2. When was he appointed?
3. Is the present postmaster a veteran of the 1914-18 war, or of the last war?
4. Was the position advertised in the town of Hazelton? If so, by what means?
5. Were any other applications for the position received?
6. If so, were other applicants veterans of the 1914-18 war, or of the last war?
7. By whom was the present postmaster recommended?
8. What was the revenue of this post office for each of the years, 1942, 1943 and 1944?

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier):

1. Mathew Arthur Myros.

2. 22nd July, 1945.

3. Yes (1914-18).

4. No. Notice of the vacancy was sent in accordance with the regular practice to the provincial command of the Canadian Legion.

5. Yes.

6. Yes.

7. Ed. T. Upplewaite.

8. Fiscal year 1941-42, $2,034.37; fiscal year 1942-43, $2,356.27; fiscal year 1943-44, $3,374.30.

CORNWALLIS NAVAL STATION

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland):

1. What is the cost of the *Cornwallis* naval station, at Deep Brook, Nova Scotia, (a) land; (b) improvements; (c) buildings; (d) total costs?
2. What has been the cost for supplies, upkeep and maintenance?
3. How many naval personnel were in training on September 1, 1945?
4. How many, (a) naval personnel; (b) civilians were on the staff and payroll on September 1, 1945?

Mr. MACDONALD (Halifax):

1. (a) Land, $65,00.00; (b) improvements (grading, services, etc.), $1,974,618.44; (c) buildings, $7,124,025.19; (d) total, $9,163,643.63.

2. From the 1st July, 1943, when directorate of maintenance was set up, to September 1, 1945, the costs for maintenance supplies, upkeep and maintenance, including fuel was $894,999.13. To segregate the costs incurred for supplies, upkeep and maintenance prior to the 1st July, 1943, would involve a tremendous amount of time and work.

3. 623.

4. (a) Naval personnel borne in the pay ledgers of H.M.C.S. *Cornwallis* on the 1st September, 1945, totalled 11,446.

Note.—H.M.C.S. *Cornwallis* is now one of the largest Royal Canadian Navy discharge transit centres. Apart from the staff and those under training the majority of personnel borne for pay are in process of being demobilized. Many are on leave prior to final discharge.

Supply and medical personnel required to demobilize these large numbers form part of the present staff. In addition the usual barracks and maintenance staffs are required to accommodate personnel drafted to this establishment for demobilization routine.

(b) 12 Civil servants, 317 hourly rate civilian employees.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland):

1. What quantity of fuel was purchased for the *Cornwallis* naval station, Deep Brook, Nova Scotia, for each of the fiscal years ending March 31, 1943, 1944, 1945 and the current year to date?

2. What was the grade and where produced?

3. What was the cost per ton, the freight, demurrage, commission and total cost of each purchase?

4. From whom were purchases made, and what tenders or alternative bids were received?

5. What was total quantity and delivered cost each year of, (a) Nova Scotia fuel; (b) imported fuel?

Mr. HOWE:

1. Fiscal year ended 31st March, 1943, nil; fiscal year ended 31st March, 1944, 13,698 tons; fiscal year ended 31st March, 1945, 20,-921 tons; 1945-46 to date, 5,934 tons.

2. 1943-44—Two types: Run of mine and slack. Both grades were produced in Nova Scotia.

1944-45—Purchases confined to one grade-slack. All purchases produced in Nova Scotia with the exception of 4,859 tons imported from the United States, at a time when there was no suitable coal in the maritimes and to ensure a supply prior to a threatened strike in the maritime area.

1945-46, to date—Purchases confined to one grade-slack. Produced in Nova Scotia with the exception of 140 tons imported from the United States.

3. 1943-44—1,288 tons at $7.77 per ton f.o.b. Cornwallis; 461 tons at $6.07 per ton f.o.b. Cornwallis; 6,023 tons at $7.07 per ton f.o.b. Cornwallis; 2,156 tons at $7 per ton f.o.b. Cornwallis; 3,246 tons at $4 per ton f.o.b. mine, Westville, N.S.; 524 tons at $2.50 per ton f.o.b. mine, Alma, N.S.

1944-45—1,082 tons at $6.12 per ton f.o.b. mine, Sydney, N.S.; 1,887 tons at $7.62 per ton f.o.b. mine, Sydney, N.S.; 1,371 tons at $8.02 per ton f.o.b. Cornwallis; 4,859 tons at $14.85 per ton f.o.b. Cornwallis; 222 tons at $3.86 per ton f.o.b. mine, Joggins, N.S.; 700 tons at $3.86 per ton f.o.b. mine, Joggins, N.S.; 300 tons at $3.86 per ton f.o.b. mine, Joggins, N.S.; 10,500 tons at $5.40 per ton f.o.b. mine, Westville, N.S.

1945-46—140 tons at $14.85 per ton f.o.b. Cornwallis; 5,794 tons at $5.40 per ton f.o.b. mine, Westville, N.S.

Freight rates were as follows: Alma, N.S., to Cornwallis, $2.10 net ton; Westville, N.S., to Cornwallis, $2.10 net ton; Sydney, N.S., to Cornwallis, $2.60 net ton; Joggins, N.S., to Cornwallis, $2.60 net ton.

Demurrage rates were as follows:

First 48 hours, free; next 24 hours, $1 per car per day; next 24 hours, $1 per car per day; each 24 hours thereafter, $5 per car per day.

The above freight and demurrage rates are standard rates approved by the board of transport commissioners for Canada. No commissions were paid by Naval Service.

4. Purchases were made from the following firms: S. Cunard & Co. Ltd., Halifax, N.S.; Old Sydney Collieries, c/o Dominion Coal Co., Montreal, P.Q.; A. P. Kelly, 436 Barrington St., Halifax, N.S.; Intercolonial Coal Co., New Glasgow, N.S.; Maritime Coal & Power Co., Ltd., Amherst, N.S.; P. Burns & Co. Ltd., Toronto, Ontario.

It was neither practical nor economical to call for tenders on this coal. The department purchased coal direct from the producer and the distributor in the maritimes whenever possible and wherever the coal was available. All prices were set and allocations made by the coal controller.

5. Answered by No. 3.

R.C.A.F.—NO. 8 REPAIR DEPOT

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North):

1. Are R.C.A.F. service personnel being used at No. 8 repair depot in Winnipeg to remodel war planes into civilian transport planes?
2. If so, what rates of pay do such personnel receive?
3. What disposal will be made of the remodeled aircraft?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West):

1. No.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.

RESEARCH ENTERPRISES—DISPOSAL OF RADAR EQUIPMENT

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North):

1. Have instructions been given for the destruction of any or all parts of radar equipment at R.E.L. plant in Toronto?
2. If so, on whose authority were these instructions given?
3. Did any of the employees ask permission to buy material which is being destroyed?
4. If so, were they granted the opportunity?

Mr. HOWE:

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Yes. Research Enterprises Limited, however, has no authority to sell any crown property. When and if such is declared surplus and is transferred to war assets corporation for disposal, the rules governing disposal of war materials will apply.
4. No, answered by No. 3.

CANADIAN ARMY OF OCCUPATION

Mr. MERRITT:

1. What was the total strength of the Canadian army of occupation in Europe on the 1st day of September, 1945?
2. Of this total, how many were, (a) NRMA personnel; (b) general service personnel who, when given the opportunity of election, gave as their first preference for further service—service in the army of occupation; (c) general service personnel who gave service in the army of occupation as second preference; (d) general service personnel who gave service in the army of occupation as third preference?
3. How many of the total of 2 (c) and (d) above had served six months or more in the theatre of war during actual operations against the enemy?

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. 1,177 officers; 19,088 other ranks.
2. (a) 1,778.

(b) Number who did not wish to volunteer for service in the Canadian far east force (later known as the Canadian Army Pacific force) but indicated a desire for service with the Canadian occupation force; 594 officers; 5,489 other ranks.

(c) Number who wished to volunteer for service in the Canadian far east force but who indicated that if not accepted for that force they desired to serve with the Canadian occupation force: 88 officers; 208 other ranks.

(d) Number who (i) volunteered for service in the Canadian far east force and who indicated that if not accepted for that force they wished to be reallocated in accordance with individual priorities and the requirements of the service

or

(ii) did not volunteer for service in the Canadian far east force and who indicated a wish for reallocation in accordance with individual priorities and the requirements of the service: 495 officers; 11,613 other ranks.

3. 4,622 all ranks.

R.C.A.F.—PENHOLD STATION

Mr. CASTLEDEN:

1. What is the total weight of, (a) freight; (b) express shipments, received at the R.C.A.F. station at Penhold, Alberta, from March 1, 1945, to September 1, 1945, from other R.C.A.F. and R.A.F. stations in Canada?
2. What quantity of, (a) radar equipment; (b) other instruments, was included in these shipments?
3. What instructions were given to the officials at the R.C.A.F. station at Penhold, Alberta, regarding the disposal of radar equipment and other instruments at that station?
4. What was the amount of such equipment on hand at that station as of September 1, 1945?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West):

1. 512,990 lbs.
(b) 46,667 lbs.

2. (a) 140,953 lbs.
(b) Other wireless equipment including instruments—418,704 lbs.

3. Instructions were given to No 2 technical signals unit, Penhold, to route for repair all repairable spares required by the R.C.A.F. and to dispose of the remainder as follows: (a) Repairable spares previously indicated by War Assets Corporation as being saleable, to be shipped to a surplus equipment holding unit for subsequent transfer to War Asset Corporation; (b) Unserviceable airborne spares which War Assets Corporation had indicated as not being saleable to be reduced to their predominant metal and disposed of as produce. Later this instruction was cancelled and superseded by an instruction whereby these spares were also to be held pending further advice from War Assets Corporation as to their disposal.

4. (a) 8,260 lbs. (178 sets) of unserviceable radar equipment; (b) 17,240 lbs. (306 sets) of unserviceable wireless equipment.

RESEARCH ENTERPRISES—RADAR AND OPTICAL GLASS EQUIPMENT

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North):

1. Has any part of R.E.L. plant at Toronto been sold to the Corning Glass Company?

2. If so, what was the sale price?

3. What other bids were received, and for what amounts?

4. Will the R.E.L. plant continue the production of radar and optical glass equipment?

Mr. HOWE:

1. Yes, building No. 14 with services as follows: Lands, 8·185 acres; buildings, one storey, 182 feet by 454 feet; two storey office, 31 feet by 125 feet; lavatory, 27 feet by 27 feet.

2. $150,000.

3. No other tenders were called.

4. This is a matter that has not yet been determined.

VETERANS' LAND ACT—SASKATCHEWAN

Mr. BENTLEY:

1. How many veterans of this war have been settled in Saskatchewan under the Veterans Land Act, in (a) the park areas; (b) the prairie areas; (c) the Swift Current electoral district?

2. What is the largest farm settled on under the act and at what cost?

3. What is the smallest farm settled on under the act and at what cost?

4. What is the average sized farm settled on under the act and at what cost?

5. In each case, what are the locations by land descriptions and nearest trading point?

Mr. TUCKER:

1. Financial assistance approved for establishment on full-time farms: (a) 56; (b) 30; (c) none.

2. Area: 1278·8 acres; Cost: $4,800 for land and buildings, $1,200 conditional grant for equipment; Location: Pt. S.E. 24-13-6-W. 4th; Pts. NE 24-13-6-W. 4th; NW 24-13-6-W. 4th; Pts. SE 25-13-6-W. 4th; SW 25-13-6-W. 4th; Pt. NW 25-13-6-W. 4th; Pts. NE 25-13-6-W. 4th; NE 26-13-6-W. 4th; SE 35-13-6-W. 4th; NE 35-13-6-W. 4th; Trading point: Medicine Hat 6½ miles.

3. Area: 10·92 acres; Cost: $5,000 for land and buildings, $1,000 conditional grant for equipment; Location: Lot 15, map 301, S.D. Y.D.; Trading point: Keremeos, B.C., 2½ miles.

4. Area: 201·85 acres; Cost: $4,071,10 land and permanent improvement, $1,095,46 conditional grant for equipment.

5. See answers to 2 and 3.

[Mr. C. W. G. Gibson.]

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION—SEPARATE STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. WINKLER:

In view of changed conditions, will the government consider dividing the standing committee on agriculture and colonization into one on agriculture and one on immigration?

Mr. ILSLEY: The government is willing to give consideration to any changes in the constitution of committees such as those requested, but at the moment it is not obvious to the government what advantage would be gained by making this particular division of functions. Perhaps if the hon. gentleman would communicate with the government, setting out his reasons, the matter could be given consideration.

APPLE PRODUCTION

Mr. ISNOR:

1. What was the total apple production in Canada in 1944?

2. What was the apple production for each of the provinces in 1944 in, (a) barrels; (b) dollars and cents?

Mr. MacKINNON:

1. The total apple production in Canada in 1944 was 5,943,000 barrels.

2. Production and value of apples in Canada, 1944

	Production bbl.*	Value
Nova Scotia	1,754,000	$ 4,872,000
New Brunswick	99,000	348,000
Quebec	300,000	1,197,000
Ontario	873,000	2,660,000
British Columbia ...	2,917,000	13,730,000

* One barrel equals 135 pounds.

Note: Figures for the other four provinces are not available.

VETERANS LAND ACT—PURCHASE OF LAND IN ESSEX COUNTY, ONT.

Mr. CASTLEDEN:

1. Did the officials of the Veterans' Land Act purchase land in Essex county, Ontario, from a Mr. Oliver?

2. What was the quantity of land purchased, and what was its location?

3. What price was paid for this land?

4. How was the value of this land determined?

Mr. TUCKER:

1. Yes.

2. 79·16 acres. Parts Lots 3 and 4 in the 5th Concession (L'Assumption) township of Sandwich West.

3. $20,000.

4. Land was carefully inspected by experienced departmental field officer. His appraisal

report was reviewed and property examined by regional advisory committee. Committee recommended purchase at price paid and recommendation concurred in by district superintendent, Veterans Land Act, Toronto.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. MacINNIS:

1. What was the number of wage and salary earners insured under the Unemployment Insurance Act as at June 30, 1945?
2. What was the number of wage and salary earners not insured under the Unemployment Insurance Act as at June 30, 1945?
3. What was the amount to the credit of the unemployment insurance fund as at the same date?
4. How many persons made application for benefits under the act during the year ending March 31, 1945?
5. How many applications were, (a) granted; (b) refused?
6. What was the total amount of unemployment insurance benefits paid for the year ending March 31, 1945?
7. What was, (a) the average time for which benefits were paid; (b) the average benefits paid?
8. What was the number of applications for benefits for the month of July in each year, 1943, 1944 and 1945?

Mr. MITCHELL:

1. Estimated 2,282,000.
2. Estimated in armed services 762,000; estimated non-insured wage earners 620,000.
3. $279,820,690.06.
4. 104,904.
5. (a) 83,175; (b) 18,979. Claims pending as at June 30, 1945—2,750.
6. $4,980,929.02.
7. (a) 16 days; (b) $30.54.
8. July, 1943, 1,087; July, 1944, 3,106; July, 1945, 10,886.

VETERANS' LAND ACT—PURCHASE OF PROPERTY NEAR RED DEER, ALTA.

Mr. SHAW:

1. Did the Department of Veterans Affairs or any other department of government purchase a block of land adjacent to the city of Red Deer, Alberta, for the purpose of establishing small holdings under the Veterans' Land Act?
2. If so, what was the total acreage purchased and what was the total purchase price?
3. How many small holdings are to be established in this block and what is the total actual or estimated cost of all improvements which will be made prior to sale to ex-servicemen? What will be the total sale price of each small holding?
4. How many applications have been received for the purchase of small holdings adjacent to the city of Red Deer?
5. Is it the policy under the Veterans' Land Act to accept applications for small holdings adjacent to Red Deer from those who did not reside in the Red Deer district at the time of enlistment?

Mr. TUCKER:

1. Yes.
2. Two such blocks have been purchased: (a) 75 acres at cost of $5,625; (b) 61.64 acres at cost of $5,550.
3. Block (a) has been subdivided into 62 lots, Block (b) has not been subdivided. The construction of 25 houses on block (a) has been contracted for at average unit cost of $4,438. Laying of water mains and sewers contracted for at cost of $34,184. Construction of roads under discussion with city authorities. It is not possible at the present time to give total sale price of each small holding.
4. One application for financial aid to become established on a small holding property adjacent to Red Deer has been received and approved. There has been no allocation of properties within blocks (a) or (b).
5. Yes.

ENLISTED MEN ON RAILROAD WORK, M.D. 10

Mr. KNOWLES:

1. Were any enlisted men sent from M.D. 10 to Armstrong, Ontario, for railroad work during August and/or September, 1945?
2. If so, how many men were involved, how long were they detailed to this work, what was the nature of the same, and how many hours a day did they work?
3. What pay did these men receive for such work?
4. What rates were paid by the railroad for such service, and to whom?

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. Yes.
2. (a) 70; (b) The men were dispatched on Aug. 11, 1945 and were, originally, to remain until "freeze-up". However, with the change in policy in respect to industrial duty, to a voluntary basis, the detail finished on Sept. 7, 1945. Thereafter, any men employed at Armstrong were there on leave without army pay and allowances; (c) Railway track maintenance; (d) Ten.
3. During the period Aug. 11, 1945 to Sept. 7, 1945: full army pay and allowances including dependents' allowance. See also answer to question No. 2 (b).
4. During the period Aug. 11, 1945 to Sept. 7, 1945: (a) Fifty-three cents each working hour per soldier less $5.75 a week per soldier charged for board and lodging; (b) Receiver General of Canada.

*CEILING ON EXPORT PRICE OF PRAIRIE WHEAT

Mr. COLDWELL:

In view of the announcement to-day that a five-year ceiling is to be placed upon the export price of prairie wheat, are all other exports of Canadian products, including textiles, lumber

and pulp to be subject to similar decreases for the long-term maintenance or possible reduction of their war-time price ceilings?

Mr. MacKINNON: It appears to me that this question is based upon a wrong premise, because in my announcement with regard to wheat prices I did not say that there would be a five-year ceiling on wheat prices. In view of that circumstance I suggest that the question be dropped and possibly reworded.

Mr. COLDWELL: Yes, reworded.

Question dropped.

KHAKI UNIVERSITY IN UNITED KINGDOM

Mr. BRUCE:

1. Has the Department of National Defence established a Khaki university of Canada in the United Kingdom?

2. If so, will the minister give the house full particulars in regard to cost, site, staff and functions?

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. Yes.

2. Cost: Costs additional to regular pay and allowances and maintenance of the troops while stationed overseas awaiting repatriation are as follows: (a) Civilian instructors at $12 per day plus expenses; (b) Modification of accommodation to provide suitable studying facilities estimated at $15,000; (c) Text books, etc. from the Canadian Legion War Services.

Site: Leavesden hospital, King's Langley, Hertfordshire, England.

Staff: As of 5 September, 1945: (1) An administrative executive of 7 officers under Brigadier G. E. Beament, O.B.E., B.A.Sc.; (2) Heads of departments to the number of 10 Officers and an instructional staff of 45; (3) Six part time lecturers provided by the university of London.

Note: To assist in the organization of the departments, four professors from Canadian universities spent six weeks at the Junior College. Three of them have returned to Canada.

A small group of civilian professors from Canada have been attached to the staff of Junior college—the number, at present, is four. With the exception of this group, the staff is made up entirely of service personnel.

Function: The object of the Khaki university of Canada is to provide, on a voluntary basis, facilities in certain university studies (including post-graduate studies), and vocational extension for selected personnel of the Canadian Army Overeas, other than the Canadian Army Occupation Force. The primary purpose of these facilities is to assist the student in effecting the process of readjustment involved in entering upon, or resuming university studies or vocational pursuits in Canada after repatriation. Without prejudice to this primary object, and in appropriate cases where the progress made in a particular subject warrants, the secondary purpose is to provide, on a voluntary basis, an opportunity for students to write examinations leading to a credit in such subject at a recognized Canadian university.

It is organized in three branches: (1) The Junior college; (2) University Extension; (3) Vocational Extension.

Re (1)—The Junior college provides opportunity for students to take 1st and 2nd year work in Arts and Science, according to courses offered for extramural study by Canadian universities.

Candidates are recommended by commanding officers to the rehabilitation training selection board of their division, or equivalent formation. The function of the board is to pass upon the candidate's eligibility and qualifications and make recommendation to the authorities of the Junior college. Candidates accepted by the registrar of the Junior college are then posted to the college for a term of three months (with provision in certain cases for a second term). During the term, a student may study not more than two subjects. During his attachment to the Junior college, the student receives pay and allowances of his rank. Rations and quarters are provided.

Re (2)—The department provides opportunity for attachment to British universities in any faculty, or students of 3rd and 4th year standing or those qualified for post-graduate study.

Candidates are screened by a committee at Canadian military headquarters with the High Commissioner of Canada as chairman. On being accepted as possessing the qualifications necessary to profit by attachment to a British university, candidates are certified to the principal of the university of their choice, or, if no vacancies remain at that institution, places are secured at some other university offering the studies desired by candidates. All students attached to British universities receive pay and allowances of their rank together with a ration allowance. They must themselves pay for all tuition and all living costs.

Re (3)—The department provides opportunity for attachment to British technical institutes, agricultural schools, industries, of those deemed qualified to profit by such attachment.

Vocational attachments are on the same terms as those of university attachments, with

this exception, that personnel attached to industry or agriculture may receive a nominal honorarium from their temporary employer for work done.

Enrolment at Junior college level:

British Columbia	69
Alberta	51
Saskatchewan	90
Manitoba	51
Ontario	263
Quebec	60
New Brunswick	19
Nova Scotia	16
Prince Edward Island	2
United States	10
British Empire	7
Czechoslovakia	1
Total all ranks	639

(Officers 3 per cent; other ranks 97 per cent; under 25 years 73 per cent; in 1st year 50 per cent; in 2nd year 50 per cent).

FISH

Mr. WINTERS:

1. What was the total Canadian fish catch in 1943 and 1944?

2. What was the total fish catch for each of the provinces for the same period in dollars and cents?

3. What was the total cod catch in 1943 and 1944?

4. What was the total cod catch for the same period for each of the provinces in, (a) weight; (b) dollars and cents?

Mr. MacKINNON:

1. 12,358,757 cwt. in 1943.
11,743,167 cwt. in 1944.

2. Quantity and value of fish caught and landed in Canada, 1943-44.

Note: In these tables, values are "as landed", i.e. values to fishermen before fish are canned, dried, or otherwise processed. All figures for 1944 are subject to revision.

	1943	
	Quantity cwt.	Landed Value $
Prince Edward Island ..	332,405	1,869,266
Nova Scotia	2,995,929	12,827,765
New Brunswick	1,815,208	5,192,472
Quebec	1,148,645	3,879,186
Ontario	305,932	4,703,655
Manitoba	358,646	3,427,614
Saskatchewan	104,866	773,181
Alberta	66,431	393,227
British Columbia	5,230,536	15,643,941
Yukon	159	2,495

	1944	
	Quantity cwt.	Landed Value $
Prince Edward Island ..	272,227	1,797,308
Nova Scotia	3,345,591	14,851,376
New Brunswick	1,747,333	5,377,841
Quebec	984,960	3,377,205
Ontario	310,392	4,389,273
Manitoba	293,231	2,830,060
Saskatchewan	129,588	1,032,061
Alberta	76,338	464,798
British Columbia	4,583,226	17,333,347
Yukon	281	3,131

3. 2,155,179 cwt. in 1943.
2,364,672 cwt. in 1944.

4. Quantity and value of cod caught and landed in Canada, 1943-44.

	1943	
	Quantity cwt.	Landed Value $
Prince Edward Island ..	62,225	250,568
Nova Scotia	1,368,860	4,704,807
New Brunswick	156,255	539,301
Quebec	552,040	2,022,358
British Columbia*	15,799	79,571

	1944	
	Quantity cwt.	Landed Value $
Prince Edward Island ..	42,237	153,986
Nova Scotia	1,659,945	5,796,408
New Brunswick	153,376	549,497
Quebec	499,700	1,872,275
British Columbia*	9,414	52,260

* Grey cod only.

*WINNIPEG GRAIN EXCHANGE

Mr. McCULLOUGH (Assiniboia):

Has the government any information with regard to the early reopening of the Winnipeg grain exchange?

Mr. MacKINNON: No.

WARTIME HOUSING LIMITED—WESTERN CANADA

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North):

1. What is the unit cost of houses, (a) built; (b) in process of building, by Wartime Housing Limited in Fort William, Winnipeg, Regina, Saskatoon, Moose Jaw, Vancouver, in 1944 and 1945?

2. Are building specifications for these houses the same in each of the cities mentioned?

3. Were tenders asked for construction of 100 war-time houses in the Elmwood area in Winnipeg?

4. If so, who submitted bids and what amounts were bid?

5. To whom was the contract awarded?

Mr. HOWE:

1.

	1944	
	(a)	(b)
Fort William	Nil	Nil
Winnipeg	Nil	Nil
Regina	Nil	Nil
Saskatoon	Nil	Nil
Moose Jaw	Nil	Nil
Vancouver	Nil	3300*

*(Estimated)

	1945		
	(a) Project No. 1	(b) Project No. 2	
Fort William	Nil	Nil	Nil
Winnipeg	Nil	$2,930	$3,347
Regina	Nil	2,861	3,250
Saskatoon	Nil	2,950	Nil
Moose Jaw	Nil	2,954	3,251
Vancouver	Nil	3,300*	Nil

(*Estimated)

Note: There are two housing projects in Winnipeg, Regina and Moose Jaw during 1945, one in the Spring and the other in the Fall. There was a greater proportion of larger houses in project No. 2 and an increase in the cost of labour.

2. No.

3. Yes.

4. Two contractors, Bird Construction Company and Claydon Company Ltd., tendered on project No. 1 for 100 houses in Winnipeg. The lowest and chosen contractor was Bird Construction Company, amount of tender $293,035.00. It is government policy not to give the amount tendered by an unsuccessful tenderer.

5. Answered by 4.

AGRICULTURAL PRICES SUPPORT BOARD

Mr. BARRETT:

1. What is the name, address and occupation of each member of the agricultural prices support board as set up under Bill 168 passed in 1944?

2. What is the salary of each member of the board?

3. Are any of the members of the board engaged in the public service?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. J. G. Taggart, Ottawa, chairman of agricultural prices support board, chairman of meat board; A. M. Shaw, Ottawa, director, marketing service, department of agriculture, temporary member; J. F. Booth, Ottawa, associate director, marketing service, agricultural economics, department of agriculture, temporary member.

2. J. G. Taggart, $8,000.

3. Yes. Mr. Shaw is employed full time as director of marketing service, for which he receives a salary of $8,500. Dr. Booth is employed full time as associate director of marketing service, agricultural economics, for which he receives a salary of $5,220. Mr. Taggart is chairman of the meat board.

*I should like to make some further explanation with regard to this question and answer. The names as set out in the answer to the first question are J. G. Taggart, who has been appointed permanent chairman, and two members of the staff of the Department of Agriculture. These men are appointed only pro tem, and are not permanent members of that board. With that explanation the answer is suitable.

WHEAT PRICES

Mr. BURTON:

1. Did the government confer with any farmer organizations with regard to the setting of the price of wheat, as announced by the Minister of Trade and Commerce on Wednesday, September 19?

2. If so, what organizations, and did anyone on behalf of the organized farmers agree to the price as announced?

Mr. MacKINNON:

1. The government from time to time received the representatives of the various farm organizations on floor prices and individual members of the government have consulted with individual farm leaders. By the nature of the government's announcement on the price of wheat no prior disclosure of the actual terms could properly be, or was, made to farm organizations, the government accepting full responsibility for the terms of the policy announced.

2. Answered by No. 1.

*ASSISTANCE IN ORGANIZATION OF PROVINCIAL CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. Have any provincial governments asked the government of Canada to provide dominion civil service personnel to assist in the organization of the civil service of such province?

2. If so, what provinces, and what numbers of personnel has each such province requested?

Mr. MARTIN: May I reply to this question orally. The answer to the first question is yes. The governments of Manitoba and Saskatchewan have asked the federal government to lend some of its civil service personnel to assist these provincial governments in connection with classification and advising generally on technical matters. In respect to Manitoba the government has lent one official, and with regard to Saskatchewan consideration is now being given as to exactly

what officers the government of Saskatchewan would like to have help them in an advisory capacity.

MEMORIAL CROSS TO FOSTER MOTHER OF SERVICEMAN KILLED IN ACTION

Mr. SHAW:

What consideration, if any, has been given to the amending of order in council P.C. 4210 (as amended by P.C. 2135) to make possible the granting of the Memorial Cross to the foster mother of a serviceman who gave his life while a member of the Canadian armed forces?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The question of extending the award of the memorial cross to foster mothers and others was carefully reviewed in June, 1944 and is was considered inadvisable to extend the scope of issue for the reasons following:

The governing orders in council (P.C. 4210 of 27 August, 1940 as amended by P.C. 2135 of 28 March, 1943) provide for the issue of the cross "as a memento of personal loss and sacrifice on the part of mothers and widows of Canadian sailors, soldiers, airmen or merchant seamen who have laid down their lives for their country during the present war", from which it will be seen that the cross is intended as a recognition of the great sacrifice arising from the closest family ties.

Whereas the sacrifice does not permit of tangible recognition, nevertheless the memorial cross was instituted as a symbol of the personal loss suffered by a mother or widow whose sense of loss is necessarily deeper than that of others, and in order to preserve the underlying sentiment of the award it is felt that it must be restricted in this manner to those bearing the very closest and most clearly determinable ties of relationship.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. HERRIDGE:

1. How many persons have been appointed to positions in the Department of Veterans Affairs since its inception in 1944?
2. How many positions have been established where the official concerned is in receipt of $3,600 per annum or more?
3. What was the previous army, navy or air force rank held by such persons holding these positions?

Mr. TUCKER:

1. 5,594.

2. 104.

3. Brigadier General 2; Colonel 4; Group Captain 1; Lieutenant-Colonel 10; Wing Commander 7; Major 43; Squadron Leader 4; Captain (Army) 12; Flight Lieutenant 4; Lieutenant (Army) 3; Flying Officer 1; Sergeant 2; Corporal 1; Private 7.

Without service in forces 3; two of these are female employees, the other is a medical officer who was rejected on application to join the armed forces.

COMMODITIES SOLD BY CANADA TO UNRRA

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

1. What is the value of all commodities sold by Canada to UNRRA up to September 1, 1945?

2. Of this amount, what was the value of, (a) manufactured products; (b) agricultural products?

Mr. HOWE:

Unrra—Free fund commitments as of September 1, 1945:

Wheat	$13,981,250 00
Foodstuffs	13,298,001 00
Manufactured goods	24,025,920 00*
(U.S. funds provided)	$51,305,171 00

* Includes $1,729,000 surplus army vehicles.

Aid-Unrra commitments as of September 1, 1945:

Wheat	$15,741,408 00
Foodstuffs	13,512,089 24
Manufactured goods	32,232,501 03*
(Canadian contribution)	$61,485,998 27

* Includes $9,000,000 surplus army vehicles overseas.

TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. BAKER:

1. How many new trade agreements were entered into between Canada and other countries between 1935 and 1940?
2. With what countries were such agreements made and in what year?
3. How many new trade agreements has Canada made since 1940?
4. With what countries were such agreements made and in what year?

Mr. ST. LAURENT:

1. Twelve.
2. 1935 United States of America.
   1936 Germany (provisional).
   1937 United Kingdom; Haiti; Guatemala.
   1938 Uruguay (*modus vivendi*); United States of America.
   1939 Uruguay (2) (*modus vivendi*); United States of America (supplementary).
   1940 Dominican Republic; United States of America (supplementary).
3. Three.
4. 1941 Chile; Argentina; Brazil.

LAY-OFFS IN AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY

Mr. FULTON:

How many workers were laid off in the motor industry of Canada as a result of cancellation of war contracts or of change over of plant equipment from war production to peace-time production types, between V-J day and September 17, 1945, inclusive?

Mr. MITCHELL: Employment in Ford Motors, General Motors and Chrysler Corporation at August 14, 1945, was 25,023; at September 17, 1945, it had dropped to 21,600, thus showing a net decrease of 3,423 between these two dates.

SALE OF WAR PLANTS

Mr. FULTON:

1. How many war plants owned by the Canadian government were sold up to and including September 17, 1945?
2. How many of the war plants thus sold had been fully converted to peace-time production at that date?
3. How many war plants owned by the Canadian government were in process of sale as at September 17, 1945?

Mr. HOWE:

1. Ten.
2. This information is not available in the department.
3. Nine.

VETERANS' INSURANCE

Mr. MARSHALL:

1. How many offices for the issuance of insurance policies under the Veterans' Insurance Act have been established in Canada?
2. Where is the office for the province of Alberta situated and who has been appointed to take charge of said office?
3. When was this appointment made, and what salary and other expenses go with the position?
4. Will the terms of the act be extended to cover the wives and families of all returned men?

Mr. TUCKER:

1. No active sales campaign has been anticipated for veterans insurance. Application for insurance may be made through the 19 district and sub-district offices in Canada of the Department of Veterans Affairs or by direct application to the superintendent of veterans insurance, Ottawa.

2. Two district offices are located in Alberta: District office "I", 217, 7th Ave. W., Calgary; District office "R", Redwood Bldg., 11250 Jasper Ave., Edmonton.

The officer in charge of each district office is the district administrator of the department.

3. See answers to questions 1 and 2.

4. This question relates to matters of policy and it is not the government's practice to disclose policy in giving answers to questions.

[Mr. St. Laurent.]

PROVINCIAL AIR CONFERENCE AT KAMLOOPS

Mr. FULTON:

1. Has the government received a copy of the proceedings of the first provincial air conference held at Kamloops, British Columbia, on May 24 and 25, 1945?

2. Has the government received a request that consideration be given to the implementing of certain resolutions contained therein with a view to encouraging Canadian commercial aviation?

3. If so, what action has been taken by the government?

Mr. FULTON: Mr. Speaker, I should like to withdraw this question and offer my apologies to the minister concerned. Two days ago I received from the body concerned, on whose behalf I asked the question, a wire asking that it be withdrawn. However, since receiving that wire, I have not had an opportunity to speak to the minister and indicate to him my intention to withdraw the question. I did send him a note this afternoon, which possibly he has not yet had time to open.

Question dropped.

AVAILABILITY TO FARMERS OF ARMY TRUCKS AND TRACTORS

Mr. JAENICKE:

1. Was the sale of army trucks and field artillery tractors to farmers in Markham, Ontario, by the War Assets Corporation, as set forth in a Canadian Press dispatch of September 20, held with the approval of the government?

2. Is it the intention to hold sales of such trucks and tractors on a similar basis in western Canada?

3. Will a priority be given in the purchases of such trucks and tractors?
4. If so, to whom?

Mr. HOWE:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. These direct sales are conducted for farmer purchasers only who are certified by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture.

4. Answered by No. 3.

AGRICULTURAL PRICES SUPPORT ACT

Mr. MARSHALL:

1. Has the government proclaimed section 9 (the section which provides the authority to buy and sell agricultural products and to make deficiency payments) of the Agricultural Prices Support Act?

2. If not, when will this be done?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. No.

2. This is a matter of government policy which will be announced in due course.

RADIO BROADCASTING—STATION CKEY

Mr. COLDWELL:

1. Does the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation own stations CBL and CJBC in the city of Toronto?
2. Who are the owners of CKEY?
3. Has CKEY been granted authority or permission to broadcast commercial American network programmes over their facilities? If so, what programmes and what financial arrangements are involved?

Mr. McCANN:

1. Yes.

2. Toronto Broadcasting Co., Limited, 44 University avenue, Toronto, Ontario.

3. Yes temporarily in respect to programs which can not be carried on CBC networks and as supplementary station for certain Dominion network programmes on CJBC. So far RCA Victor—CKEY receives 50 percent network rate after deducting frequency discount.

MOUNTED POLICE PERSONNEL—REGULATIONS RESPECTING MARRIAGE

Mr. CROLL:

1. Are R.C.M.P. personnel not permitted to marry until after they have served seven years on the force?
2. If so, what is the reason for this regulation?
3. Is the R.C.M.P. the only service in which this regulation is in force?

Mr. ST. LAURENT:

1. No. The marriage regulations of the R.C.M. Police were modified in April, 1945, by increasing the married establishment from 45 per cent to 50 per cent of the total uniformed strength of the force, which, in normal circumstances, may permit marriage after a minimum service of five years.

2. The reasons for the existing regulations are: (a) To ensure receipt of an adequate salary, in order to maintain a home. (It should be remembered that a Constable of the force does not receive the maximum pay of his rank until his eighth year of service.) (b) Mobility.

3. No. Paragraph 936 of the King's Regulations and Orders, 1939, fixes a married establishment for "other ranks" of the permanent force, Canadian Army.

NO. 6 S.F.T.S. MOWING EQUIPMENT

Mr. LENNARD:

1. Will the mowing equipment at No. 6 S.F.T.S., Dunville, Ontario, be declared surplus and released for sale?
2. If so, when?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West):

1. A survey of all aerodrome maintenance equipment is presently being conducted with a view to ascertaining that portion of equipment, including mowing equipment at No. 6 S.F.T.S., surplus to R.C.A.F. requirements.

2. It is expected that this survey will be completed within thirty days at which time any surpluses will be declared to War Assets Corporation for disposal.

RESEARCH ENTERPRISES BUILDING NO. 14, LEASIDE

Mr. McCULLOUGH (Assiniboia):

1. Was building 14, Research Enterprises, Leaside, sold?
2. If so, to whom?
3. What was the date of sale?

Mr. HOWE:

1. Yes.
2. Corning Glass Company.
3. June 15, 1945.

PRISONERS OF WAR IN CANADA

Mr. FLEMING:

1. How many enemy prisoners of war are now held in Canada?
2. How many have been returned to Europe (by nationalities)?

Mr. ST. LAURENT:

1. 34,051.

2. 1,245 in all. Of these 848 were members of the German armed forces, 302 German merchant seamen and 95 Italian merchant seamen.

DOMINION BONDS PURCHASED BY U. S. CITIZENS

Mr. QUELCH:

What is the amount of dominion bonds purchased by American citizens non-resident in Canada since the declaration of war in each of the years from 1939 to 1945?

Mr. MacKINNON: Total sales of direct dominion issues of bonds to residents of the United States reported by Canadian security dealers and banks to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics follow:

Year	(Millions of Can. $)
1939—Sept. to Dec.	7·8
1940	17·2
1941	15·1
1942	28·0
1943	74·0
1944	35·9
1945—Jan. to June	49·6

These figures do not include the sale of new dominion issues in the United States in 1941 and 1943 in connection with the refinancing of some issues redeemed in the United States. There were also issues called for redemption in the United States in 1943 and some purchases by Canadians from non-residents in connection with "switches" in their holdings of outstanding securities.

OTTAWA HOUSING PROJECT NORTH OF CARLING AVENUE

Mr. PROBE:

1. Is the housing project north of Carling avenue, about one-half mile west of McKellar golf club, Ottawa, being sponsored by the Veterans' Land Act?

2. Has the department authorized a "no admittance" sign to this project? Is there a watchman at the entrance and does he allow inspection of this project by veterans and their families?

3. Are continuous inspections being made by land act inspectors of the buildings?

4. What interim payments to contractors have been authorized on this project?

5. What explanation for the collapse of the foundation of the second building from the southwest corner in this project has been received by the department?

6. What percentage mixture of concrete or other binding material is specified for use in the basement of this building? What percentage mixture is being used?

Mr. TUCKER:

1. Yes.

2. No—this is the general contractor's responsibility. A "No trespassing" sign has been erected by the general contractor. A watchman is employed by the general contractor in accordance with the terms of the contract. Inspection has been allowed but is not encouraged as it would interfere with the contractor's operations. Permission would be the contractor's responsibility during course of construction. When houses are completed inspection by interested veterans will be encouraged.

3. Yes.

4. Monthly progress estimates are paid upon submission by the contractor and audit by the treasury department.

5. The foundation did not collapse. A foundation wall was accidentally knocked down by impact of a five-ton tractor and bulldozer working in wet clay in back-filling operations.

6. Standard make of pre-cast concrete block, laid in cement mortar 1 to 3 mix is used for the foundation walls. Strength of block is 100 lbs. per square inch. 2000 lb. concrete is used for wall footings, all as specified.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BANK—LOANS

Mr. MANROSS:

1. (a) What is the total amount of loans made to date by the industrial development bank; (b) what amount in each province?

2. What was the number of loans made under $10,000, from $10,000 to $25,000, from $25,000 to $50,000, from $50,000 to $100,000, over $100,000, by provinces?

3. What is the amount of losses to date?

[Mr. MacKinnon.]

Mr. MAYHEW: The Industrial Development bank is not a branch of the dominion government but a subsidiary of the Bank of Canada.

Section 29(1) of the Industrial Development Bank Act requires that "the bank shall, within twenty-one days following the end of each calendar month, make up and transmit to the Minister of Finance in such form as he may prescribe, a statement of its assets and liabilities at the close of business on the last day of the preceding month." This statement as at August 31, 1945, appeared in the *Canada Gazette* of September 22, 1945, and showed Loans and Investments, (excluding dominion government securities) at $711,965,87.

In addition, section 29(2) provides that "The Bank shall make up and transmit to the Minister of Finance at least once in its fiscal year or more frequently if so directed by the minister, in such form as he may prescribe, a classification of its loans and investments and of the loans guaranteed by it." Provision is made for the publication of this statement in the *Canada Gazette* following its receipt by the minister.

FREE PORTS IN CANADA

Mr. ISNOR:

1. Has a special committee been appointed by the government to study the question of establishing and exploiting free ports in Canada?

2. If so, (a) at whose request; (b) what are the names, addresses and occupations of members of the committee?

3. Is there a member of the committee presently residing in any portion of Nova Scotia? If so, what is his name and address?

4. What are the powers of this committee?

Mr. CHEVRIER:

1. An interdepartmental committee has been formed consisting of representatives of the departments interested.

2. (a) The city of Quebec has made recommendations to the government that legislation be introduced to provide for the establishment of free ports, and the above mentioned committee has been appointed to report on the matter; (b) J. E. St. Laurent, vice-chairman of the National Harbours Board, chairman; Dr. C. A. Annis, Department of Finance; H. W. Brighton, Department of Trade and Commerce; G. N. Bunker, Department of National Revenue; and a representative of the Department of Munitions and Supply, not yet appointed.

3. No.

4. To study and report on the specific recommendations submitted by the city of Quebec and on the general question of the establishment of free ports in Canada.

FAMILY ALLOWANCES—CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS

Mr. ISNOR:

1. Are children within the age brackets of the Family Allowance Act, denied the family allowance benefits if living in charitable institutions?

2. Are parents of children living in charitable institutions denied the benefits of family allowance?

Mr. CLAXTON: Payment is made to parents maintaining children in accordance with the provisions of the act and regulations, even though such children may be in institutions; but the act does not permit direct payment to institutions as they are defined in the regulations.

PETITCODIAC RIVER POWER DEVELOPMENT

Mr. HAZEN:

Has a report been received by the government on the proposed Petitcodiac river power development plan?

Mr. GLEN: No. It is expected the report will be received within the next few weeks.

WARTIME HOUSING LIMITED—PROVISION FOR RETURNED SERVICE PERSONNEL

Mr. FLEMING:

1. How many houses have been constructed by Wartime Housing Ltd.?

2. How are they distributed by provinces?

3. How many of them are earmarked for occupation by, (a) returned personnel; (b) families of deceased service personnel?

4. How many houses are, (a) now in course of construction; (b) contracted for, by Wartime Housing Ltd., or under contract with Wartime Housing Ltd.?

5. How are they distributed by provinces?

6. How many of them are earmarked for occupation by, (a) returned service personnel; (b) families of deceased service personnel?

7. What is the contract price of such housing, and by what method is it determined?

Mr. HOWE:

1. 18,992 houses as of September 15, 1945.

2. British Columbia, 2,135; Alberta, 350; Saskatchewan, 50; Manitoba, 400; Ontario, 10,531; Quebec, 2,882; New Brunswick, 400; Nova Scotia, 2,244; total, 18,992.

3. The last 1,287 housing units constructed were earmarked for servicemen's families and any vacancies occurring in the remaining 17,705 units were and are likewise earmarked. Families of deceased service personnel are given first preference when the deceased was the head of the home.

4. (a) and (b) 4,598 houses. A house is considered to be under construction when the contract is awarded.

5. British Columbia, 800; Alberta, 400; Saskatchewan, 600; Manitoba, 450; Ontario, 1,400; Quebec, 578; New Brunswick, 100; Nova Scotia, 270; total, 4,598.

6. All are so earmarked as the need arises. Refer also to answer for question 3.

7. The contract price of such housing now being built under lump sum contracts varies from an average of $2,860.86 to an average of $3,749.73 depending on the location, time of letting the contract and types of houses built. The final cost of cost plus fixed fee contracts can not now be determined since the contracts have not as yet been completed, but the fixed fee per house for these contracts varies from $90 to $125 depending on the number of houses to be constructed under the contract.

The contract price is determined by competitive tenders whenever satisfactory tenders can be obtained. Cost plus fixed fee contracts are awarded only when unsatisfactory tenders have been received or where the urgency of commencing work is such that there is not sufficient time to call for tenders.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BANK—LOANS

Mr. WRIGHT:

1. What are the locations of the branches of the industrial development bank, and what is the name of the manager of each?

2. How many loans have been made by the bank?

3. What is the total amount of such loans?

4. What amount has been loaned in each province?

Mr. MAYHEW:

1. Montreal, S. R. Noble, general manager; Toronto, J. C. Ingram, supervisor; Vancouver, N. C. Tompkins, supervisor.

2, 3 and 4. The Industrial Development bank is not a branch of the dominion government but a subsidiary of the Bank of Canada.

Section 29 (1) of the Industrial Development Bank Act requires that "The bank shall, within twenty-one days following the end of each calendar month, make up and transmit to the Minister of Finance in such form as he may prescribe, a statement of its assets and liabilities at the close of business on the last day of the preceding month." This statement as at August 31, 1945, appeared in the *Canada Gazette* of September 22, 1945, and showed loans and investments (excluding dominion government securities) at $711,965.87.

In addition, Section 29 (2) provides that "The bank shall make up and transmit to the Minister of Finance at least once in its fiscal year or more frequently if so directed by the minister, in such form as he may prescribe, a classification of its loans and investments and

of the loans guaranteed by it." Provision is made for the publication of this statement in the *Canada Gazette* following its receipt by the Minister.

WARTIME HOUSING LIMITED—PRIORITIES

Mr. FLEMING:

1. What priorities are now in effect in favour of Wartime Housing Ltd. with respect to the purchase, acquisition of control of building materials of all kinds?

2. When did each of such priorities come into effect?

3. When does the government intend to abolish such priorities?

Mr. HOWE:

1. Priority assistance is given to Wartime Housing Limited with respect to the purchase of plumbing supplies, roofing, lumber, millwork, wood shingles, gyproc, rock wool, asphalt shingles, cedar grain asbestos shingles, roofing materials, furnaces, nails.

2. April, 1941.

3. These priorities will be abolished when Wartime Housing Limited no longer requires assistance in building low rental houses for veterans and their families.

STEAMSHIP SUBSIDIES

Mr. GILLIS:

1. What amount of money by way of subsidy or other assistance was paid to the North Shore Steam Ship Company Limited, in 1944, and what is the expiry date of the present contract?

2. What amount of money was paid by way of subsidy or other assistance to the New Bras D'or Steam Ship Company Limited, in 1944, and what is the expiry date of the present contract?

Mr. MacKINNON:

1. $25.000, plus $3,857.66 from Steamship subsidies war stabilization fund. Present contract expires close of navigation 1945-46.

2. $18,000, plus $2,681.77 from Steamship subsidies war stabilization fund. Present contract expires close of navigation 1946-47.

POSTAL SERVICE—PREFERENCE TO RETURNED SERVICE PERSONNEL

Mr. BRYCE:

Does the Post Office Department give preference to ex-members of the armed forces when letting mail contracts?

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier): No. Section 67 of the Post Office Act requires that contracts shall be awarded to the lowest tenderer who offers sufficient security for the faithful performance of the contract.

[Mr. Mayhew.]

VETERANS LAND ACT—PROPERTY EAST OF BOWMANVILLE

Mr. STEPHENSON:

1. Did the government purchase land on highway No. 2, about two miles east of Bowmanville, for soldiers' small holdings, under the Veterans' Land Act?

2. If so, (a) how much land; (b) at what price?

3. How many houses will be built on this property and of what size?

4. When will such houses be ready for occupancy?

Mr. TUCKER:

1. Yes.

2 (a) 11¾ acres; (b) $1,468.75.

3. Property subdivided into ten lots. Four houses are under construction. Average size 14,172 cubic feet. Two of the houses have four rooms and bath and two five rooms and bath.

Plans for next year's building programme have not been definitely settled.

4. About December 15, 1945.

TORONTO MAIL SERVICE

Mr. CHURCH:

1. What is being done to give a better mail delivery to the residential districts of Toronto?

2. What steps have been taken by the department to employ more letter carriers and resume pre-war mail service in the city of Toronto?

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier): It is intended to resume the two delivery letter carrier service to residential districts when a sufficient number of experienced postal employees, who are on active service, return to civil duty.

DOMINION ELECTIONS—BALLOT BOXES

Mr. FRASER:

1. How many ballot boxes were bought for the 1945 federal election?

2. From whom were they bought, and what was the cost per box?

3. Were any of these boxes made in the United States of America? If so, how many and who supplied same?

Mr. MARTIN:

1. 2,000.

2. These ballot boxes were made at the Kingston penitentiary from material secured from various sources, at a cost of $1.32 each.

3. No.

FAMILY ALLOWANCES—CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETY

Mr. FRASER:

What action has the government taken with regard to the granting of family allowances to wards of Children's Aid society?

Mr. CLAXTON: Where Children's Aid societies are maintaining children within the meaning of the Family Allowances Act, they may on application qualify for payment.

DAMAGE BY STORMS TO TORONTO ISLAND LAKEFRONT PROPERTY

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Has the attention of the Minister of Public Works been called to the inroads made by storms, and the washing away of part of the breakwater and some groynes on the south shore and lagoons of Toronto island, on the lake front, and the heavy damage done to private property and the government breakwater there?
2. If so, what action has been taken in the matter to save further damage, (a) of a temporary nature; (b) of a more permanent shore protection?

Mr. FOURNIER (Hull):

1. Yes.
2. Report being obtained from the district engineer at Toronto.

*HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT—DISTRIBUTION OF WORK

Mr. CHURCH:

What has been done to carry out the proposals made in this house for a conference of the two houses of parliament so as to increase the efficiency of parliament by an arrangement to give the other branch in another place more useful and additional public work to do?

Mr. ILSLEY: The government has not considered it appropriate to arrange a conference of the two houses of parliament with a view to increasing the efficiency of parliament, but arrangement of the work is a matter of continual consideration by the leader of the government in this house and the leader of the government in the senate.

Mr. GRAYDON: And some progress is being made?

Mr. ILSLEY: Oh, yes.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

THUNDERCHILD INDIAN RESERVE

Mr. CAMPBELL:

1. Did the government through the Indian department or otherwise, about 1906, purchase the original Thunderchild Indian reserve, situated between the Battle and North Saskatchewan rivers, west of the town of Battleford, in Saskatchewan?
2. If not, did the government direct, or through the Indian department, sell the same reserve for the Thunderchild band?
3. If sold, who were the purchasers?
4. What was the purchase price?
5. What amount has been paid up to date?
6. What amounts, if any, are now owing the Thunderchild band in (a) principal; (b) interest?

Mr. GLEN: Return tabled.

PRAIRIE FARM ASSISTANCE—SASKATCHEWAN—FIELD INSPECTORS AND SUPERVISORS

Mr. JAENICKE:

1. What were the names of the field inspectors and supervisors operating in the province of Saskatchewan under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act in 1944?
2. How long was each of them employed in 1944?
3. What salary did each of them receive in 1944?
4. What was the amount of the travelling expenses paid to each of them in 1944?

Mr. GARDINER: Return tabled.

JAPANESE NATIONALS

Mr. REID:

1. How many of Japanese race and origin are resident in each of the nine provinces?
2. Of the twenty-three odd thousand Japanese resident in Canada, how many have signified their willingness to return to Japan?
3. How many of Japanese race and origin were interned at the commencement of the war with Japan and how many are still in internment camps?
4. Has the government any record of the number of Japanese citizens, who left Canada from 1938 to December, 1941?
5. How many of these were born in British Columbia?
6. Is the government aware that a Canadian born Japanese has been named as one of the most brutal persons in dealing with our members of the forces in Japanese hands?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Return tabled.

PRODUCTION OF PORK AND BEEF

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

1. What was the total production in pounds of pork and beef in each of the years 1943, 1944 and up to July 1, 1945, (a) in Canada as a whole; (b) in Manitoba; (c) in Alberta; (d) in Saskatchewan?
2. What floor prices, if any, have been set on the said products at any time during the present year?

Mr. MARTIN: Return tabled.

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES—PERSONNEL SENT TO GREAT BRITAIN SINCE V-E DAY

Mr. HAZEN:

1. How many officers and other ranks, including women, in the Canadian navy, army and air force, have been sent from Canada to Great Britain or Europe since V-E day?
2. Why were they sent in each case?

Mr. MARTIN: Return tabled.

HOUSING

Mr. NICHOLSON:

1. How many houses will be built during 1945, (a) under National Housing Act supervision; (b) by Wartime Housing Limited; (c) by municipalities; (d) by private builders; (e) by limited dividend corporations; (f) by veterans land administration?
2. What is the estimated total number of housing units being built in Canada during 1945?
3. How many limited dividend corporations have been formed in accordance with the National Housing Act of 1944?

4. How many agreements with municipalities have been entered into in accordance with the National Housing Act of 1944; and with what municipalities have agreements been made?

5. What grants have been made for research purposes as provided by the National Housing Act of 1944?

6. Who has been appointed as director of housing; and what are his qualifications?

Mr. MARTIN: Return tabled.

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT—REQUESTS FOR FREE TITLE WITHOUT FURTHER PAYMENT

Mr. FAIR:

1. From January 1, 1943, to June 30, 1945, were any requests from (a) organizations; (b) individuals, received by the Prime Minister, the Minister of Mines and Resources, the Minister of Veterans Affairs, the director of soldier settlement and Veterans Land Act or any other department of the government asking that veterans of great war I who hold land under contract with the soldier settlement board be given clear title without further payment?

2. If so, how many, and what are the names and addresses of those from whom such letters were received?

3. During the same period, were any letters or other communications received by the individuals and departments enumerated above, stating that if clear titles, as requested, were granted, requests for refunds by those who have already paid up or are continuing to make payments would be made?

4. If so, how many, and what are the names and addresses of those from whom such letters or communications were received?

RIDING MOUNTAIN NATIONAL PARK TIMBER LIMITS

Mr. ZAPLITNY:

1. What are the names and addresses of all firms or individuals who have bought, or contracted for, timber limits in the Riding Mountain national park in each year 1940 to 1945, both inclusive?

2. How many feet of lumber were taken out in each case?

3. What was the price paid to the government in each case?

Mr. GLEN: Return tabled.

CIVIL SERVICE—EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN

Mr. FRASER:

1. How many women civil servants, (a) permanent; (b) temporary, were employed by each department of the government in Ottawa, at March 1, 1945?

2. How many women civil servants, (a) permanent; (b) temporary were employed by each department of the government in Ottawa, at September 10, 1945?

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES—GROCERIES AND FOODSTUFFS ON HAND

Mr. FRASER:

1. What stock of staple groceries and foodstuff had the Canadian army on hand in Canada, Great Britain or other countries at September 1, 1945?

[Mr. Nicholson.]

2. What stock of staple groceries and foodstuff had the Canadian navy on hand in Canada or other countries at September 1, 1945?

3. What stock of staple groceries and foodstuff had the R.C.A.F. on hand in Canada or other countries at September 1, 1945?

Mr. MARTIN: Return tabled.

N.R.M.A.—DESERTERS AND DEFAULTERS—FARM LEAVE, ETC.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

1. (a) How many (i) deserters, (ii) defaulters, of the N.R.M.A. personnel, by provinces, still remain unaccounted for? (b) How many have been prosecuted, by provinces, and of these how many have received sentences of imprisonment?

2. (a) How many N.R.M.A. personnel were in the army as of September 1, 1945? (b) How many as of September 1, 1945, were absent on (i) farm leave, (ii) because of being needed in industry, and (iii) for other reasons? (c) How many N.R.M.A. personnel have been discharged since V-E day (i) upon medical grounds, (ii) on any other grounds?

AIRCRAFT "F" FOR FREDDIE

Mr. HANSELL:

1. Under what auspices was the aircraft known as "F" for Freddie, flown across Canada?

2. Was the government aware that this aircraft was stunt-flying over cities endangering the safety of citizens? If so, were any instructions given in respect to the conduct of this aircraft during its exhibition tour?

3. What are the government regulations respecting the flying of aircraft over towns and cities, and what are the military regulations respecting the same?

4. Is stunt flying permitted by any aircraft flown under government or defence supervision?

MISS HELEN DOHERTY

Mr. FRASER:

1. Is Miss Helen Doherty writing a report on her trip to Europe?

2. If so, is it finished?

3. Was it sent to any women's voluntary organizations in Canada?

4. If so, to what women's voluntary organizations was it sent?

5. Did any of these organizations comment on the value of the report?

6. If so, what are the names of the organizations?

7. When will the report be published?

8. Is Miss Doherty doing any work in connection with repatriates?

9. If so, is she making a report on this work?

10. When will it be published?

11. What experience has Miss Doherty had in connection with repatriation?

Mr. McCANN: Return tabled.

AIRPORTS—CANADA, NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

1. How many cost plus contracts were given by the government in Canada, Newfoundland and Labrador, for construction of airports of R.C.A.F. stations?

2. What was the amount of each of these contracts and where were those stations located?

3. What is the total amount of overpurchases (surpluses) on each of these contracts of goods and materials not used and turned over to the construction equipment valuation board to be turned over later to the War Assets Corporation?

4. What percentage of those surpluses have been disposed of, and by what department or corporation?

5. What was the total value of construction equipment such as shovels (power), caterpillars, trucks of all kinds, rollers and cars, purchased by the government in connection with airport construction in addition to that rented from the contractors?

6. What are the total rentals for plant and equipment used or rented by the contractors on those contracts which were on a cost plus basis?

7. What amounts have been charged to the government for repairs to such equipment (rented) at each of these contracts, (a) repair parts; (b) labour or mechanics' wages; (c) freight or aeroplane charges on such repairs?

8. What instructions were given by the minister, if any, to the engineers in charge of the works at these stations as to control or limiting the charges for heavy equipment?

9. Are there any instances where more than the new price of equipment has been paid to contractors for rental?

10. If so, did the government take over such equipment, or what disposition was made of it?

11. If same was taken over, to what department was it transferred?

WATSON LAKE, YUKON, AIRPORT

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

1. At the construction of the airport at Watson Lake, Yukon, R.C.A.F. station, were the contractors for this station the same as those who had the contract for Tofini station?

2. If not, were any of the directors on boards of construction companies which interlocked?

3. Who were the directors of the construction company which held the contract for Watson Lake station?

4. Are any of them also, or were they, directors of the Coast Construction Co.?

HOUSING—ELIGIBILITY FOR LOANS—NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. NICHOLSON:

1. Are municipally-owned limited dividend corporations eligible for loans under part two of the National Housing Act?

2. What criteria have been applied to ensure that the 50,000 houses to be built in Canada within one year after V-E day will be in the localities and for the families, including veterans' families, whose needs are greatest?

3. What is to prevent the wealthy from outbidding the rest for materials and skills?

4. What safeguards apply to prevent collusion between owners of high-priced slum property and the financial institution or its subsidiary offering a nominal price to a municipality for the same site in cleared condition?

5. Of the five million dollars appropriated for research and information by the National Housing Act in August, 1944, (a) what sums have been spent on research; (b) on dissemination of the results thereof?

6. Are the Department of Labour and the wartime bureau of technical personnel files being used to secure personnel for reconstruction projects?

7. How many professional persons have been added to N.H.A. staff in the past six months?

8. How many professional persons have left N.H.A. in the past six months?

TOFINI, B.C., AIRPORT

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

1. Who were the contractors on the construction of the airport at Tofini, B.C., R.C.A.F. station?

2. Who are the directors of the contracting company?

3. Are any of the directors members of the senate of Canada?

4. What was the fee paid the contractors for this contract?

5. Was there much over-purchasing on this contract?

6. When the job was finished how many tons of bolts, nuts and cap-screws which were not required were on hand and surplus?

7. Was the contractor paid a fee or commission on those surplus goods?

8. How many trucks were engaged on this work and who were the owners of each?

9. How many new motors for trucks were purchased on this contract?

10. In what condition were the trucks shipped in by the contractor?

11. What rental was paid for same?

12. Were new motors installed in them and what became of those motors?

13. What was the total amount paid by the government for truck and tractor repairs on this contract?

14. What was the amount of wages charged for repairing such equipment?

15. Has the government checked to see if any oil, gas or other charges were made on this contract, including up-keep and/or repairs to a palatial yacht which hovered around this airport?

16. Was this yacht owned by the contractor? If so, when and from whom was it acquired?

17. If not owned by the contractor was same rented by the owner, and if so, who is the owner?

18. What was the cost of upkeep of this yacht per month during the construction period?

19. How did this yacht come into the possession of the contractor?

20. How many of a crew were employed on this yacht?

GOOSE BAY, LABRADOR, AIRPORT

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

1. Who was the contractor on the construction of Goose Bay, Labrador, airport, R.C.A.F. station?

2. What was the figure stated by the government for the construction of this station?
3. Did the cost exceed that amount?
4. What was the total cost?
5. What were the surplus purchases by the contractor when the job finished?
6. Did the contractor receive a cost plus fee on those excess purchases?
7. Did those surpluses include over-purchases on the following: commissary and food supplies, kitchen supplies and kitchen equipment, electrical supplies?
8. If so, what were the amounts charged by each?
9. Did the construction equipment valuation board register any complaint to the minister about such purchasing?
10. Did the minister take any action, or is any action contemplated to check up on these expenditures?
11. Did the Department of Transport have any checker on this contract? If so, who?
12. Was any complaint registered or any action taken by the engineer, or engineers in charge of the work?

CIVILIAN PERSONNEL IN CERTAIN WAR DEPARTMENTS

Mr. THATCHER:

What was the total civilian personnel employed: (1) by the wartime prices and trade board; (2) the national selective service; (3) the Department of National Defence, (a) on the day preceding V-E day? (b) what is the total number employed at the present time?

Mr. MARTIN: Return tabled.

BAGOTVILLE, QUE., AIRPORT

Mr. GAGNON:

1. What was the total cost of the land purchased for the airport at Bagotville, Chicoutimi, Quebec?
2. From what person or persons was this land purchased?
3. What was the price paid to each?
4. What was the total cost of the airport?
5. Under what financial conditions are the Canadian Pacific Air Lines using such airport for carrying mail and passengers?

Mr. MARTIN: Return tabled.

ALUMINUM

Mr. KNOWLES:

1. What quantities of aluminum in all its various forms have been exported from Canada during the calendar years 1939, 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944, and thus far in 1945?
2. To what countries have such exports been made, and what is the quantity exported to each country in each of the above years?

Mr. MacKINNON: Return tabled.

ENLISTED SERVICE PERSONNEL ABOVE RANK OF CAPTAIN

Mr. THATCHER:

What was the total number of enlisted personnel in the armed forces in Canada, above the rank of captain in the army, and corresponding ranks in the navy and air force, (a) on the day preceding V-E day; (b) what is the total number at the present time?

[Mr. George Black.]

PORK AND PORK PRODUCTS

Mr. HATFIELD:

1. What was the total production in pounds of pork and beef in the years, 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944 and up to July 1, 1945, in Canada?
2. What was the amount processed by the packing companies in pounds of pork and beef during the above mentioned years?
3. What was the amount in pounds of pork and beef, bacon and hams exported during the above mentioned years?
4. What was the average in pounds of pork and beef and pork and beef products held in cold storage in Canada during the years in question?

Mr. MARTIN: Return tabled.

ASSISTANCE TO PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED CIVILIANS

Mr. McCUAIG:

What provision has been made by the government for assistance to physically handicapped youths and adult civilians, i.e., those mentally fit but handicapped in earning full maintenance by reason of amputation, deformity, partial paralysis, etc., by way of, (a) vocational training; (b) pension; (c) employment?

Mr. MITCHELL: Return tabled.

MANITOBA MILITARY AND AIR FORCE STATIONS

Mr. ZAPLITNY:

1. What decision has been reached as to the retention or disposal of, (a) the main aerodrome at Dauphin, Manitoba; (b) the relief fields at North Junction and Valley River; (c) No. 7 bombing and gunnery school at Paulson, Manitoba?
2. Have any offers been received for the purchase of building or equipment on any of the above?
3. If so, from whom, and what amount was offered in each case?

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES—HOSPITALIZATION

Mr. BRUCE:

1. What hospital bed accommodation is, (a) now ready; (b) in preparation, for our sick and wounded veterans returning from overseas, exclusive of beds occupied by veterans of the war 1914-18 and this war, as of August 31, 1945?
2. How many sick and wounded from, (a) the war of 1914-18; (b) the war of 1939-45, are now occupying hospital beds?
3. How many sick and wounded were being hospitalized overseas as of July 31, 1945?

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES—NUMBERS REJECTED AS MEDICALLY UNFIT

Mr. BRUCE:

1. How many men examined for enlistment in the armed forces of Canada were rejected as medically unfit from the beginning of September, 1939, to end of May, 1945?
2. What percentage of the total number examined does this constitute?
3. How many of these were in the navy, army and air force respectively?
4. What medical reasons were given for rejection?

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES—HOSPITALIZATION—MEDICAL, DENTAL AND NURSING SERVICES

Mr. BRUCE:

1. How many beds, in how many hospitals and where situate, are provided for our sick and wounded by the Department of National Defence for, (a) navy; (b) army; (c) air, respectively?
2. How many, (a) medical men; (b) nurses; (c) dentists; (d) other personnel were on the strength of the navy, army and air force overseas and in Canada?
3. How many in each category have been demobilized?

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES—CLOTHING

Mr. ISNOR:

1. From June 1 to July 31, 1945, what orders were placed by the Department of Munitions and Supply on behalf of the Department of National Defence for, (a) army uniforms and greatcoats; (b) R.C.A.F. uniforms and greatcoats; (c) naval uniforms and greatcoats; (d) underwear; (e) hosiery; (f) naval white broadcloth shirts; (g) R.C.A.F. dress shirts; (h) khaki cloth; (i) naval serge?
2. What are the names of persons or firms receiving these orders and on what date was each order placed?

Mr. HOWE: Return tabled.

EXPORTS OF LIVE STOCK AND OTHER COMMODITIES

Mr. PROBE:

1. Have permits been issued in 1945 for the export of live stock, dressed or processed meats, building lumber, or other building materials, to countries other than to Canada's combatant allies?
2. What amounts of each of the following commodities have been shipped from Canada during the first eight months of 1945: live stock, dressed meats, processed meats, building lumber, other building materials?
3. To what foreign countries were these commodities exported, and what amount to each, during the first eight months of 1945?

Mr. MacKINNON: Return tabled.

GROSS AND NET ANNUAL INCOME OF INDIVIDUALS

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North):

1. What were the gross and net annual wages, salaries, profits, interest, rents, received by individuals in Canada for the years 1926, 1931, 1936, and 1941?
2. How many people in Canada received incomes, (a) under $500; (b) between $500-$1,000; (c) $1,000-$1,500; (d) $1,500-$2,000; (e) $2,000-$5,000; (f) $5,000-$10,000; (g) $10,000-$25,000; (h) $25,000-$50,000; (i) over $50,000, during the years 1926, 1931, 1936, 1941, and what was the total income of each group?

WHEAT PRICES—SUBSIDIES FOR EXPORT

Mr. WRIGHT:

1. How many bushels of wheat have been purchased by the millers in Canada from the Canadian wheat board since the closing of the Winnipeg grain exchange, for (a) home consumption; (b) export?
2. What was the price per bushel paid?
3. Were any subsidies paid to the millers? If so, how much?
4. How much per bushel are Canadian millers paying to the wheat board for wheat being milled for export to-day?
5. Are any subsidies being paid to Canadian millers on wheat milled for export? If so, how much?

EIGHT-HOUR DAY

Mr. COLDWELL:

1. Is Canada a signatory to the convention of the international labour organization dealing with the eight hour day adopted at Geneva in 1936?
2. Has the government taken steps to enforce the eight hour day as it applies to merchant seamen sailing on inland and coastal ships?

ARMED FORCES—INDUSTRIAL SECTION AND RELEASES COMMITTEES

Mr. FLEMING:

1. How many men have been granted releases from the armed services on the recommendation of industrial selection and release committees?
2. How were such persons distributed by trades and occupations?
3. How many of such persons had not served overseas?
4. How many of such persons were N.R.M.A. troops?

CANADIAN OVERSEAS FIRE FIGHTERS

Mr. KNIGHT:

What action has been taken by the government in answer to requests that treatment of discharged Canadian overseas fire fighters should be identical with that given to discharged members of the armed forces?

Mr. McCANN: Return tabled.

BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's):

1. What is the total number of employees of the government of Canada, including employees of boards and commissions appointed by federal authority as of the following dates—namely, March 1, 1944; March 1, 1945; September 1, 1945?
2. What is the total amount of salaries, wages and allowances paid to such employees in each of the following months, namely, March, 1944; March, 1945; September, 1945?
3. What is the total number of employees who have been appointed since March 1, 1944, (a) for work not directly associated with the war; (b) for work directly associated with the war?

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, the first and second parts of this question should be passed as an order for return. It is quite impossible to answer the third part of the question because many of these employees are both war-time and peace-time employees. I would suggest that No. 3 be dropped.

Mr. SPEAKER: Then it will pass as an order for return, so far as the first and second questions are concerned.

Mr. MARTIN: And the third question would be dropped.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): As the hon. member who asked the question is not here, would it not be proper to allow it to stand?

Mr. MARTIN: I should be glad to accept that suggestion.

Mr. SPEAKER: Questions 1 and 2 will stand as an order for return; question 3 will stand.

RETIREMENT OF CIVIL SERVANTS AT STATUTORY AGE LIMIT

Mr. ROSS (Hamilton East):

1. What is the total number of civil servants who have reached the retiring age?
2. How many in each department?
3. What steps have been taken with respect to the retirement of these persons?

POSTAL SERVICE—WINNIPEG DISTRICT

Mr. KNOWLES:

1. How many postal employees over the retiring age are still being retained in service in the Winnipeg postal district?
2. What was the total number of letter carriers in the Winnipeg postal district as at, (a) September 1, 1939; (b) September 1, 1942; (c) September 1, 1945?
3. How many, (a) letter carriers; (b) other postal employees, from the Winnipeg postal district enlisted in the armed forces for world war II? How many of these have returned to the service?

CANADIAN SERVICE PERSONNEL—LEAVE FOR MORE THAN THREE YEARS' SERVICE

Mr. CRUICKSHANK:

1. Do our R.C.A.F. personnel receive thirty days' special retirement leave for more than three years' service?
2. Do (a) naval and (b) army personnel receive the same leave for equivalent service?
3. If not, what is the reason for the difference?

FERNIE, B.C., HOTELS—GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURE

Mr. MATTHEWS (Kootenay East):

1. What total amount was spent by the government in cooperation with the city of Fernie, British Columbia, in the reconstruction of the Napanee hotel and the Queen's hotel, in that city?
2. How many suites were thus provided in each building?
3. How many suites were occupied in each building in each of the months of May, June, July, August and September of this year?
4. Will rentals of above-mentioned suites be set at local rental levels?

SHIPMENT OF FOOD PRODUCTS TO UNITED KINGDOM AND EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie):

1. Since June 1, 1945, what quantities of food products have been sent to England, France, Belgium, Holland, Norway, Italy, Greece and other Balkan countries, either as a gift or loan under lend-lease, or by way of sales or otherwise, with details concerning each product and country as well as the mode of payment provided (gift, lend-lease, export credits, ordinary commercial transactions between individuals or governments)?

2. In addition to the quantities of food products already sent, have said countries made application to the government of Canada or attempted to negotiate agreements to obtain additional quantities? If so, what was the nature of such applications, with details concerning each product and country?

3. Apart from negotiations between governments and in addition to the quantities sent, have Canadian merchants or exporters applied for permission to export such products?

4. If so, for what amount of exports to each of these various countries have such permits been required, and in what proportion have same been granted or refused for each country?

HOUSING IN TORONTO

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Since the house met in April this year, what steps have been taken to relieve the serious housing situation in Toronto, (a) for soldiers' families; (b) for civilians?

2. What has been done in 1944 and 1945 to build houses in Toronto for, (a) wartime housing; (b) for civilians, by any government authority?

WARTIME INFORMATION BOARD—STAFF

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

1. How many persons are, or were, employed by or connected with the wartime information board, (a) as of September 27, 1945; (b) as of 1st of January, 1945?

2. What was the total amount paid to the said officials or employees for salaries and expenses, (a) during the month of January, 1945; (b) during the month of August, 1945?

ORDERS IN COUNCIL

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

How many orders in council have been passed, (a) between September 1, 1939, and May 8, 1945; (b) since May 8, 1945?

LUMBER EXPORTS

Mr. FLEMING:

1. What was the annual volume of Canada's exports of lumber of all kinds, by countries, from 1938 to 1945 inclusive, (a) by measurement; (b) by price?

2. What were the prices paid by the United Kingdom for Canadian lumber of all kinds in each of the said years?

3. Did the timber controller participate in the negotiation of the said prices?

4. Did the Department of Munitions and Supply or any other government department participate in the negotiation of the said prices?

5. Did the Minister of Munitions and Supply or any other government department approve the said prices?

FOREST PRODUCTS

Mr. WRIGHT:

1. What was the total production of forest products in Canada for 1939 to 1944 inclusive, under: (a) pulpwood; (b) ties, pit props, fuel wood; (c) lumber and lumber products; (d) any other items?
2. What were the total exports of forest products from Canada from 1939 to 1944 inclusive, under: (a) pulpwood; (b) ties, pit props, fuel wood; (c) lumber and lumber products; (d) any other items?
3. What was the total production of forest products by provinces for the years 1939 to 1944 inclusive, under: (a) pulpwood; (b) ties, pit props, fuel wood; (c) lumber and lumber products; (d) any other items?
4. What was the total export of forest products by provinces for the years 1939 to 1944 inclusive, under: (a) pulpwood; (b) ties, pit props, fuel wood; (c) lumber and lumber products; (d) any other items?

Mr. MacKINNON: Return tabled.

INCOME TAX—DIVISIONAL OFFICES

Mr. PEARKES:

1. In what cities in Canada are divisional offices of the income tax department located?
2. What were the amounts collected through each office during the past fiscal year?
3. Has the minister received a request from the city of Victoria, British Columbia, that a divisional office be located in Victoria to meet the needs of the taxpayers on the southern portion of Vancouver island?
4. If so, what action is being taken by the government?

Mr. McCANN: Return tabled.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

AMSTERDAM, SASK., POST OFFICE

Mr. NICHOLSON:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, reports and other documents in the possession of the Post Office Department, regarding complaints arising out of the administration of the post office at Amsterdam, Saskatchewan, since January 1, 1940.

RED DEER WATER DIVERSION PROJECT

Mr. QUELCH:

For a copy of any report or reports in the possession of any department of the government on the progress of the survey of the Red Deer diversion project, along with a statement showing (a) the estimated cost of completing this project; (b) when construction will be started; (c) the possibilities of power development.

Mr. GARDINER: I have no objection to any information being brought down which is available, but any information that does exist is in the offices at Regina. It will be necessary for me to get the information from Regina in order to make it available. I am not sure that all the reports will be in shape so that they can be brought down immediately, but whatever reports can be properly brought down will be brought down as well as any information based upon them.

Motion agreed to.

LAST MOUNTAIN LAKE, SASK., WATER LEVELS

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

For a copy of all correspondence, reports and surveys since 1935 in connection with measures that could be undertaken to elevate the level of Last Mountain lake in Saskatchewan, and/or the partial diversion of the waters of the South Saskatchewan river into the valley of the Qu'Appelle river.

CANADA'S ATTITUDE, PRIOR TO 1939 RESPECTING OUTBREAK OF HOSTILITIES

Mr. HAZEN:

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, cables and other documents exchanged between His Majesty's government in the United Kingdom and His Majesty's government in Canada from September 1, 1938, to September 15, 1939, relating to the attitude of Canada in the event of an outbreak of hostilities betwen His Majesty and any other power.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: The consent of the government of the United Kingdom has been asked for the production of the correspondence that would come within the terms of the motion. I am informed that it would be more convenient if this motion were extended to October 1, because during September, 1939 the matter was dealt with by correspondence and there were exchanges subsequent to September 15, which are required to complete the disposition of the matter referred to in the correspondence. Perhaps the hon. member will have no objection to having the date extended to October 1, 1939, so that the correspondence may show how the matter being discussed was disposed of.

Mr. HAZEN: I have no objection to that, but what I was most interested in was to find out what had occurred up to the outbreak of the war.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: It will be subject to the consent of the government of the United Kingdom being obtained for the porduction of the documents in question.

Motion as amended agreed to.

POSTAL SERVICE—LETTER RETURNED FROM TIMMINS TO OTTAWA

Mr. KNOWLES:

For a copy of all correspondence between Mr. A. W. Stewart, of Timmins, Ontario, Mr. E. H. King, postmaster of Timmins, Ontario, and the Post Office Department at Ottawa, with reference to the return to Ottawa of a letter addressed to Mr. Stewart, by the Post Office Department.

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

Mr. CASSELMAN:

For a copy of all correspondence exchanged between the governments of Canada, United States and the province of Ontario or between any officials of the said governments from December 30, 1940, to the present time, referring to the development of the international section of the St. Lawrence waterway.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Correspondence tabled.

MUNITIONS AND SUPPLY—DISPOSAL OF EQUIPMENT PURCHASED FROM AUTOMOBILE COMPANIES

Mr. CASTLEDEN:

For a copy of all contracts made by the Department of Munitions and Supply for the purchase of, (a) trucks; (b) jeeps; (c) passenger automobiles; (d) station wagons, with (1) General Motors; (2) Ford Company of Canada; (3) Chrysler Corporation, together with a copy of any agreement with the said companies concerning the repurchase or disposal of such equipment.

Mr. HOWE: I suggest that this motion pass subject to the understanding that copies of the master contracts and amendments thereto are tabled now, but not the acceptances of the tenders pertaining to them. The master contracts with the companies mentioned in the motion form the basis on which all automotive vehicles were purchased. The master contracts with the companies mentioned in the motion form the basis on which all motor vehicles were purchased. There are, however, thousands of formal acceptances of tender, all subject to the terms and conditions of the master contracts, the tabling of which from the standpoint of work involved could hardly be justified. There is no agreement with the said companies concerning the repurchase or disposal of motor vehicles.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion subject to the remarks made by the minister?

Motion agreed to.

ESTABLISHMENT OF FREE PORT AT QUEBEC

Mr. ISNOR:

For a copy, in English, of all letters, telegrams, reports and other documents exchanged between the Prime Minister of Canada, the Minister of Justice or other ministers of the cabinet and His Worship Mayor Lucien Borne, Quebec city, from October 1, 1943 to date, in reference to the establishing of a so-called free port at Quebec.

DISALLOWANCE OF PROVINCIAL LEGISLATION—SASKATCHEWAN

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

For a copy of all petitions made by any corporation, person or persons, in connection with the disallowance of certain acts passed by the Saskatchewan legislature, namely, the Farm Security Act, the Local Government Board (Special Powers) Act, and the Mineral Taxation Act, and of all correspondence relative thereto as passed between the Department of Justice, the petitioners and the government of the province of Saskatchewan.

[Mr. Knowles.]

HOSPITALIZATION OF VETERANS, P.E.I.

Mr. McLURE:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, reports and other documents in the possession of the Department of Veterans Affairs, exchanged between any person or persons and the said department, or any other department of the government, or between the different departments of the government, during the past six months, relative to hospitalization of veterans in the province of Prince Edward Island.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I have no objection to the resolution passing, subject to the customary reservation regarding confidential documents passing between different departments of government.

Motion agreed to.

DOMINION-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE

Mr. FULTON:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, memoranda or other documents dated since June 1, 1944, exchanged between the Prime Minister or any member or official of the federal government and the premiers or officials of the provincial governments, relative to the holding of the dominion-provincial conference, the agenda of such conference, the holding of the adjourned meeting on the conference, or any other subject related to the conference.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: There is no objection to this motion being passed, on the understanding that it will be satisfactory to produce only the correspondence since August 14, 1944, on which date all previous correspondence was tabled and published as an appendix to the *Votes and Proceedings* of that day, and that it will not be necessary to produce the voluminous correspondence between federal and provincial officials on such technical matters as the preparation of comparative statistics or correspondence relating to train schedules, hotel reservations and other preparations for the conference, the distribution of documents and so forth, which correspondence is very voluminous and can be of no general interest.

RESIGNATION OF MINISTERS OF THE CROWN SINCE NOVEMBER 1, 1944

Mr. FLEMING:

For a copy of all correspondence between the Prime Minister and any minister of the crown who resigned subsequent to November 1, 1944, regarding the resignation of such minister.

Mr. ILSLEY: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Prime Minister I should like to comply with this order of the house immediately, and I now place the correspondence on the table. In doing so I should like to make clear one point. The government has been advised that that there is a long standing rule that it was under no obligation to table letters of resignation or correspondence relating to resignations of ministers before the general election which resulted in the election of the parliament in which the motion is made. However, there is no disposition on the part of the Prime Minister to take advantage of the rule in this case and I am therefore tabling the correspondence. Included in the correspondence are the letters from the Hon. A. G. L. McNaughton and the Hon. D. L. MacLaren, together with the Prime Minister's replies. To some of the letters of resignation there were no written replies, the replies being made orally.

Motion agreed to.

COLEMAN LAMP COMPANY

Mr. COLDWELL:

For a copy of correspondence, report or reports under the dominion trade and industry commission, regarding a complaint made in 1937 that the Coleman Lamp Company had refused to supply the Merchants Consolidated Limited, of Winnipeg, with their products.

Mr. MacKINNON: The dominion trade and industry commission do not make reports regarding complaints of this kind. The procedure is that the complainant writes to the commission, and the commission in turn write to the alleged offender. This correspondence is carried on more or less in confidence, and I am warned that if the exchange of correspondence were made public it might defeat the objective. If the hon. member will accept the offer of the use of the file in order that he may read it, I shall be glad indeed to make it available to him now.

Mr. COLDWELL: I thank the minister very much, but my purpose in placing this motion on the order paper was rather to get the kind of reply that I have just obtained so that the house would understand the position. I have raised this complaint before in the house. I wanted to have access to the correspondence in the proper way, but was refused. Complaints of this nature made in parliament, or even outside of parliament, should be subject to review by parliament, and the reports should be before us here. That is why I put the motion on the order paper. I shall be glad to see the correspondence, but it does not really meet what I required.

Mr. GRAYDON: What does the minister mean by "more or less" confidential?

Mr. MacKINNON: Just what it says.

Mr. GRAYDON: It does not mean anything.

Mr. SPEAKER: Motion dropped.

Mr. COLDWELL: Under protest.

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT

QUESTION OF GRANTING CLEAR TITLES TO LAND HELD UNDER CONTRACT ON MARCH 31, 1944

Mr. ROBERT FAIR (Battle River) moved:

Whereas veterans of great war I who settled on land under the soldier settlement scheme as well as their wives and families, have in many instances suffered severe hardships because of purchase of land, live stock and equipment at inflationary prices, and low prices received for farm products brought about by lack of adequate policy for agriculture;

And whereas we are now embarking on another land scheme for veterans of the present war, under a government policy that does not guarantee cost of production, the success of which scheme may be jeopardized by the apparent failure of the former soldier settlement board scheme;

Therefore be it resolved,—that, in the opinion of this house, the government should take into consideration the advisability of giving clear titles to all soldier settlers who on March 31, 1944, held land under contract with the soldier settlement board.

He said: I am very glad to have the opportunity of again taking up this question on the first private members' day made available after the close of the war, which I believe is now finished. I want it plainly understood in regard to what I shall have to say on behalf of the soldiers for whom I am speaking that they are not asking for any charity. I also want it plainly understood that I am not a soldier settler, nor am I in any way indebted to the soldier settlement board.

This question, as I have stated before, is one of long standing, and I hope that in the very near future it will be disposed of to the benefit of those interested and to the credit of the Canadian people.

Some people may feel that there is no justice in this matter. Personally I feel quite differently about it, and before I am through I hope to show that several other Canadians feel exactly the same as I do.

I am bringing this matter up at this time, as I have brought it up in past years, because the men who return from this war and who are going to settle on the land under the present Veterans' Land Act will be in a position similar to that of the veterans of the first

great war unless we take care now to see that the old veterans are dealt with as they should have been years ago.

In order to show that these men have some claim, as have the men who are coming back from this war, I am going to read from an address delivered by the late Sir Robert Borden to the Canadian expeditionary force away back in 1917. This may sound old, but in my opinion it forms a basis for the claim that is made by these old soldier settlers. I quote:

> You are the men actually facing the enemy day and night. You are suffering greatly from fatigue, overstrained, and lack of rest. The marvel of it is that men could undergo such a strain without breaking; but you have never yet broken, and history will appreciate that in days to come.
>
> You are men about to enter one of the most serious engagements that ever faced the Canadian corps. I cannot, at this moment, give any information as to where this attack will be staged; whether it be successful or not, it is to be borne in mind that it will not be an easy success. . . . We feel confident that you will succeed where others failed, for you have never yet failed in anything you have set your hand to, as a Canadian corps.
>
> You can go into this action feeling assured of this, and as the head of the government, I give you this assurance; that you need have no fear that the government and the country will fail to show just appreciation of your service to the country and empire in what you are about to do and what you have already done. The government and the country will consider it their first duty to see that a proper appreciation of your effort and of your courage is brought to the notice of the people at home, and it will always be our endeavour to so guide the attitude of public opinion, that the country will support the government to prove to the returned man its just and due appreciation of the inestimable value of the services rendered to the country and empire; and that no man, whether he goes back, or whether he remains in Flanders, will have just cause to reproach the government for having broken with the men who won and the men who died.

This matter of granting simple justice to the veterans of great war I is not a new one. I have in my hand a copy of a brief which was presented to the members of the Senate and the House of Commons in 1938, after quite a lot of work had been done by a committee at that time. Let me read one paragraph from the introduction:

> It is only fair to state at the outset that it is our opinion that the large expenditure of taxpayers' money on these remedial measures and for the settlement scheme has failed utterly to accomplish its purpose, viz.—the ultimate ownership, within a reasonable period of time, of his home in the country for which he fought during the war.

That is from the brief presented by the Soldier Settlers Union, with headquarters at Lloydminster, of Saskatchewan and Alberta.

I will not dwell on that, but I have a number of figures which I think it is necessary to place on the record in order that the case of the old veterans will be studied by the many new members we have here, and I hope they will give us the backing which the old veterans deserve. I am asking this because many service personnel have returned from overseas, and there are a number of men elected to this house whose duty it is to see that the men who come back from this war and settle on the land and in other occupations are properly dealt with by the government.

This is not a political matter. The men for whom I am speaking are all Canadians, as are the men who are returning now and who have returned from the recent conflict. The total number of settlers under the old soldier settlement board scheme was 25,017. The total amount advanced by the government of the day for the purchase of land, live stock and equipment was $109,034,331. The rate of interest on that amount was five per cent on current account, seven per cent as soon as the account went into arrears; and I think it will be readily understood that, because of the conditions that obtained at that time, namely, the high prices paid for land, live stock and equipment and the low prices that very soon prevailed for agricultural products, the men went into arrears and as a result were faced with the problem of paying seven per cent interest on their debts.

Here may I say that had the government of the day done its duty it would not have been necessary to pay seven per cent on that money, or five per cent, or even 3½ per cent. It would appear however that the golden calf, or the golden bull as some people call it, had to be worshipped instead of the rights of the men who went and fought for Canada, being preserved. I will give the total principal repaid from the inception of the scheme up to March 31, 1944—and I am making that cut-off because, if we let this thing drag on for a little while, we shall find the old saying coming true, that—

> Old soldiers never die, never die, never die;
> Old soldiers never die; they simply fade away.

That will be realized, I say, and the government will have some more land for sale, perhaps to aliens, and at much less than the amount against it at the present time.

The total amount of principal repaid by everybody under that scheme, that is, the settlers themselves, civilians to whom land was sold after the soldier settler had vacated it, and British families and others, was $50,507,493.20. The total amount of interest was $25,381,060.13, making a total of $75,888,-

553.33. Because of the conditions that existed at that time the government found it necessary to take many methods of reducing the debts of the settlers, in other words of rectifying the unjust contract into which these men had entered. As a result of seven or eight different processes there was a total amount cancelled on account of soldier settler debts of $24,867,637.64 of principal, and interest to the amount of $19,234,239.77, making a total of $44,101,877.41. Up to the end of March, 1944, the cost of administration of the soldier settlement part of the scheme alone amounted to $27,340,763.64. That, I might say, represents an annual expenditure of cost of administration of approximately $1,100,000. The amounts that I have just given total $71,442,641.05.

Then again we have other cancellations that were made necessary because of the civilians, British families and others, who bought this land after the soldier settlers got off. These amounts were as follows: For civilians, principal $2,403,489.46; interest $2,518,264.86; British families, principal $4,485,087.05; interest $3,304,596.49; other families for principal $383,656.07, and interest $294,244.17. These items added together make a total of $7,272,-232.58 for principal, and $6,117,105.52 for interest. The grand total $13,389,338.10.

We now add to this the amounts of cancellations of the soldier settlers, which totals $71,442,641.05, and also the general land administrative expenses of $3,376,548.32. Adding all this together gives us a total of $88,208,-527.47. This is the amount of cancellations and administrative expenses, and we have up to the end of March collected only $50,507,-493.20 in principal and $25,381,060.13 in interest, making a total of $75,888,553.33.

From these figures I think it will be clearly seen that the scheme was a sadly and badly improvised one and impossible right from the start. As I have pointed out on other occasions, the government would have saved money, and the soldier settlers who settled under that scheme would have been saved a whole lot of misery, poverty and punishment, if the government had adopted a scheme of giving them the land without one cent being charged against them.

At the end of March, 1944, the soldier settlers owed a total of $7,715,954.01; the civilian settlers under that scheme owed $6,999,197.40, the British families owed $1,895,-612.66, and others $122,333.98, making a total amount outstanding at the end of March, 1944, of $16,733,098.05. The total amount of arrears owed by soldier settlers at that date was $1,054,269.30; civilian settlers $616,235.77; British families and others $205,794.91, making a grand total of arrears as at March 31, 1944, of $1,876,299.98. At that time there were 6,153 soldier settlers still holding contracts with the board, or approximately 25 per cent of the original number of settlers. At the same time we had 5,715 civilian settlers and 1,163 British families and others, making a total of 13,031 settlers still on the land and holding contracts with the board.

I am not making any plea to-day on behalf of the British families and others. What I am principally interested in is the old soldier settler, but I had to bring in these figures to give a complete picture of the financial standing of the soldier settlement board.

The average original debt at the time these men took up the land was $4,358.40. The average balance owing by the settlers still on the land at the end of March, 1944, was $1,254, which represents 29 per cent of their original debt at the time they settled on the land. The number who acquired title during those twenty-five years is 4,130 settlers, or 16 per cent of the 25,017 who originally settled on the land. I think this should make some people sit up and take notice.

I think it should be noted that a number of the old soldier settlers enlisted for service in the war just ended, and in many cases the reason was not patriotism. In fact I know of some who enlisted who could not make a living on the land for their wives and families, and because of the inducements in the form of dependents' allowances and pay for the soldier himself, many of those men enlisted. I may say that they could not make a living on the land, for different reasons. One of the reasons is that we had seventy cent wheat at Fort William until the first of August, 1942. That meant an average of about forty-five cents a bushel on the veterans' farm in the prairie provinces. Then we had corresponding prices for other farm produce. After these men enlisted, their wives and families were left home to look after the land. Perhaps the crops were not as good as they should have been, and payments were not coming into the board. The then minister of mines and resources, perhaps prompted or prodded by his director of soldier settlement, decided that something must be done about it, and as a result on March 19, 1941, order in council P.C. 138/1936 was passed by the treasury board on the recommendation of the then minister of mines and resources. The effect of that order in council was to permit the soldier settlement board to deduct up to $20 a month from the money paid the dependents

of these men who had enlisted for the second time, though that money rightfully belonged to the wives and families of those soldiers, for the purpose of making good the payments to the soldier settlement board. In view of the address made to these men in 1917 by the late Sir Robert Borden I wonder if we as a government were keeping faith with the men who went over and fought, particularly when they offered their services and joined up for the second time.

Then on November 19, 1942, another order in council was passed, supposedly for the benefit of these old soldier settlers. You will note that up to this time they had been given some twenty-three or twenty-four years in which to pay for their land, but were not able to do so. During those years they were giving the very best they had; they were in the prime of life. At the end of that time their land was run down to a certain extent, and their implements and live stock had not improved over the years. So in order to make it possible for them to continue to worship the golden calf, order in council P.C. 10472 was passed on November 19, 1942, providing for the setting up of a committee which, if it saw fit, could recommend to the treasury board that the time for payment of the debt on the land could be extended another twenty years. That meant a total of forty-five years for a veteran of the first great war to pay for his farm. The committee also could recommend to treasury board that the debts of various settlers be reduced, and it had also power to recommend that the interest paid by those settlers who enlisted for the second time might be reduced to 3½ per cent.

Those things were brought about because of pressure put on the settlers by the officials of the soldier settlement board. If anyone wants to get a picture of the conditions under which many of these settlers are living, it will be found that a large number are living alone, putting up with things which Canada should not allow any of its citizens to put up with, and particularly old soldier settlers. Several attempts have been made to get action; I think we all realize that when we are hard pressed we are liable to do something about it. So in April, 1943, the settlers of the prairie provinces called a meeting at Saskatoon, at which I believe four resolutions were passed, and again in November of 1943 a meeting was held in the same city. Among other things, those attending that gathering decided to circulate a petition during the winter. Those men had no money; they had to start out on their own, but by raising nickels and dimes they were able to obtain enough money to send a delegation to Ottawa a little later on.

As a result of their work 12,500 signatures were obtained to a petition, and on May 23, 1944, a delegation of nine, representing that organization, came to Ottawa and met members of the cabinet.

That meeting was presided over by the then minister of mines and resources, who has since gone to a place of rest; and I may add that with the exception of the chairman all the members of the committee expressed the opinion, either privately or publicly, that this thing should be cleaned up. These men were promised consideration, and we expected they would get it; but of course being promised consideration by members of the cabinet does not always mean that the consideration is going to be in the interests of those asking for it. That consideration was promised in spite of the fact that in the May 1944 issue of *The Legionary,* the official organ of the Canadian Legion, an article appeared dealing with this very matter. In the pages preceding those containing this article we find advertisements dealing with International Nickel, Canada Post Office, O'Keefe's Brewing Company, Canadian Legion cigarettes, and so on. Then on page 10 we see a picture of the governor general and a little girl under which this caption appears:

> Five-year old Carole Louise Hooey, of Toronto, proudly clings to the Distinguished Flying Cross won by her father, the late F/O Gilbert Hooey, who lost his life serving as a pilot overseas.

Then in the lower right hand corner we see a picture of Lieutenant General Sir Richard Turner, V.C., of Quebec City, extending the glad hand of welcome to Major Paul Triquet, whom we had the honour of welcoming here in Ottawa. This is a beautiful setting, interesting and patriotic, for one of the most scurrilous attacks that could be waged against the old soldier settlers by one of our civil servants, who apparently is in good financial circumstances and whose security in old age no doubt is provided for. I am just going to read the opening and closing words. The body of the article deals with figures which are entirely onesided. The article is headed, "Soldier Settlement" and is written by Gordon Murchison, director, Soldier Settlement and Veterans' Land Act. The first paragraphs of the article read:

> Editor, *The Legionary*—
>
> During the last several months a number of representations have been received by my minister, the Hon. T. A. Crerar, and by myself from and/or on behalf of an organization formed in Saskatoon last summer and known as the soldier settlers association. This association has declared its policy by a resolution, part of which calls for the cancellation of all unpaid balances due or accruing in the agreements between soldier settlers and the director representing

the dominion government. I understand the dominion executive of the Canadian Legion has received similar representations, and so that the situation from the standpoint of the government—

I ask hon. members to note those words—

—and the administration may be placed fairly before the Canadian Legion and the readers of *The Legionary*, the Hon. Mr. Crerar has authorized me to furnish you with an official statement.

A statement, let me repeat, of arrogance and impudence.

First of all there is lack of evidence that the resolution and representations above referred to reflect the serious views of more than ten per cent of soldier settlers and, knowing the situation as I do, I am sure the great majority of the remaining ninety per cent must feel somewhat humiliated by the publicity being circulated by the few who for reasons best known to themselves and their friends endeavour to paint a dark and gloomy picture. What are the facts?

Before going further I am going to give some of the facts, to disprove some of the information, or misinformation, as you may prefer to call it, contained in this article. Those supporting the request of the old veterans include over 12,500 signers of a petition; the Alberta legislature; the Saskatchewan legislature; the Alberta farmers union; the Saskatchewan association of rural municipalities; the Saskatchewan wheat pool; the United Farmers of Canada, Saskatchewan section; the United Farmers of Alberta and the Alberta branch of the Canadian Legion. In case there should be any mistake about some of the resolutions, I shall read one or two passed by the Canadian Legion at a provincial convention held in Memorial Hall, Edmonton, on June 6 to 9, 1943. This is the first:

Whereas the majority of original soldier settlers, who are still endeavouring to carry on under the soldier settlement scheme have now found it, owing to advanced years and the adverse conditions prevailing in agriculture, particularly the lack of parity prices, increasingly difficult to liquidate their indebtedness to the settlement board,

And whereas the settlers have struggled on through the years of drought conditions and low prices unprecedented in the agricultural history of this country and have now nothing to show for their years of toil and struggle but whatever equity they may have in the land which is liable to foreclosure,

Therefore be it resolved that we now petition the government to relieve the soldier settler of any further payments and that they be given the title deed to their land or, failing this, that a parliamentary committee in conjunction with representation from the dominion command of the Canadian Legion, review the whole situation of the soldier settler with a view to alleviating their present financial difficulties.

The second resolution was as follows:

Whereas it has come to our notice that by order in council the soldier settlement board has been permitted to order deductions made from the pay and allowances of dependents of men now serving in the armed forces to be applied against land and taxes,

Therefore we ask that this order in council, be rescinded immediately, and that any sums of money so deducted be refunded.

In addition to the organizations to which I have referred, we also have the executive of the British Columbia branch of the Canadian Legion, and several others which I shall not take time to list. After giving the side of the story pleasing to the director and the government, the director concludes in this manner.

In the face of the above factual information, what is the logic behind the argument that soldier settlers of record to-day should have their contract indebtedness cancelled, which means in effect legislation into ownership? Do the sponsors of the petition believe that this would be the end of the matter? Do they think for a moment that those who have paid for their farms, and all those who are meeting the terms of their agreements in full and on time or are prepaying their agreements, would stand quietly by and make no demand for a refund? I have received direct assurances that such demands would be made.

In reply to the last argument I have asked for the names and copies of the letters which would justify or back up this claim; and the answer I got in July, 1944, I believe it was, was to the effect that the representations were made in confidence to the director and members of his organization. To my mind the letters are not there, and cannot be produced. Then, to proceed with the quotation:

Do the petitioners behind this movement consider that they alone have rendered service to the state which outshines the service of tens of thousands of other veterans of the last war who have paddled their own canoes during good times and bad but never asked for or received a dollar of state aid toward the purchase of a home?

These are the questions which give some food for thought and illustrate why legislation into ownership involves a great deal more than appears at first glance.

Under the heading "No change" we find this:

In conclusion I am authorized to say that the proposal is not deemed to be in the public interest and, consequently, it is not being entertained by the government. Therefore, the best advice I can offer to the soldier settlers concerned is to get into step with those who manifestly prefer securing title to their farms by complying with the terms of their agreements.

Let me point out here that those old soldier settlers are not in receipt of guaranteed government salaries. They have to fight the elements in producing crops, and after they

have done that they have got to fight monopolies on each of the markets on which their produce is sold.

Nothing was done until parliament was prorogued. Then late in August the Minister of Mines and Resources made a radio announcement to the effect that the petitions of the old soldier settlers would not be granted.

In October, 1944, feeling that the Prime Minister did not know the exact situation, I made a special trip to Ottawa, at which time I laid the case before him in his own home in this city. He told me that in the following week the Department of Veterans Affairs would be set up, and that he would turn the matter over to the minister of that department.

I am quite satisfied that the Minister of Veterans Affairs is sympathetically inclined to the granting of titles. If he is not sympathetic, I should like him to tell us now. If he says no, then we shall have some argument at a later time. Apparently he is satisfied that those titles should be granted.

In the next week the department was set up, but nothing has been done up to the present time. As a result of no action being taken, the president and secretary of the settler's organization accompanied me when I visited Ottawa in March of this year, upon which occasion we called upon the Minister of Veterans Affairs and afterwards upon the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Veterans Affairs who apparently had certain objections prepared for him told us that payments were being made, and also that if titles were granted to the old settlers, the new settlers would want free titles also.

I shall deal later with the question of payments; but in connection with the new veterans not wanting to pay up, may I say I would not think the Minister of Veterans Affairs would admit that the new scheme had proved to be a failure, and that the veterans could not pay up; because if they could pay I am quite satisfied that every one, both new and old, would pay. They want to live up to their agreements if at all possible.

After a little while we went on to see the Minister of Finance. While we were received very cordially we did not get very far. He told us that payments were coming in freely, and that he also believed in the sanctity of contract. In connection with payments coming in freely, my comment would be that we have had three good crop years in western Canada, and that prices have been better than they were in other years, both for grain and for live stock. In many instances the families of those old settlers were engaged in war industries, and many of the boys had gone overseas. Well, they were pouring money home to make the old homestead safe for their folks, so that those old people would have a roof over their heads and the boys would have a home to come to when they returned.

Those are some of the reasons. Then, again, dependents' allowances are being used in some cases to make payments. Many of those old settlers and their families went without the necessities of life. One of the delegates who came here in May, 1944 had, shortly before that time, lost his wife. If she had had proper medical attention he would not have suffered that loss.

The fear of eviction will drive many people to do things they would not do otherwise. I think all hon. members can realize the position in which the old settler would find himself if he had no home. Some say, "Oh, well, the soldier settler would not be evicted." Let me contradict that suggestion, because in a return brought down to this house we find that between 1930 and 1942 soldier settlers to the number of 1,006 signed quit-claim deeds. I do not wish anyone to think that they signed those quit-claims voluntarily, because in many cases a good deal of pressure was put upon them, and after signing quit-claim deeds, they got off. And in nearly a thousand cases during the same period, settlers were served with thirty-day notices to get off. That is no worse than the mortgage companies have done —those fellows against whom many of us in this house have railed. Between April 1, 1941, and March 31, 1943, no less than 253 settlers signed quit-claim deeds and 108 settlers were served with thirty-day notices. During the war those men were forced to pay up—or else.

In connection with the sanctity of contracts I want to say that the government made agreements with these men to pay a certain amount for the land. At that time the price of the land was based upon the price of the produce that was being raised on the land. For instance, in many cases wheat was selling at close to $3 a bushel; cows were worth $125 to $150 apiece and horses were worth up to $500 a team and perhaps more. Those are the prices that prevailed at the time those land contracts were made. If the government saw fit to allow those prices to drop down to 20 cents a bushel for wheat, $50 a team for horses and $10 for milch cows, then it was their duty to drop the price of the land in accordance with those prices.

In conclusion I am once more, and I hope I will have plenty of company, asking for clear titles for these men, these old settlers, who held contracts with the soldier settler board at March 31, 1944. In doing that we will be granting nothing more than simple

justice. We will be placing human values before money values. To sum up, 25,017 settlers had an average credit of $4,358.40 under the scheme. At the present time 6,153, or 25 per cent, have an average debt of $1,254. A total of 4,130, or 16 per cent, were able to secure titles in twenty-five years. The rate of interest under the old scheme was five per cent on current debts and seven per cent on arrears, while under the Veterans' Land Act it is 3½ per cent or one-half the old rate. Under the present scheme a settler who takes full advantage of the scheme will get a clear grant of $2,320 provided he lives up to the terms of his contract during the first ten years, which is equal to 39 per cent of the total amount of his credit. The average amount owed by the old settlers is only twenty-nine per cent.

Why not give them all a square deal? As I said before, these old fellows were Canadians. I am not speaking of them as being Liberals or Conservatives or of any other political faith. They are Canadians who fought for Canada. The average debt of these old vets is only twenty-nine per cent of original credit extended to them. The shooting war with the enemy is over; let us conclude our war with the old vets, because war it has been for a number of years. The average age of these old settlers is close to sixty years, and to my personal knowledge some of them are over eighty years of age. Yet we are giving these old fellows another term extension of twenty years in which to pay up their debts. Do I see many red faces around here? Can Canada afford nothing better?

The record of payments during the last few years has been obtained at the expense of the health and welfare of the settlers and their families. Coming back to monetary values, we know that during the heat of the war it was costing us more than $16,000,000 a day to send presents to Mussolini, Hitler and Tojo. A total of $7,715,000 will clear off these debts, less than the cost of one-half day of war. If you want to treat it as a direct tax, it amounts to sixty-five cents per capita for the population of Canada. Can we afford it?

I do not feel that I should say very much more about this matter, but there is one thing I want to emphasize. I hope the men who settle on the land under the Veterans' Land Act will not find themselves evicted as many of these old settlers have been. If the land is purchased on the basis of prices being paid for agricultural products to-day, the government should see that credit is made available for the difference between prices that are existing to-day and those that may exist in the future. If that is not done, we will have a bunch of bankrupt veterans of this war. Let it never be said of us:

> We love our nation's heroes dead,
> We very much adore 'em;
> And since they haven't to be fed,
> We build grand tombstones o'er them.

We want our heroes alive; we want them living in the prosperity which this country can very well afford. The welfare of the old vets is inseparably bound up with the future success of those settling under the Veterans' Land Act. Issue those clear titles now and ensure success for the veterans of this war.

Mr. P. E. WRIGHT (Melfort): Mr. Speaker, I wish first to compliment the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Fair) upon his persistence in keeping this matter before this house. He did so during the life of the last parliament and he is doing so again in this new parliament. As a matter of fact, one of the results of his persistence was that the minister who was dealing with this particular matter in the last parliament was induced to retire to the senate. I hope the present minister, who I know is sympathetic, will not be forced to make a similar decision before this parliament is over.

This matter is not political; it is a case of dealing with the men of the last war. I intend to deal with it from just a little different angle from that of the hon. member for Battle River. He stated in his opening remarks that he was not a soldier settler and therefore was not primarily interested in the matter from a selfish point of view. I am a soldier settler who settled under the act in 1919. For twenty-three years I made payments to the settlement board. I settled in a part of Canada where ther was the greatest concentration of settlers under the act in all the dominion. I have been intimately connected with these men in veterans' and farm organizations for the past twenty-three years, and I know something about the conditions under which they have lived and endeavoured to pay their debts. I want to deal with the matter more from a humanitarian or personal angle.

The hon. member for Battle River gave some figures which I am not going to repeat. He placed many of these figures on the pages of *Hansard* during the last parliament and has repeated many of them this afternoon. This matter was raised in the committee which dealt with veterans' affairs in 1941 and at that time various objections were raised by the government. One objection was that we were starting a serious conflict which would require all the resources of Canada, both financial and material, and that it was a poor time to drop payments to the dominion government when

the government was entering into financial obligations which would strain its every endeavour. We are now through that period; we have spent millions, if not billions, and that excuse cannot be used.

Another excuse given for not dealing with this matter was that the men who had completed their payments under the act would feel that an injustice was being done and might think that the government should pay back to them some of the money they had paid. As an old settler who has met and talked with many other old settlers, many of whom made a success under the act and met their obligations and many others who failed and took other positions in which they made successes, I believe I can safely say that I do not think there would be one per cent of the old settlers who would object to some alleviation being granted as far as the present debts are concerned. The men who have not been able to meet their obligations and who under the legislation passed recently have had their debts spread over another twenty to twenty-five years have done their best but have met with circumstances over which they had no control which made it impossible for them to meet their obligations. To bear me out in that, I am going to quote extracts from letters which I have received from soldier settlers during the past few years, and I quote them, not to support individual cases, but because they represent a class of case and because the reasons given for failure to meet obligations apply not only to the individual writer but to a large group of soldier settlers.

In the first place, a large number who were settled under the act were settled in the drought area in Saskatchewan, in the Pelliser Triangle, where for years they suffered under drought conditions which made it absolutely impossible for them to meet their obligations under the act. I quote from a letter from one of these men: The amendment which provided dollar for dollar payments was made, I think in 1937, and there were a large number of the soldier settlers in the south of the province who in that year and in the year following were unable to meet their payments because of drought conditions over which they had no control. This soldier settler writes:

> During the drought period a dollar for dollar bonus on arrears was offered. As we had no crops at all we could not take advantage of it, and now when things are a little easier it is discontinued, which is distinctly unfair to the people who need it the most.

Hon. members know that it was 1941 or 1942 before we had a real crop in western Canada and before many of these settlers had a chance to meet their obligations. But in 1941 the dollar for dollar bonus was discontinued. He goes on to say:

> Secondly, the soldier settlement board paid the taxes which were afterwards cancelled, but are still charged against us with accruing interest, placing us in a worse position than civilians.

As the writer states, the soldier settlement board in 1938 or 1939 took over and paid all the taxes owing and charged them against the principal of the loan. A year or so later these taxes were cancelled for civilians but remained a debt so far as the soldier settler was concerned. He goes on to say:

> To illustrate this, my original loan was $1,500. I reduced this to $800 before the drought. It now stands at over $1,700. These figures may not seem very large, but they are to us.

There is another class of settler, those who were unable to meet their obligations because of sickness in their family or their own sickness. I quote from one of these letters, which shows quite clearly the position in which a large number of these settlers found themselves. The writer says:

> Then, seven years ago, came my wife's illness, lasting over three years, with several operations and then her death. This easily added one thousand dollars to my debt and to-day I am paying a housekeeper in wages nearly as much as the payment to the soldier settlement board comes to in a year. Besides my two children, I have my father, nearly ninety years of age, to care for, so I am badly handicapped, and I have fifty per cent disability myself.

This man has a fifty per cent disability. Yet the soldier settlement board, under an order in council passed on March 19, 1941, states:

> The director of soldier settlement has no authority to carry such accounts indefinitely and it is considered desirable to provide for deductions from dependents' allowances to cover local taxes and interest due.

And the board took $10 a month out of this man's pension to meet the payments on his loan.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Shame!

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes. There is another class of case. A great many of our settlers under the old act were settled on unsuitable, marginal land, and because of that fact were unable to meet their obligations to the government. I state these things because they show in a great many cases that "hard core" which the department speaks of, was caused by circumstances over which the soldier settler had no control, such as drought, sickness, unsuitable land.

Another factor which operated against the old soldier settler was lack of capital with which to break his land and bring it under

cultivation. The soldier settlement board made a certain allowance for the breaking of the land, but there was so much red tape that many settlers could not take advantage of it. I have letters here which, if I read them to the house, would prove definitely that the red tape which was attached to these loans often made it impossible for the soldier settler to take advantage of them.

Another factor has been the interest rate which was charged on the old loan, six per cent once the payments became overdue, and five per cent on the original loan. This meant that many settlers paid the original loan several times over. Here is a letter which illustrates that point. The writer says:

> As you are aware, there have been several adjustments since the original scheme was introduced. The last adjustment was made in my case in 1939, under the Farmers' Creditors Arrangement Act, and then my quarter was revalued at $1,800, although I had paid over $3,000 under the original agreement. Since then, although the price of wheat has been very low, I have been able to keep up my payments, but not when due, viz., October 1. For the last two years it has been impossible, through restricted deliveries and quotas to make payments when due, but the board charge compound interest, which I have refused to pay. It sems incredible that the government should take advantage of this situation to make additional profits, but this is the case. I would point out that since 1939, not including due payment this fall, I have paid the board four payments of each $124.23, some $496, but you will notice I have not reduced the principal yet by $100—some $80 in fact. Surely this would appear to be heavy interest without charging compound interest on top.

That is the position in which many of these old soldier settlers find themselves, and I think it is only simple justice that we in this parliament should take action to relieve them. Under the new land settlement act we have provided much better conditions for the soldiers coming back from this war than were provided under the old act, and in simple justice this parliament should take action to relieve some of the suffering of many of these old soldiers under the old act.

There is another injustice under the old act, and while there are not many cases in which this has happened there are some where the soldier settler under the old act had two quarter-sections of land, one of which he bought through the board and one which he had as a homestead before going overseas. Later, when he came back the board took a mortgage on both pieces of land before they would give him stock and equipment under the act, and in some cases the soldier disposed of one of these quarters to another settler or another individual. Later, this particular individual made application under the Farmers' Creditors Arrangement Act to have his debt reduced and in some cases the board allowed the reduction. Strange to say that reduction was charged back against the old quarter of the soldier settler. That seems to me to be absolutely unjust, because under the old agreement, under the Soldier Settlement Act, the soldier was liable to the board for the full amount of indebtedness; he had disposed of one quarter and later on, perhaps three years after he had disposed of it, that quarter came under the Farmers' Creditors Arrangement Act and the debt was reduced, the amount of reduction being charged back to the original quarter of the soldier settler.

I do not know how many cases there were of this kind but there were some. The fact that there is this old core of dissatisfaction under the old act is causing many of the younger soldiers, younger men coming back from this war, to hesitate about again entering into any agreement with the government in regard to land, and I think it would be to the advantage of the government to clear up this matter immediately and to start with a clean slate under a new act. If they do not do so it will simply mean a lot of grief and trouble to them later on, because in areas where you get a few old settlers who have a just complaint, and a group of new men coming in under the new act, invariably the older men will get in contact with the new men and tell their story and dissatisfaction will arise among the newer group. I am sure the new men who settle under the new act, seeing they are getting a better deal than the old soldiers received under the old act, would not use that as a pry to try to get some further consideration from the government as far as meeting their obligations is concerned.

I hope that the new minister will take this matter into serious consideration. As the hon. member for Battle River stated, a delegation came here over a year ago to interview the government. They were certainly given some encouragement by the government to believe their case would be considered after they had gone home, but they found, through the article which the hon. member has just quoted, and from what took place in the veterans' convention in Vancouver, that their case was being passed up as far as the government was concerned. They again came to Ottawa and placed their position before the government. I do not know what the result of the last interview was. I do not know whether they were given encouragement in that last interview, but certainly they have a just case, and I would urge the government to take that case into consideration and do

as suggested in this resolution—cancel the old debt that remains. It is a very small amount in comparison with the expenditures that are made to-day, and I am sure that any action along that line would be appreciated by the old settlers and would be an encouragement to the new men who are returning to settle under the new act.

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): In rising to give my support to the resolution moved by the hon. member (Mr. Fair), may I join with the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Wright) in complimenting him for his persistence and consistency over the years in asking for what is requested in this resolution. I have had occasion to meet with soldier settlers, particularly those settled near the city of Prince Albert, where conditions have been such that they have been unable to carry on and to reduce their indebtedness. There they were settled in sub-marginal land for the most part, and many to-day are in a position that is little improved over that in which they were ten or fifteen years ago. Not only do they request consideration along the line of this resolution, but many soldier settlers with whom I come in contact, who are in the same position as the hon. member for Melfort and who have discharged their indebtedness, are asking, in the interests of the morale not only of those who to-day are still delinquent but also of those who are returning from overseas and are desirous of taking up land under the Veterans' Land Act, that consideration be given by the government to the cancellation of the indebtedness that exists.

There were 25,017 returned men who chose to go farming after the last war. Of that number twenty-five per cent remain on the land to-day, and many even since the beginning of this war are being forced, either directly or indirectly, to leave the land upon which they have been settled for a period of twenty-two to twenty-five years. The figures were given in a return tabled in this house, showing that as between the beginning of the war, September 1, 1939, and December 31, 1943, 2,418 settlers either left their land voluntarily, as it is said, or were actually removed as a result of the institution of the law in that regard by the board officials.

There have been reductions in principal and interest, but these reductions have applied not only to the soldier settler but also to the settler who has taken land under the act. The purport of this resolution has received the support of outstanding public institutions in the prairie provinces, including the wheat pool, the Alberta legislature, the Alberta farmers' union, the united farmers of Canada, and the united farmers of Alberta. Whenever there is a legion meeting, a zone meeting, in the province of Saskatchewan, support is given to the request of these men. Therefore, as the hon. member for Melfort says, it is not a partisan matter. It is a matter that cuts right through partisan considerations and it merits and has secured the support of authoritative and responsible bodies all over western Canada.

What are the arguments that can be raised against it? One argument would be that it means the repudiation of the indebtedness of these men, and the cancellation of the terms of the contract. Well, Mr. Speaker, parliament has recognized the principle that where through drought or difficulty or poor prices the farmer is unable to carry on and to meet the indebtedness he may apply under the Farmers' Creditors Arrangement Act for a reduction. As far as the Farmers' Creditors Arrangement Act is concerned its operation will not meet the needs of the soldier settlers and their peculiar problems.

Another matter which strikes me as of great importance is that while to-day there is a great modicum of their original indebtedness remaining due, there is still a very large expenditure being made in the collection of the accounts outstanding of soldier settlers. I was struck with the figures that were given in a return that was brought down on March 10, 1943, in answer to the question: "What is the cost of administration of the board during the years 1930 to 1942?" We find that in 1930 and 1931 the cost of administration a year was $1,300,327. It amounted to $757,507 for 1935-36, and for 1941-42, with a very small indebtedness proportionately to the amount originally outstanding still due, the government of this country had to expend the sum of $646,446 for administration. That is a very large sum, about $650,000 a year for the collection of an amount that has been reduced to a matter of only a few million dollars. I mention that for this reason, that only recently, in a desire on the part of the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie) to alleviate conditions under which these soldier settlers have been operating, extensions have been provided for whereby the indebtedness has been amortized over a period of twenty or twenty-five years. The soldiers who served in the last war are approaching fifty years of age or over. Many will not live to see the day when their indebtedness will be discharged. The administrative expenses will have to be continued throughout those years. In other words, you can multiply twenty-five years more by approximately $600,000, which is the average amount expended in the last few years for

administration, and you reach a total of $15,000,000 in all for the collection of an indebtedness but little more than that. There is a consideration that would appeal to the people of the country as a whole. We are simply, by amortizing the indebtedness, going to collect approximately the amount that in that period of time will have been expended in extra administration. On the basis of ordinary good business my submission is that this resolution deserves the support of the house.

There are other grounds upon which it could be supported. Some of them have already been mentioned by the hon. member for Melfort and by the hon. member who moved the resolution. These grounds were set forth in a memorandum that was delivered to the government by the committee of soldier settlers who were here on May 23, 1944. It will not benefit the house to re-read the grounds that were then advanced by these men for the cancellation of this indebtedness. They are known to hon. members. Repetition does not make them any stronger, nor does repetition make them any clearer. I believe, sir, that all over the prairie provinces—and in the main these settlers are in the prairie provinces—and without regard to political persuasion, there is a general agreement, in the interests of those men, in the interests of morale, above all in the interests of removing any suggestion that too often pervades the mind of the soldiers returning from the war just ended that the men of the previous war did not receive a fair deal, and also in the interests of good business, that this resolution should be supported, and I am supporting the intent of the resolution moved to-day by the hon. member.

I have not yet had an opportunity to do so on a previous occasion and before concluding I wish now to convey my best wishes to the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker) in the honour he has received in being appointed parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Veterans Affairs. With his record of service in two wars, with his interest in the welfare of the veterans of this country, with his capabilities as a parliamentarian, I, speaking for the members in this part of the house, say that we compliment him on his appointment, and we wish him well in the work that he will do on behalf of the veterans of this country.

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Cariboo): Mr. Speaker, I shall take just a few moments of the time of the house to add my views to those of the other hon. members who have preceded me on this issue, and if the opportunity affords itself, I shall also give my vote in favour of the motion which is now before us.

I cannot imagine any hon. member having very serious objections to the motion. It asks that the soldiers who have survived the economic conflict of the last twenty-five years or so shall at this hour be granted what I think they should have been given at the outset. The most important argument for correcting the mistake which was made at the very beginning is this, that it has cost the people of Canada perhaps more to try to collect the uncollectible than it would have cost us to have made a free gift of land to the soldiers who settled on it. That condition, as the previous speaker pointed out, still pertains. If we continue this policy we shall continue only to badger men who will not be able to meet their obligations, and it will be done at a very high cost to the nation. I believe that we are all looking forward to the birth of a new social order based on social justice, as has been mentioned in the speech from the throne. This is an excellent place for us to begin. If there is any justice in us it should be manifested first toward the men who fought in the first great war and who have, as I have said, suffered so much in the economic conflict which has taken place since then.

To some extent the history of the soldier settlement project has been given by the hon. member who introduced the resolution. Figures have been quoted as to the number of settlers who took advantage of the Soldier Settlement Act, and as to the number of those who were able to meet their obligations and who at last got their title, and the numbers who are still struggling in a vain hope of securing those titles. Figures have also been given as to the amount that has been paid by the government in administrative costs and in other ways. There is no need for me, or for any other hon. member, to take up the time of the house in further reiterating these facts; but I want to bring this to the attention of hon. members. I know they all know it, but it will not do any harm to remind ourselves of it again. Our soldier settlers bought their land and equipment under inflated prices, and they were compelled to sell their products, by which alone they could pay for their land and equipment, at deflated prices. In addition to that, they had to pay a very high rate of interest on their borrowings. It was just as impossible for them to do that as it was for a large percentage of the civilian agricultural population to do so, and they fell by the wayside just as many of their fellow farmers did.

The returned soldier of the last war who fought for his country should have a little bit of it to call his own. I do not know of anyone who has a better right. I venture to suggest that the economic conflict which these farmers have sustained since their return has been more difficult to bear, more grievous, fraught with greater heart-burnings and despair, than the three or four years they fought in the trnches in Flanders, in France and in Belgium. Not only had they to fight the econmic battle, with the assistance of their wives and families, and watch their loved ones suffer deprivation which hurt them deeply; they also had to watch their families fighting with them a losing battle. It is true that four thousand of the twenty-five thousand or so came through, but that is true of every battle. A thousand men may go into a real battle. Four hundred may come through; three hundred may be killed and the remainder wounded. The four hundred were lucky to come through; and the four thousand who came through in this case, in the economic battle, were also lucky. Perhaps in some cases they were better farmers; the chances are they were settled in better communities; they were closer to markets, or they may have had better land. They may have missed the frost or the hail storm or some other hazard of agriculture, and so managed to come through. But there were a great many who did not come through this economic battle; they lost out, and have gone from the picture.

Now some six thousand remain. They are old men and unable to continue to put up the vigorous fight they have been carrying on during the past twenty years. In a great many cases their children, who have been helping them in the past, have grown up and left home to take up jobs and responsibilities of their own. So that these soldier settlers, who are now becoming old men, are being left pretty much alone. I wish to impress upon the minister that if these men in the vigour of youth and with the assistance of their young families have been unable to meet their obligations up to this time, certainly they will not be able to meet them from now on. In view of the fact that the actual cost to the people of Canada will be a paltry sum in comparison with what we have had to expand during the last five or six years, I would urge that these men be now given free title to the land they first strove so hard to win in Flanders and then worked so hard to hold in Canada, the country for which they fought.

Not only are these men getting old and losing the help of their children, who are moving into new pursuits and raising families of their own; we must not forget that the health of these men, which in many instances no doubt was impaired by their service, is growing worse as they grow older. So that the problem becomes increasingly acute for them. It is true, as someone has said, that some are still trying to pay, but I wonder if we stop to ask at what cost they are trying to pay. I know some returned soldiers who would rather die than fail to meet their obligations, but I do not think we should demand the last drop of blood from these men even if they should be willing to continue to make the sacrifices they made in years gone by. As I have pointed out already, most of them never will be able to get clear title. Let us be magnanimous to them; let us remember their service to Canada and give them free title now to the land they have fought so hard to earn. It has been suggested that it would be against the sanctity of contract for us to do anything like that, but surely we have the right to alter a contract ourselves if we so desire. We are not asking these men to violate a contract; we are asking ourselves to draft a new one which will give them free title to their land. It has been said that some who have paid may object. I do not believe that will happen, and if it does there will be very few such cases. But even if it should happen, let it: let them object if they wish. This is a case where we have a right to act in spite of such objections and I urge, sir, what this resolution be passed and that the government act in accordance with the terms.

Mr. T. J. BENTLEY (Swift Current): Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to labour the point. I had expected a little more debate from other quarters of the house either for or against this motion, and left my notes upstairs intending to use them this evening. Consequently I shall be very brief in my remarks, but I should like to emphasize just a few things which, although they have been brought out already, have not been emphasized quite as much as I believe they should be.

The mover of the motion (Mr. Fair) made an excellent address, giving all the figures necessary to convince anyone who is open to conviction, so that there is no need for me or anyone else to recapitulate what he said. The next speaker, the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Wright), gave a good picture of the actual position of the people outside the financial field. The hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) carried on from there, while the last speaker (Mr. Irvine) summarized what had been said previously.

Hon. members have been told already of the organizations throughout the country which have supported this resolution. These

include the Alberta legislature, by no means all of whose members are returned soldiers. Hon. members have mentioned also the legislature of Saskatchewan, which is not composed entirely of returned men either. They have mentioned the Saskatchewan wheat pool, not all of whose 165 delegates are returned soldiers. They have mentioned also a very important body, the association of rural municipalities of Saskatchewan, which is composed of men who are councillors and reeves of rural municipalities, men who cannot be called soft-headed or soft-hearted when dealing with the finances in their trust.

Hon. members have supported this resolution for a variety of reasons. One which was mentioned only once during the debate today—and was not then emphasized—is that the plight of these old soldier settlers has an emotional appeal. I should like to be able to draw a picture of conditions; if I were like an hon. member who sits opposite me, I would do so. I would describe some of the homes in which these people have had to live during the years, homes in which they have endured struggles, fighting climatic conditions and sickness in the families.

I should like the house to realize that those chaps went through a terrific strain many years ago. In the light of the war just passed, perhaps our little effort of 1914 pales into insignificance. But do not forget the boys who clamoured around the Glory Hole, the M and N trenches, the boys who were up around Sanctuary Wood, and Ypres, the boys who were down at Regina trench and other places on the Somme; the boys who were at St. Albert, Amiens, Passchendaele, and all those other places. They went through tough times, too. And they come home—many of them—not as vigorous as some might judge from outward appearances.

Those chaps settled on these soldier settlement farms. The percentage who now need assistance is not very great. The financial outlay will not be great because, as other hon. members have said, the cost of collection will use up a great deal of it, anyway. So that the necessity for spending the whole $7,000,000 in doing this is not going to be there.

It has been said by some people, in private conversation—and I believe this statement has been attributed to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley), while in conversation with the delegation last spring—that these men should live up to their contracts, and that if they cannot they should apply for veterans' allowances, or should come under some scheme of that kind. People have said to me that that would be better—"Give the old duck his $60 a month, or whatever it will be under the veterans' allowances provisions, and let him live in comfort in some small village."

Well, maybe he would live in great comfort; but remember the necessity for human association. He has lived in his little log shack, or his small farm home. He may have raised a family. That is his home, and he does not want to come in under any veterans' allowances scheme which would make him live away from home. While the soldier settlers are not all of one mind in these matters, yet I believe the great bulk of them are just like you and me. These are the homes they have lived in through all the years; surely now they have earned them.

Those men risked their lives to get that land. Not many years ago in the history of this country a great organization risked money to build a railroad across the country. They got tremendous grants of land to take care, as they said, of the risk they were taking in case the venture did not turn out well. They did not risk anything in the way of life or death. True, there may have been a few shot at with arrows by some Indian who was a little bit too well-filled with fire water. They may even have had to dodge a few stones thrown by some exuberant workman on pay day when the Canadian Pacific railway was being built. However, the risk was not very great, and these people built a great transportation system. They did receive tremendous grants of land. Every soldier settler in the west, and many others besides, know that from the time they cut cordwood at $1.25 a cord, and put it into boxcars on the railway, they were making revenue for one of our great transportation systems. When they sold a pig or a cow or some cream or a few bushels of wheat, they made a further contribution to that transportation system. So, that, even though we gave them title to their land at the present time, we could not say we gave them everything, because they have made their contribution.

Many of them are now old. It has been pointed out that a twenty-year extension of their debt might possibly mean that much less extension on their hope of living, because the worry would probably kill many of them before the twenty years had expired.

I should like to hear other hon. members indicate their support. I realize that many of them are not close to this problem, and we cannot expect them to be as sympathetically inclined as we are. But I believe I can say for the four hon. members who have spoken that we would like other hon. members who are not so well acquainted with the problem

to lend their support. We have spoken earnestly and sincerely on behalf of the soldier settlers this afternoon.

Mr. A. J. BROOKS (Royal): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has just taken his seat mentioned that he would like to hear some observations from other hon. members representing other sections of the country. The remarks to which we have listened thus far have been confined mostly to western Canada. May I point out that we who come from the maritime provinces face a similar problem, although our problem may not be as acute as it has been in the western provinces because we had fewer soldier-settlers.

May I take this opportunity to congratulate the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Fair) who has so consistently brought this subject before the house, and has persisted in his efforts on behalf of the soldier settlers. His has been a worthy cause, and one which I am satisfied should receive the sympathetic attention of the house.

As I said, there are not many of those settlers whose farms are still unpaid left. One hon. member has said that only the hard core remains. I shall not repeat the arguments which have been presented this afternoon. All have been logical and sane, and I believe they will commend themselves to all members. I have known many of the young men who returned from the last war with high hopes of taking part in the farming industry of this country. As we know, many of them have been greatly disappointed. I have in mind three men in my own district who took up land not far from my own town. To-day those farms are abandoned. When this war came along these three men gave up hope of carrying on their farming operations. Some joined the veterans guard, and others found work around the camp at Sussex. They have had a difficult time, just the same as the men in the west.

As has been pointed out, these men bought their farms at very high prices, prices which were perhaps almost double what they should have been. That was a condition of the times. Then, when they bought their stock it cost them possibly twice what it should have cost. I believe that the men who are returning from the war which has just ended, and who are coming back to Canada with the intention of taking up farming, will find the same conditions their fathers found when they returned after the first great war. That will be the condition, if we do not watch very carefully.

For instance, cows are selling to-day for as much as $125 and $150. In a few years there is no doubt that those cattle will bring much lower prices. Farm machinery is costing to-day twice as much as it did some years ago. These are the conditions which made it difficult for men who returned from the last war, and they are the conditions which will make it just as difficult for men who are returning from this war with the intention of taking up farming.

We must remember, too, that the men about whom we have been speaking this afternoon had to go through one of the worst depressions the world has ever experienced. I do not agree, as has been suggested on the floor of the house at different times, that that depression was due to the policies of any political party. Any man with ordinary common sense and judgment must know that it was not; it was a world-wide condition and Canada could not escape any more than any other country.

These men, burdened as they were, tried to make a success of farming under those conditions. However, they could not do so and they abandoned their farms. They were patriotic enough to go overseas during the last war. During the time they have been on their farms they have raised families and to-day their sons are coming back from this war. They would like to see some one of these sons continue on the farm. I was much impressed by the statement made by the hon. member who has just taken his seat that there is sentiment connected with a farm on which a man has lived for twenty-five years, on which he has raised a family, sent his children to school and tried to make a living. That place has become home to his children. These farms should not be abandoned, not only in the interests of the farmers but in the interests of their sons and the country generally.

Just lately I drove through certain sections of Ontario and I was amazed at the number of vacant farms. People are flocking into the towns and cities, a condition which should not be. These men would like to have their sons take up farming again, but they do not want to see them take it up under the burden of debt that they have at the present time.

In my province we have small school districts, and when two or three farms are vacated it becomes difficult for those who are left in the district to carry on. The district loses its taxes, the children are taken away from school, and there is in general a bad effect.

I do not think there is much more that I wish to say this afternoon. I am heartily in accord with the resolution moved by the hon.

member. I feel there is much of justice in it. I have talked to many other veterans regarding it and some few say that we should treat the veterans who have paid for their farms the same as it is proposed these men should be treated. However, I believe if a census were taken of those who have paid for their farms, ninety-five per cent or possibly one hundred per cent would be willing to have justice done to these men who have struggled for so long to bring up their families and provide a home. For many years the hon. member has brought this matter before the house and I sincerely hope that it will receive favourable consideration and that justice will be done.

Mr. G. R. PEARKES (Nanaimo): Mr. Speaker, I should like to indicate briefly my desire to support this resolution. I do so, first, because I am a returned man. These men who took up farms under the soldier settlement board were comrades of mine in the first great war and I feel that justice should be done to them. Therefore I should like to express my support of this resolution which I believe indicates the road to justice.

Second, I rise because I represent another part of the country. I come from Vancouver island, at the opposite end of the country to that from which the previous speaker comes. On that island there are a large number of veterans who settled under the soldier settlement scheme. I know for a fact that these men have had a trying and difficult time. They have honestly done their best to try to make ends meet.

Farming conditions on Vancouver island are not easy. There are no large farms. There are a few dairy farms, but mostly they are fruit, vegetable and poultry farms. These farms are encircled by the forest, and unless the farmer keeps hard at work, day in and day out, nature encroaches on the small clearing that he has made. You see the bracken and the fern growing up very thickly in the pasture. It is not an easy life.

I noticed that when the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) was speaking the other day he called attention to the fact that eggs were the only farm product which was not selling at parity according to the definition of parity as given that night. A great many of these returned men are in the poultry business and, as one can see from that statement, they must be having considerable difficulty as far as marketing their produce at reasonable prices is concerned.

I also endorse the statement that was made that a large number of these men left their farms at the beginning of this war, either for motives of patriotism or because of dire necessity. Many of them felt that they would have a better opportunity of making a livelihood from the grants and pay they would receive for their services to their country. Whether it was from patriotism or because of necessity, they joined up in such organizations as the veterans guard of Canada and they did faithful duty in that corps in the way of guarding outlying forts and prisoners of war.

I think I am correct in saying that these men are not entitled to any consideration under the new Veterans' Land Act because they are considered to be too old and therefore not a good risk. As I understand this resolution, it would put that class of men on a parity with the veterans who will be discharged from this war and who may want to take up land under the Veterans' Land Act. I hope most sincerely that the house will give sympathetic consideration to the resolution.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. L. A. MUTCH (Winnipeg South): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate I should like to declare at once that I am in sympathy with the resolution, if not with its wording, presented by the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Fair). I would be happier in associating myself with this resolution if I did not find in the preamble, the introduction to the resolution, as one so often finds in resolutions presented in this house; namely, that a criticism applied to the original soldier settlement land scheme, a criticism which can be and has been justified by myself and by others, is by inference, or so it seems to me, intended by the mover of the resolution to imply the probability of the failure of the present Veterans' Land Act. The resolution says in its first paragraph:

> Whereas veterans of great war I . . . have in many instances suffered severe hardships because of purchase of land, live stock and equipment at inflationary prices—

That is perhaps well merited as a criticism of the original scheme. The preamble goes on to say:

> —and low prices received for farm products brought about by lack of adequate policy for agriculture.

Implying that policy or lack of it contributed to failure. I am perhaps unique in this house in that I have not in my constituency anyone who is a landowner or landholder, so far as I know, under the original

scheme of land settlement. I fancy that the only constituents of mine who have had any connection with that scheme, if there be any, are those who decided that it would not pay and got out of it sooner or later. Because I have no constituents who come within the groups for whom relief is sought by this resolution I can speak freely and without any suggestion that I am addressing myself to them.

In its second paragraph the resolution says:

> And whereas we are now embarking on another land scheme for veterans of the present war, under a government policy that does not guarantee cost of production, the success of which scheme may be jeopardized by the apparent failure of the former soldier settlement board scheme.

There again, I cannot see how the mover of the resolution hopes to win sympathy for those whose cause he pleads by introducing in the preamble to his resolution something which is an issue in current politics, apart from the cause of those whose relief he seeks.

I do not support the resolution with any thought that by doing so we in this house would be conferring any considerable favour, economically at least, on the 4,000 odd whom the member for Battle River described this afternoon as being still condemned to pay for their land. The reason I say that is this; I agree wholeheartedly with what hon. members opposite have said this afternoon about the ridiculousness of the prices paid for the land, and about the machinations of various agencies, civil and political, which resulted in soldier settlers being settled upon some of the least desirable of sub-marginal land at the time this scheme was initiated. That criticism has been developed and is well founded, but to suggest, and by inference it is suggested, that under those conditions had there been an agricultural policy—that agricultural policy is not suggested but is hinted at—a large number of these people might have succeeded in paying for their land is in my own experience something which is open to grave doubt. I can remember farms being sold in that initial period to veterans of the last war who knew very little about farming, and sold to them when there was two feet of snow on the land. It was a good thing, too, for the seller because if there had been only one foot of snow the veteran would have been able to see the rocks. I remember also the inflationary prices that were paid for live stock to go on these farms often by men who hardly knew the business end of a cow. I remember investigations into land transactions in my own province and in other provinces which indicated all too conclusively that no proper selection was made either of the men who were to go on the land or of the land itself. I may be pardoned, if I derive some little amusement out of the circumstances in which some hon. members are now hastening to add their voices to the chorus of those who would give to these settlers who have put a large chunk out of a lifetime on what was often sub-marginal and useless land. Some of them represent groups which were instrumental in permitting the lack of organization which made possible the present situation.

I am a little at a loss to understand why the hon. member who introduced this resolution should imply in his introduction that failure to clear up the admitted injustices of selection and placement; the admitted inflationary prices of that earlier period which have induced almost countless failures and which still contribute to the difficulties of those who as late as March, 1944, were, after repeated demands to give them relief still in arrears, I am at a loss to understand, I repeat, why he should now imply that their situation would have bad effects on the Veterans Land Act which is at present on the statute books.

I am very much interested in that angle, because I am one of those who believe that we have very largely profited from the mistakes of the past. Not only are we guarding against inflationary prices for the land which is to be distributed, but much excellent land has been secured and is being held for the returning veterans of this war at prices which are at least commensurate with the expectation of returns from the land. I am reminded also of the very considerable differences which exist to-day with respect to the selection of the personnel who will go on the land. Perhaps some will regard this as a minor consideration, but I am very much impressed with the fact that in the selection of soldier settlers who shall go on the land under the Veterans' Land Act a great deal of attention is being paid by the selection boards to the desires and opinions of the wives of the men who will secure farms. I should not like anyone to take from my remarks that I feel or have felt that ineptitude of the wives of the men who have not made the grade under the soldier settlement scheme was a major contributing factor in their failure. I know of many instances of women without experience, without any knowledge even of the physical conditions of the part of the country to which they were called upon to go, who have made simply heroic contributions in keeping with the best traditions of the pioneer stock of this country. But I do know something of the western prairies. I know something of the territory which has been settled very largely by these

soldier settlers, and I know that any man's chance of success under the circumstances which exist are very considerably enhanced by having associated with him in that enterprise a woman who not only understands what she is to be called upon to do, and to endure, but who is wholeheartedly and enthusiastically behind the project from the beginning.

We are terribly prone, I think, to look to the period after the last war and to say, not only with respect to soldier settlement but with respect to almost every attempt which was made to do something for the returned veterans of the last war, that the whole thing was thoroughly bad. I am reminded that there are at present in this house and have been in the last few parliaments men who under the conditions which then existed did achieve success, so much so that their natural leadership in their own communities eventually brought them to this house. I am reminded, too, that it is not possible by legislation or by grants to take someone who has no aptitude for farming and, by virtue of the fact that society is grateful to him for the contribution which he made in another branch of the public service, namely, the armed services, to ensure his success.

I have not much regard for the sentimental arguments which are sometimes presented. Arguments which have been presented at one time or another when each of the various relief measures has been initiated in connection with the soldier settlement board. I am impressed with the practical nature of the present suggestions. Perhaps it is the Scots blood which flows in my Canadian veins, perhaps it is just a little practical common sense, but I am impressed with the argument that it is futile and silly to throw good money after bad. I am impressed and satisfied with the argument that there is no probability of redeeming those sub-marginal farms under the control of their present owners with profit to the state. I have no hesitation on that ground, if on any other, in supporting the resolution of the hon. member for Battle River in which he says:

> That, in the opinion of this house, the government should take into consideration the advisability of giving clear titles to all soldier settlers who on March 31, 1944, held land under contract with the soldier settlement board.

I would support his resolution, I think, if couched in stronger language for the reason which I have given. I am not particularly impressed with the results which I have received from time to time when I have finally prevailed upon those in authority to give "serious consideration" to any matter. The phrase itself smacks of "brush off." However, it is my privilege to stand here and urge with the hon. gentlemen who have done so that consideration be given. I do not believe that in most of the 4,000 odd cases which the hon. member cited this afternoon it will be possible under any other arrangement for men, most of them now in their late fifties, ever to get title to the property which they now occupy. I doubt very seriously if very many of them will be able under present circumstances, and in view of the conditions under which they operate, to make anything even approximating an adequate living for the remainder of their days if we do give them clear title to the property which they now occupy.

I know, however, that there is something in the heart of man which responds to ownership of land. I believe it must be particularly true of one who through good season and bad season over a period of years, under adverse conditions, has striven and stayed with it for the length of time these gentlemen must have done to be still, nearly twenty-six years later, occupying the land which they originally took. I do not think we would be giving away anything. I think we would be bringing satisfaction to some of them, and perhaps we might be paying something in the nature of a tribute to them because they have played an exceedingly important role in the life of our country in the last few years.

It was my privilege to see a great deal of Canada, part of western Canada and all of eastern Canada, during the period of this last war. It was noticeable wherever one went, from one end of Canada to the other, that in almost every community the first man who tried to get into the army in this war was the chap who went through the last war; and right behind him was his son and indeed eventually his daughter.

This country owes a not inconsiderable debt to these men in every community in which they live for the leadership which they showed when the war came and for the leadership which they showed within their communities during the period which some of my friends like to refer to as the hungry thirties. In times of dissatisfaction and stress as well as in times of national peril these men have been the hard rock centre in the community life of every part of Canada.

I promised when I began that I would not resort to sentimental appeals in this matter, and I submit that what I have just said is not a sentimental appeal but simply a statement of fact which will be recognized as such by everyone in the house who has had contact with these families during the last ten or eleven difficult years.

I take it that, because of association of ideas, it is possible at this juncture to refer for a moment or two to the Veterans' Land Act as at present constituted in an attempt to show that a difficulty does exist beween the cleaning up of the soldier settlement board scheme and the present scheme. The hon. member for Battle River this afternoon said that 4,600 original settlers had completed their contract. I do not dispute the figure, but I realize that if to-day we are to go the whole way, for economic or for sentimental reasons, and give title to an almost equally large number who are still attempting to complete their contract, many of them in arrears, this or any other government will be faced with a problem of reconciliation and compensation. I do not agree with the hon. member who said this afternoon that in his view such a concession would not be questioned or resented by those who had completed their contracts. I do not think it is an insuperable barrier, but I suggest to this government, or to whatever government eventually carries out the undertaking called for in this resolution, that they be prepared with a logical and reasonable argument in order to be able to meet the objections that will be brought forward. I am perfectly sure that not only will those who have completed their contracts, but also some of those who were either released from their contract or who broke it themselves, feel, and with some justification, that they would be discriminated against. This situation can be met.

I would point out one other fact which I think must enter into the consideration to be given to this measure by this or any other government, namely, that we are at the beginning of what we conceive to be a bigger and better settlement scheme. The pitfalls and mistakes of the last scheme have been observed and have been reasonably well guarded against in the new scheme. I believe that whoever finally accedes to the request of this resolution should take particular care to establish what the hon. member for Battle River attempted to establish—and I think he did so—namely, that the old scheme was exceedingly unjust, and that in many cases, the circumstances under which those contracts were originally entered into were iniquitous. If that is not done we are going to begin a new scheme, which appears to have most of the elements which make for success, bedevilled with the now prevalent idea that over a period of time the settler may possibly be granted more than is in his original contract.

I do not now argue for the sanctity of the contract, as such, against all circumstances.

[Mr. Mutch.]

I do think it is exceedingly important that sons of farmer veterans, and those chaps returning to-day who wish to take advantage of this scheme, should be made to feel that everything which can be done in the way of security, everything which can be offered in the way of compensation for perseverance and persistence in the keeping of the contract should be offered at the beginning rather than at the end. Realizing as I do that inevitably the security of old soldiers becomes a problem of the federal administration, I also realize the inevitability of change.

I should like to think that the dominion is getting close cooperation from the provinces and from the officials of the provincial governments in the selection of land and in the selection of areas in which land can be bought. This was not the case twenty-five or twenty-six years ago. Some of the provinces are cooperating in that way to-day. Therefore, before I leave the problem of the effect of what happens to the old scheme in its impact on the new scheme, I should like for a moment or two to refer to some of the differences between the two schemes. I refer particularly to the section which permits the settlement of soldiers on small holdings. In my remarks on the speech from the throne a few days ago I said a word or two about the effect of settlement on small holdings near large urban populations. I was very grateful when I saw that in the present regulations the area in which people could take up small holdings had been reduced from one acre to half an acre. I have some knowledge of the amount of work required to cultivate one acre intensively enough to make it an economic asset no matter where the locality happens to be. I was one of those who felt that no one who held a job that was of any consideration at all would be capable of getting full development out of a larger acreage. Therefore it was a matter of pleasure to me—and I think it will make for success of the small holding—when I saw that the acreage required under the plan was reduced to half an acre.

I should like to say one thing about the small holding aspect of this problem. There is a tendency in some parts of Canada and in some communities to hive the small holdings together. My conception of the rehabilitation of the soldier is to fit him once more into the communal life of the country with as little differentiation between him and his neighbours as is humanly possible. For that reason I am somewhat sceptical of the value of the veterans' communities in the small holdings programme. I realize the economic

possibilities of that type of development, but if I may issue a word of warning based on experience with relation to the veterans of the first great war it would be to suggest that we walk warily in the establishment of veterans' communities, as such.

I have taken advantage of this resolution in the first instance to express my own personal view toward it and to give my reasons for supporting it, and also to inject into the discussion some other remarks touching on the present scheme. I do not know whether this resolution will be accepted at this time, but I venture to predict that we will not continue over the years to send good money after bad only to continue to make the declining years of these soldier citizens of Canada as difficult as they have been in the past.

Mr. J. A. ROSS (Souris): Mr. Speaker, in rising to support this resolution may I do as some other members who spoke this afternoon have already done, compliment the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Fair) upon his determination and insistency in this matter. He has certainly stuck by his guns for some years on this matter of principle toward the settlers under the old Soldier Settlement Act.

Some fault was found by the previous speaker (Mr. Mutch) with the wording of the resolution, which is as follows:

> Whereas veterans of great war I who settled on land under the soldier setlement scheme, as well as their wives and families, have in many instances suffered severe hardships because of purchase of land, live stock and equipment at inflationary prices, and low prices received for farm products brought about by lack of adequate policy for agriculture.

And so forth. I do not think anybody can very well contradict those words, because I well remember those days in 1919 and 1920 when prices of land, live stock and equipment were certainly inflationary. As has been said in 1919, some 25,017 settlers were placed on the land under this act at an expenditure, in round figures, of $109,000,000. The average credit given to each settler was some $4,358. I think the last speaker had his figures slightly mixed up when he spoke of some 4,000 on the land, because there are still some 6,000 who will be affected by this resolution.

During twenty-five years of the settlement only 4,130 settlers, or sixteen per cent, have obtained clear title to their holdings. The total amount in principal cancelled during those years was something over $24,000,000, or approximately twenty-three per cent of the original amount put into the scheme. Up to March 31, 1944, the cost of administration has been something over $27,000,000, or an average of about $1,100,000 a year. As of the same date some 6,153 settlers remained on the land, with an average debt of $1,250, or a total of slightly over $7,000,000.

In 1919 and 1920, as I have said, values of land and live stock were greatly inflated. Perhaps I might cite an illustration in my own county, which is not an isolated case at all. In those years this chap agreed to pay $15 an acre for a half-section of land, and it was not very good land at that. He paid $500 a team for work horses, which were only average horses, $150 each for milch cows, and other live stock and equipment cost in proportion. It is true that on application prior to October 1, 1927, a revaluation was made, allowing forty per cent of the purchase price for live stock purchased prior to October, 1920, and twenty per cent on live stock purchased after that date. Again, in 1933 the settler was given double credit for the amount paid within a certain period, which I believe expired some time in 1941. Under that scheme, for every dollar of arrears or instalments paid by the settler, another dollar would be credited to his account.

During the drought and depression years this chap I mentioned as an example signed away any further claim to his land. Those were very difficult times. No government was responsible for the conditions which existed in this and other nations, but it was impossible for any man on a farm to get the cost of production for the goods he had to sell during those years. This man, along with others, signed away any further claim. When he did that the half-section for which he had agreed to pay almost $5,000 was sold by the board to a civilian for $500, or approximately ten per cent of the amount set out in the agreement for sale. This works out at slightly more than $1.55 an acre. But the man who had signed away his claim was not given an opportunity to purchase at that price.

I was impressed by the remark made by some of the speakers this afternoon, that apparently human values do not count with this administration at this time. I do not believe we should be carried away by feelings of sentiment or anything like that, but we should not forget that during the struggle of the past six years the taxpayers of this country have donated goods worth billions of dollars under Mutual Aid. Just the other day we listened to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) appeal for food for the starving people of Europe, and rightly so, emhasizing the humanitarian point of view. Surely we can apply the same doctrine to those who fought for us in 1914-1918. Many of their sons were among the first to volunteer their services in the last

great struggle, and they fought a great battle for us during those years. They are the type of citizens we should encourage in Canada if we want that national unity of which we hear so much in this country to-day. New settlers under the present Veterans' Land Act are given a clear grant of thirty-nine per cent of their total credit of $6,000, provided that they carry out their agreement for a period of ten years. I am happy to think I had the privilege of serving as a member of the committee which brought the present legislation into being. Perhaps it is not all we had hoped for, but I think it is an improvement over the old act, as a result of our experience under that legislation.

I believe these 6,153 settlers, who have laboured for the past twenty-five years and most of whom are now old men, should be granted clear title to their land by the government writing off the 29 per cent of the original debt still remaining. Surely these men are entitled to at least equal consideration, in virtue of their service to this nation, to those coming under the new legislation. This is a time of readjustment, both for nations and for individuals. Old settlers under the board should receive consideration equal to that being shown new settlers under the present act. I am one of those who believe that a proper adjustment for these settlers will mean a great deal to the young veterans now coming back, who are inclined to settle under the present legislation. I know some of these chaps feel a bit discouraged when they think of what their parents had to go through, what with the drought years, the depression and all the rest of it, and they are inclined to try almost anything but farming. I do not believe that is a healthy sign. Experience would indicate that a large portion of our population should be encouraged to live on the land, and that we should have decentralization as much as possible. In that connection the provision in the present act having to do with the small acreage settler, the man who perhaps has a position in a city but who wants to carry on gardening or a small poultry farm, is a very fine feature. In order to encourage the younger veterans to go on the land, and in order to diversify the citizenship of this nation, I believe the government should give immediate consideration to the problems of these 6,000 odd men who come under the settlement act. Apart altogether from sentiment, I believe it would be good business in dollars and cents for the taxpayers of this country, and on these grounds I support the resolution.

[Mr. J. A. Ross.]

Mr. RENE JUTRAS (Provencher) (Translation): Before voicing these few remarks, I wish to join the hon. members who spoke before me in tendering you my most sincere congratulations and in assuring you of the confidence which I and the hon. members of this house place in you. Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to express a wish, which is that the heavy responsibilities that devolve upon you may never take away the smile which has always characterized you and which has gained you such a host of friends.

(Text): I join with those who have preceded me, in asking for sympathetic consideration on the part of the government for those who settled on the land under the settlement board. Every hon. member is fully aware of the great difficulties they encountered and of the many reasons why they found it so hard to get along at that time. Economic conditions were not to their advantage. Also in many instances veterans tried to settle on farms, without having had any experience whatsoever before. I would presume that unfortunately all those have fallen by the wayside before now. Those with whom we are now concerned are the ones who in some way or another have survived the economic chaos of the depression and even the weather which for seven years worked against them, particularly in the prairie provinces. They are the ones who must receive our attention and consideration this evening. That is why I wish to support the suggestion that a special study be made of their case at this time, that this matter be given consideration in the light of conditions as they exist to-day, and that their position should be made as secure as possible for the years to come, even if it means writing off certain sums of money.

The hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Fair) presented his case well, and earns my commendation in that respect. He placed before the house a complete picture, and in his observations even anticipated the objections and answered most of them. I shall not weary the house by repeating what has been said thus far in the debate. I wish, however, that the hon. member for Battle River had worded his resolution somewhat differently, because I am afraid if it were accepted in its present form a wrong impression might leave this house, one which I feel sure would be to the detriment of the veterans.

When I first read the resolution as it appears on the order paper I felt that it conveyed a certain measure of defeatism, and that it may in some way, if misunderstood, harm to some extent the new Veterans' Land Act, which is

now being put into operation. If hon. members will bear with me I shall read the first two paragraphs of the resolution as it stands:

Whereas veterans of great war I who settled on land under the soldier settlement scheme, as well as their wives and families, have in many instances suffered severe hardships because of purchase of land, live stock and equipment at inflationary prices, and low prices received for farm products brought about by lack of adequate policy for agriculture;

And whereas we are now embarking on another land scheme for veterans of the present war, under a government policy that does not guarantee cost of production, the success of which scheme may be jeopardized by the apparent failure of the former soldier settlement board scheme.

I know the hon. member did not want to convey the impression that the new Veterans' Land Act did not have a much better chance of succeeding than did the one which existed before. But I am afraid that that impression might be gained by people who would read or hear the resolution as it appears on the order paper. It would be unfortunate indeed if that impression were gained, because I have great confidence in the land settlement act as it stands to-day. I suggest that every hon. member should guard his words and deeds so as to build up a still greater confidence in the new act as it appears on the statute books.

I have many reasons for that contention. First of all, agriculture to-day enjoys the confidence of Canadian citizens as a whole, something which I believe it did not enjoy after the last war. To-day it is recognized by all as a major industry of national importance, and by this I mean that Canadian citizens as a whole realize well that Canada cannot continue on an economically sound basis without having agriculture on an equally sound basis. That fact was brought to the attention of Canadians to a greater extent during this war than it ever was in the past. I feel that to-day there is possibly more public sentiment in the whole of Canada in favour of agriculture than there has ever been before, and there is the general feeling that agriculture should receive the true and sincere support of the whole nation.

I would hope that no hon. member would at any time say or do anything which would tend to hurt or possibly to destroy the public confidence we enjoy at this time. Further, we should do everything we can to encourage progressive young men with farming experience who wish to engage in farming. Let them begin their work with the greatest of confidence.

The Veterans' Land Act as it stands to-day offers a great many new advantages which veterans of the last war did not enjoy. It is not my purpose this evening to review the operation of that act, because the debate is directed to the Soldier Settlement Act which operated following the last war. I would, however, point out a few facts which relate to the Veterans' Land Act, and I do so because of the bearing those facts may have on the resolution as it is now worded.

First of all, one of the chief reasons why many who settled under the earlier scheme failed to make a success of farming was that they did not have the necessary experience, and had not lived in the locality in which they settled. I remember the case of a veteran who settled next to my home. This man came from Ontario; he had never before lived in western Canada and had had no experience whatsoever in farming. The result was that he remained on the farm for only six or seven months and then abandoned the project as hopeless, despite the fact that the land on which he settled was good.

To-day there are still a large number of very good farms in the Red River valley, and it is our hope that the young men of that district will avail themselves of the opportunity to begin operations on those farms. There is no doubt, however, that after having watched the operation of the Soldier Settlement Act which was passed after the last war, many of those young men have not any great amount of confidence in the new act which is now in operation. I take this opportunity to try to point out to all these young men that they should avail themselves of the opportunity now offered to them. The Veterans' Land Act offers them a good, sound business. I believe the capital outlay will be smaller than that required by any other enterprise in which they might want to establish themselves.

As I pointed out before, they certainly have a reasonable chance of success on a farm to-day. There are many reasons why this is so. Unlike the veterans of the last war, they are not being asked to buy land at inflationary prices. Generally speaking, prices of farm land are very reasonable. I know of many pieces of land in the beautiful Red river valley from which I come. I know of several good farms that are available at the present time at most reasonable prices. But what is causing me concern is the fact that young people, even in that particular area, do not seem to be any too keen to settle down on farms at the present time.

These men will have a fairly definite assurance that prices of farm products will remain at a reasonable level and to a certain degree

their income will be more or less secured. If they wish to raise large families the family allowances will increase their security. I could go on and enumerate many other advantages, but I think it will suffice to say that to-day agriculture is in a far better position than it ever was. It is in a better position to-day than it was in the past when considered from the security point of view.

I hope that all young veterans who have been brought up on farms or who have had any experience in farming will settle on the land. But this time they should be careful in selecting the land, because that is one of the most important factors if they are to make a success. They should try to settle on land in their own localities, on land that is similar to that upon which they have been brought up; in other words, on land that they know.

I am in full agreement that soldiers who settled under the Soldier Settlement Act should receive periodical consideration from the government. They settled on the land under most adverse conditions which were made worse at times by the weather. These conditions were aggravated still further by the economic collapse which occurred later on. They struggled through, and those who survived deserve a lot of credit and should be given immediate consideration. I feel sure that the minister concerned will try to give them his most sincere consideration and endeavour to see that they are placed in a secure position.

Mr. THOMAS REID (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, the resolution before the house is a very important one. This matter has been discussed every year since 1930, when I first came into the house. On many occasions it has been brought up by the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Fair) and others. I have two reasons for rising to speak on this occasion. First, I had nine years municipal experience between 1922 and 1930, just when the soldiers were being settled on the land. Believing that with that experience I could add something to the debate, I thought I should do so to-night. Second, there are one or two things I should like to say about the present Veterans' Land Act as it affects the veterans of this war and there are one or two matters I should like to draw to the attention of the minister.

I should like to say to the mover of the resolution that I have always deprecated the fact that quite often a member will introduce a resolution or bring a matter before the house and not always place all the facts of the case before hon. members. On reading the resolution, I was reminded that there are certain districts in Alberta and elsewhere that have suffered in part from the effects of drouth. However, if one reads the resolution he will find that a great deal of the blame if not all—is placed at the door of the government. The government should not and cannot be held responsible for what takes place in drouth areas. I may be wrong, but it is my opinion that if the present boards were in charge of placing settlers it is problematical if many of these dried-out areas would be settled.

The resolution is divided into two or three parts. I do not intend to take the time to deal with all of them. First, may I say that like most hon. members who have spoken I have every sympathy for the resolution proposed, which reads:

> That, in the opinion of this house, the government should take into consideration the advisability of giving clear titles to all soldier settlers who on March 31, 1944, held land under contract with the soldier settlement board.

Anyone who listened to the stories told this afternoon and this evening by the hon. member for Battle River and others could not help feeling sympathetic, but I began to wonder whether a voice would be raised on behalf of another class of settler that I have in mind and that I feel sure every hon. member has some knowledge of. I refer to those settlers who in the early years of the soldier settlement scheme worked and battled their way, those settlers whose wives and families in many instances were oftentime denied some of the necessities of life in order that after a time they might obtain titles to their land.

I am not going to raise any objection to titles being given to those who have not been able to obtain them, but I certainly am going to put in a plea for those settlers who in past years have suffered and worked hard in order to get title to their land. What is to be done? Will no one say a word on their behalf? I could mention case after case where the settler, his wife and family have stayed at home, where they have worked hard, where in many instances they have gone without some of the necessities of life, but who now stand with the titles to their farms in their hands. Is nothing further to be done for that splendid class of settler?

May I make it clear that I am not going to object to titles being given to those who have been unable to obtain them because of circumstances which intervened, but I am going to voice a plea for those who have fought hard to get their titles and who in my opinion are just as deserving. This afternoon many instances were given of failures of the last

scheme. Every member of parliament could regale the House of Commons with speech after speech on that subject, but conditions to-day are not similar to those of 1921 and 1922. The officials of the veterans land board to-day, from what I know of them in British Columbia, through the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie), know all that took place in those earlier years, and from what I can see they are not repeating the mistakes of those years. They have the benefit of those mistakes to go on, and consequently to-day are preventing many of the same mistakes from occurring. I well remember that in 1921 and 1922 there was a move by the government of the day to get men settled on the land as quickly as possible. I know men of that day who were also just as determined to settle on the land as farmers, some of whom called themselves farmers, and if anyone dared to dispute it they had to be ready for trouble. I remember one settler in particular who after he was settled on a farm was looking forward to the time when he might have to increase his dairy herd and he actually bought a young steer. Although his herd did increase, may I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that it was not because he had bought that particular animal. I know another man who was very angry when asked: Did he know anything about farming? He said: "I was brought up on a farm. My father and grandfather before me were brought up on a farm." Although the board of that day had set a price of $4,000 on a farm this man put up $2,000 more of his own for the place, and he was on it for only a month when he asked his neighbour if he had to plant potatoes every year. But it is no good going back and rehashing the failures.

One thing I do not like in this debate is that the impression may go abroad that all the settlers were failures. Nothing of the kind. True, many mistakes were made by the government. There was a lot of land and stock bought at high prices, and some land was purchased which in my opinion should never have been bought. While there are certain faults in the present scheme, it is a great improvement over the 1922 scheme.

What is one of the complaints being made to-day of the new settlement board in my district? By the way, I have the honour to represent a district with more soldier settlers settled under the last scheme than most of the other districts in British Columbia. What criticism do I get now? I hear farmers, yes, and real estate men too, saying that the government is paying too little for the land bought. Is that not a fine recommendation of the Veterans' Land Act officials, that they are out protecting the men from being robbed by preventing them from paying the high prices of 1922? Let me give an illustration from my own district. I need not mention names, but I could if desired.

A father and son wanted to settle close to my own home two months ago. The father was a veteran of the last war and of this war, and his son had been in the air force in this war. The son wanted a place for which the man who was selling it was demanding $3,000. The Veterans' Land Act officials had looked over the property and said they would allow more than $2,000 for the place. After negotiating with the officials, the son came to see me and he was in a very high-strung frame of mind. The names he was calling the officials of the government for all the red tape, as he called it, were harsh. If he wanted to pay $3,000 for the farm, he should be able to do so, he said. I investigated the matter myself, and this is what I found. I found that it had been purchased a year previous for $1,200, and the present owner was wanting this soldier settler to pay $3,000 for it. The Veterans' Land Act officials, realizing that the owner had made some improvements to the property, were willing to pay $2,000 for the property, but nothing more.

I mention that one instance because the complaints which I have heard under the present scheme are not that land is being bought at too high a price or that the soldiers are being robbed. The complaint is being made by farmers in the district that the land is being bought too cheaply. They feel that such reasonable prices might depress the price of property they themselves might want to sell.

I should liked to have seen, and I proposed this in the house last year, that the soldier be given the land as a gift, or at least without any interest charges. I should like to see that matter discussed when the special committee is set up. I was very glad indeed to note that the Minister of Veterans Affairs has a motion on the order paper to set up a special committee where all these matters can be thoroughly discussed.

I have one or two criticisms, and it might be as well for me to make them now.

I think we had better be careful about where we place the small holder under the Veterans' Land Act. There is a tendency, I believe to settle the veterans on property which is a little too far out from the city and from transportation. In the constituency of New Westminster at the present time they are building in one corner of Richmond muni-

cipality seventy-five homes, ten or twelve of which are now ready for occupancy. These homes are each on one acre of land. I think the veterans' land board paid something like $850 an acre for the property. To my mind, one acre of land is far too much for a man to look after who intends to make his livelihood in industry. If he works eight hours a day in the shipyard or anywhere else he certainly cannot do much if any farming after his working hours. The odd one will be found who with the help of his wife and family may perhaps take on some extra work, but generally speaking, if a man is faithful to one master he will not be able to cultivate much on a small fruit ranch or on one acre of garden land. I would suggest to the minister that he review these plots of land, and I suggest that where they are close to the city half an acre of land would be sufficient. The minister has just intimated to me that that is being done, and I am glad to hear it, because I raised the same objection last year and I know whereof I speak as to what the soldier settler can do in the Fraser Valley and in other parts of British Columbia.

I cannot agree with those in the house and many outside who are endeavouring and have endeavoured to place the industrial worker on the same plane with the man who has fought our battles overseas. I am very sorry if I cannot see eye to eye with those who do; to me there is no comparison between the industrial worker and the man who offered his life and fought on the battlefront so that we here may have the life we have. And so I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and through you to the house, that our first charge must be to rehabilitate those who fought our battles. That at least is my thought and it is one of the thoughts I am leaving with the minister. While we shall probably not see what was witnessed in the last settlement under the Soldier Settlement Act, nevertheless we in British Columbia and particularly in the city of New Westminster have started something which, I believe, may be adopted by other cities. The city of New Westminster has the honour to have two men who won the Victoria Cross, and perhaps thinking of the days which followed the last war the citizens set on foot a scheme which, in my opinion is highly commendable. It is the first of its kind in Canada and has a great deal to merit its adoption by other cities. The citizens of New Westminster decided to grant annuities, at the age of fifty, to these two New Westminster boys who won the V.C., and in addition to that they have set up a fund for scholastic purposes to be known under the names of these two V.C. winners. The response was extremely generous and the two holders of the Victoria Cross, one, Major Mahoney, V.C., and the other, Private "Smoky" Smith, will at the age of fifty have an annuity of $100 a month for life, so that, never again, so far as these two are concerned, will there be any fear of their looking for charity or even of seeking jobs as janitors or as a run-about in the House of Commons such as we heard about the other evening. What has been done by the city of New Westminster I commend to other cities which have the honour of having V.C.'s.

I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that a special committee is to be set up to discuss this and other matters affecting our ex-servicemen. I am not sure whether all the provinces have a scheme similar to that of British Columbia, but that province has set aside one million acres in the interior as a free grant of land in which each soldier will share who wishes to settle there, with the result that all soldier settlers who take advantage of that offer in British Columbia will be able to start in without a debt hanging over their heads and with a cash balance of something like $2,300, being a free grant. This is equal to what they would obtain under the dominion Veterans' Land Act if they took up land elsewhere and stayed with the project for ten years, as called for under the regulations. There is no doubt that interest charges were a heavy burden on many if not all of the settlers who took up land under the old soldier settlement board scheme, and while there were many faults, nevertheless those faults have perhaps helped in large measure to lay the foundation for the present act. If the foundation has been laid fairly well it can be still further improved, and I hope the minister will take note of all the suggestions that have been made.

Mr. L. E. BAKER (Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare): I have been much interested in the remarks concerning veterans of the last war and have listened with interest to the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Fair) and other hon. members who have spoken in this debate. What I am going to say I shall say without bias and it will be non-controversial from the political point of view, because matters concerning veterans are far too important to be put on any political or controversial basis.

I am a new member here and also a veteran of two days' standing, having received my discharge on Saturday. Therefore I do not know very much about veterans' affairs so far as men of the last war are concerned. I know quite a bit, however, about legislation

passed with respect to men returning from this war, and I am particularly interested not only in what happens to our present veterans but also in what happens to the veterans of the last war. After all, we are all comrades in arms together, and I must speak without fear or favour, because in the final analysis, should I be called to the bar of that great body known as war veterans, I should have to acquit myself. Therefore I am careful of what I say now.

There is one thing of which I would remind the house. The other day, being a new member and being interested in these matters, I was pleased to hear certain remarks that were made, as reported in *Hansard* at page 467:

Mr. A. J. Brooks (Royal): May I ask the Minister of Veterans Affairs if it is the intention of the government to set up a special committee on veterans affairs at this session of parliament, and if so, at what time we may expect the committee to be set up?

Hon. Ian A. Mackenzie (Minister of Veterans Affairs): The reply is in the affirmative. The intention is at once to set up such a committee, and I shall be asking the various parties and groups in this house for their selections of names for that committee, probably in a day or two.

I think that is the right way to tackle the matter. I may be wrong, but it seems to me that these things should be worked out properly from the start. If it was not worked out properly from the start the first time—and I am not saying either that it was or that it was not—then more time should have been spent in working out the details. There are about ninety-five new members apart from myself, the majority of whom, I venture to say, do not know very much about the Veterans' Land Act or the Soldier Settlement Act, and therefore it would be a good idea to allow this committee to get down to work and come to some sort of conclusion, because they will have all the details at hand and the committee will be comprised of members from different sections of the house, so that it will be able to arrive at a satisfactory solution. I think, however, that it would be a very dangerous thing to vote in favour of this resolution to-night. Frankly, I am a veteran and I would not support the resolution because I do not know enough about it and the matter is too important. If we pass wise legislation in matters pertaining to veterans I feel sure that we shall have public support. If we do anything hastily and make mistakes we shall not have public support, and I think too much of the veterans and their future to support anything with which I am not thoroughly conversant.

Mrs. GLADYS STRUM (Qu'Appelle): I did not intend to take part in this debate. There seem to have been a great many opinions expressed and a great deal of information and data brought before this house. There are a few things that I as a new member fail to understand when we come to deal with this problem. It is very difficult for a new member to come to this house and find that all hon. members agree that something is desirable and yet nobody wants to tackle it. I think the hardest thing that a new member has to put up with in this house is frustration.

Mr. BLACKMORE: The old members too!

Mrs. STRUM: I do not think we need to have any more royal commissions to deal with what happened to the veterans of the last war. We have the evidence in every community, and anyone who has lived here since the last war, as I have, does not need any royal commission to find out what happened. I submit, Mr. Speaker, the thing that happened to the veterans is the very same thing that happened to everybody else in this country; they were the victims of a set of circumstances with which our governments failed to deal. There are a few things in the brief submitted to the Rowell commission by the Hon. T. C. Davis, who was the attorney general of Saskatchewan in 1937, that have not yet been mentioned, and I am going to bring them to the attention of the house for a few moments.

We have recently dealt with the problem of a floor price for agricultural products. I wish to draw the attention of hon. members to the fact that in the eighteen years between 1920 and 1937 wheat reached $1 a bushel only six times. Only six times in eighteen years did those veterans get what we now say should be the floor price. I should like to draw the attention of the house to the fact that in those eighteen years cattle went as low as $18, $19, $20, $22 a head, and the highest price recorded was $59 a head. I wish to draw the attention of the house to the fact that those veterans who were selling eggs took, according to the report of the Saskatchewan government, as low as seven cents a dozen for the year's average, which meant that those eggs went as low as three cents a dozen when they hit the rock-bottom price in the summer months. I think, we must accept these figures; they are the figures submitted by a Liberal government to a royal commission, and I believe them. I lived through them, Mr. Speaker, and I know what they meant to the family income and to debt. These people have produced enormous quantities of wealth, huge surpluses and gluts,

and the worst part of the whole picture was the price failure, not the crop failure. The result was huge burdens of unpaid interest that became principal and finally took the farms out from under the feet of those people who had saved us from the fate of the people of France and Belgium.

If I were a veteran coming into this country to-day and saw a parliament sitting here talking about what each speaker in all parts of the house has called simple justice; "simple justice" everybody says, and yet we sit here and do nothing. I have been warned that is what is called "talking it out." I have been warned that you can talk a measure out so that you do not have to deal with it, and then you do not have to account for your actions. I hope that is not what we are witnessing, although I have a horrible suspicion—if I were a veteran coming back to-day I would feel very jittery to think that the new government was that kind of a government, and that that sort of policy would affect my future in the next few years.

We hear references to family allowances, and that the family allowance is a means of farm security. I think the family allowance is a good thing; I never criticized it. The C.C.F. were the few people who talked about it in the last few years. I did not hear a popular demand in the country for family allowances aside from C.C.F. platforms, when we said that they had started them in New Zealand and that it would help the mother of a family—

Mr. CLAXTON: They were first suggested by the Liberals in this house.

Mrs. STRUM: Perhaps in this house, but I first heard about them, not in Canada but in New Zealand when I visited there in 1939. But there is one thing that many people overlook, namely, that your children grow up; they do not stay under sixteen. And what are you going to do with the bachelors who are farming? What are you going to do with the married couples who have no children? The family allowance is not farm security. The family allowance will not buy underwear for the children, let alone take the place of a crop or decent prices. Therefore I hope that this house will not fail to deal with this thing which is just simple justice.

I am amazed at people talking about the weakness of sentiment. I want to ask the house, did we refuse to use sentiment in 1914, 1915 and 1916? Did we appeal to those boys on the basis of good business? Did we ask them to enlist because there was money in it, or did we appeal to them on the sentiments that were worthy of the occasion? The only reason why I am in this house is that I care what happens to people. I am not interested in the dollars and cents angle of this business. I would not be here if I did not care about people, and the sentiments that move me are the sentiments that have to do with how people live and work, and how governments discharge their obligations. Therefore I move, Mr. Speaker, that the question be now put.

Mr. RALPH MAYBANK (Winnipeg South Centre): I thought for a moment—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. MAYBANK: I was in some doubt as to whether I was in order when I rose. I did not understand that there had been any motion put before the house and seconded, and that the question which the lady member moved was not properly before the house. Have I the floor?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is just one motion before the house.

Mr. MAYBANK: I did not think the hon. member who has just finished made a motion which was seconded, and I did not think there was anything to prevent me from endeavouring to follow in her footsteps, which would be a difficult endeavour. The first thought that arose in my mind—I hope the hon. member will not take offence when I say this—was that there was a possible uncertainty of not obtaining the last word, and that she was endeavouring to effect some insurance that would give her the last word. I have not any objection to a lady having the last word; I think it is only right that she should.

Mr. FRASER: It would not help you anyhow.

Mr. MAYBANK: It would not help, anyway.

Mrs. STRUM: How about a little cooperation?

Mr. MAYBANK: It would not make any difference—

Mr. WRIGHT: Why endeavour to talk it out?

Mr. MAYBANK: I would be quite agreeable indeed to granting her another whack at it if there were any real desire on her part to have the last word.

Mr. Speaker, there are some features about this debate that are reminiscent of old-time revival meetings. I do not think there has ever been a question before the house on which there have been so many affirmative opinions given. It reminds me of a revival meeting in that one speaker after

another rises to give testimony. So far as the effectiveness of the resolution is concerned I do not think it makes any difference whether it is or is not talked out, particularly after the display that has been given this afternoon and this evening.

I should like to join with others who have spoken in supporting this resolution, although as I read it there may be some detail in it, some point or another, with which I might disagree. When it comes to the resolution itself, however, I submit that it is in no way objectionable either under the rules and customs of this house or under the method adopted by the government in dealing with these matters. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) is not in his place at the moment; probably he is engaged in the very serious business of preparing the budget. But even if he were here I hardly think he could say there was in this proposal anything in the nature of an attempt to raid the treasury. I would point out that the resolution does not ask that certain moneys be spent; it uses the much more diplomatic method of recommending to the government that they take into consideration the advisability of, in effect, giving clear title to this land, and for that reason I think the government might very well look upon the resolution in a kindly way.

There is no doubt in the mind of any person, I believe, that returned men after the last war were mulcted of untold sums of money by the operation of the Soldier Settlement Act of that time. I have worked with men who for many years were on farms obtained under that scheme, men who struggled until they could struggle no longer in an endeavour to make the payments, and who finally had to give up. I distinctly remember one man who had been on the land for ten or twelve years, paying money year after year on a contract which never, under any circumstances, could he hope to complete. That, of course, was only one case; I know of many others. In the interval between that time and the present many may have obtained title to their land, but many others have given up and lost out after having put a great deal into it. We now have this small number remaining who are in the position described by the mover of this resolution, and it would seem to me to be a matter the government should take into very serious consideration, as to whether they should not give some final relief to these people who have laboured under this disability for so long.

I have not spoken for very long, so that I cannot be accused of endeavouring to talk out this proposition. On the contrary I have probably taken less time than many who have spoken from the opposite side of the house. I do not know that there is anything more that can be usefully said by me at the moment. I suggested in the beginning that this was a matter of simply giving testimony, and I wish to place myself on record as being in favour of doing everything possible that can be done under the circumstances of this case.

Mr. F. W. TOWNLEY-SMITH (North Battleford): Mr. Speaker, I should like to express myself as being wholeheartedly in favour of this resolution. I suppose nearly everything that can be said about it has been said, but I wish to add just a few words. I happen to have lived among some of these men who took farms after coming back from the first great war; as a matter of fact, four of them were on quarter-sections immediately adjoining my own farm. I watched their efforts; I saw their struggles and understood their difficulties, because they were also mine. They faced the hazards of farming: weather, frost and hail, drought, insect pests, plant diseases; all these encompassed these unfortunate people in exactly the same way as they did the rest of us, but they were quite unable to stand up under the strain. I watched their efforts, their progressive difficulties and their progressive failures. I saw their wives die under the strain. I saw their children attending school ill clad and poorly fed. I watched one generation fail to secure a fair education because of the poverty and difficulties under which their parents were labouring. All this I saw from my own doorstep. These people never had a chance. It is quite true that the fault did not lie entirely with the government. The hazards I have mentioned can never be blamed on any government, but they were there just the same. Probably one reason for the failure of these men lay in the fact that in some districts a quarter-section of land is not an economic farm; the overhead is too high for that acreage.

As I said, four of these men settled around my farm; none of them is there now. They have all gone and others are on those quarter-sections. That was twenty-six years ago, and it does seem to me that if, after struggling with the problem for twenty-six years, these men have been unable to straighten it out, the very least we could do would be to straighten it out for them and give them this land. They are no longer young. When they came there they were ambitious and cheerful; many of them were strong. Now their ages are from fifty to sixty years; and if in the last twenty-six years they have not been able

to make a go of it, they will never be able to get straightened out now. Some hon. members have spoken about agriculture being in pretty good shape just now. If they would read their newspapers they would see that western agriculture, particularly in Saskatchewan, is having its own difficulties this year. They would read about two and four bushel crops, and some districts where there are no crops at all. Some areas have been fortunate and are having good crops, but taking the province as a whole conditions are not good.

There is one particular instance I should like to mention. A quarter-section of land was sold to a veteran at the going rate of $25 an acre. After some twenty years the veteran was compelled to leave that land, broken and bankrupt. The same quarter-section was immediately sold to another man by the soldier settlement board for $10 an acre. At $10 in the first place the veteran could have paid for it; at $25 he was unable to do so.

Some hon. members have been distressed over the wording of the preamble. May I suggest to them that they are not voting on the preamble but on the resolution, which reads:

> That, in the opinion of this house, the government should take into consideration the advisability of giving clear titles to all soldier settlers who on March 31, 1944, held land under contract with the soldier settlement board.

Hon. members, let us do this thing. Let us give these men one real good break.

Mr. G. A. CRUICKSHANK (Fraser Valley): Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak for forty minutes in connection with this motion.

I am entirely in accord with the principle, and would be glad to support it in every way.

Mr. GLEASON BELZILE (Rimouski) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise for the purpose of speaking on this motion, because I believe that what has been said so far did not touch the matter of principle which underlies the resolution. Without any doubt, our full sympathy goes to all those veterans who, after the first great war, took up land under the Veterans' Settlement Act. Those men, on their return from the war, certainly deserved whatever opportunities the government afforded them, but as I said a few moments ago, we are now dealing more particularly with a matter of principle and I think I am in a most favourable position to discuss it, since there are very few instances of such land settlement in the constituency I have the honour of representing.

The matter of principle which underlies the present discussion seems to be the following: in taking up land the veteran entered with

the government into a contract which was perfectly free and quite voluntary. That contract was not forced upon him, it was signed under no pressure; everything was done on a purely voluntary basis. On the one hand, the government offered the veterans definite and distinct advantages, and on the other hand the veterans assumed some obligations, and agreed to terms and conditions clearly laid down in their contracts. Therefore, there is at stake a principle, which is linked up with the sanctity of contracts.

I do not believe we could interfere and ask that contracts that have been entered into in all freedom, and freely accepted by both parties be set aside merely on a resolution asking the government to take into consideration the advisability of giving clear titles to all soldier settlers for their land.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution appears to me as being prompted more by political considerations than by common sense. Indeed, it is only necessary to examine its wording to notice that it represents the present situation as being due to the "lack of adequate policy for agriculture". Of course I am not in a position to go over the whole farming policy of this government or of the liberal administrations which have preceded it, and I do not think this is the proper time to do so, but the least that can be said about the resolution is that it is an evidence of defeatism on the part of the hon. member who has moved it.

The motion before the house, rests on a question of simple justice: either the veteran has met his obligations, in which instance there are no complaints because every one is satisfied; or, he has failed to meet them for various reasons, such as bad weather, unfavourable international marketing conditions, competition and so on, but not necessarily from lack of an effective agricultural policy on the part of this country's government.

In that case, if the government grant a clear title to the veteran whose payments are in arrear, it will appear to me as a clear case of injustice to those who, under similar circumstances, have met their obligations. Then we might be confronted with the somewhat queer procedure of another motion asking the reimbursement of sums paid in by those who have not defaulted. No argument could prevent the moving of a resolution to that effect on the very same grounds. The parties concerned would have the same arguments of sympathy and sentiment; they could base their claims on their status as veterans and the hard times they have experienced. And then, for the second time, we would have to

sanction an injustice flowing from the adoption of the motion before the house at this moment.

One thing is certain, the veterans of the first great war and those of the war just ended, do not ask for pity; all they want is fair treatment, nothing more.

Let us suppose for a moment that the present motion be carried. All the borrowers under the federal farm loan scheme, for example, who have defaulted in their payments, could come before the house, and, through another motion, request that their debts be cancelled, for reasons of sympathy, on account of hard times and especially because of the conditions engendered by the failure of the government to implement an efficient farm policy.

In the event the present motion is carried, we shall have established a precedent. Thus, there would be no valid reason to reject a similar resolution. From there on, whatever anyone would be in debt with the government, he could simply have to play on the sympathy and sentiments of the members of the house who would then be bound to grant his request.

Mr. Speaker, I believe sentimentality should be excluded from our discussions; we should take into account not the interest of a particular class of our citizens, but only the general welfare of the whole population. Everyone who would find it impossible to meet his obligations and would be faced with bankruptcy would have the right to apply to parliament for exceptional treatment and thus the House of Commons would become a dispenser of compassionate grants.

I respectfully suggest that the passage of such a resolution would inevitably lead us to state paternalism. Further, it would tend to give the veterans of this war, who are entitled to the advantages provided by the new settlement act, the wrong and false impression that if they fail to meet their obligations all they will have to do will be to come before Parliament in ten or fifteen years hence and request a remission or reduction of their debts. From a business standpoint, it would be creating a bad precedent; and I do not think that we should be moved by sentiment and become soft-hearted. Let us glance into the past and we shall find that the pioneers who came from France and who settled on the old lands of Quebec, on the island of Orleans and in the district of Rivière Ouelle and who, with their bare hands have built a whole country, did not receive any land clearing bonuses, or Government grants or remission of their debts from a paternalistic state; however, they built a whole country with the sweat of their brow, their labour and their devotion to duty.

Mr. Speaker, I feel we should recall the past and consider those facts. Accordingly, on a matter of principle, and disregarding any appeal to sentimentality, I place myself on record as being opposed to this resolution.

Mr. R. R. KNIGHT (Saskatoon City): Mr. Speaker, may I express my sympathy for my colleague, the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mrs. Strum), and what she has expressed in her brilliant little speech. I have no particular skill to stand upon my feet for forty minutes and say nothing, or to say those things which have already been said, nor do I intend to acquire such skill through practice. I think everything that can be said upon the motion has already been said. It would appear that hon. members from all sections of this house believe that the veterans of 1914-18 who now remain on the land should be given clear title to the land. We are all agreed; so let this government give it to them. The hon. member for Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare (Mr. Baker) has said that as a new member he does not yet understand about such things as the veterans' acts and so on of the last war. I was reminded of Miles Standish whose friend spoke on his behalf and who was told, "Why don't you speak for yourself, John." The hon. member also advised against haste, but I would suggest that eight years of debate on this question should be sufficient, and there are still sixty minutes of this evening left.

Mr. D. K. HAZEN (St. John-Albert): Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the wording of the preamble to this resolution for reasons that I do not think it necessary to state this evening, but with the resolution itself I am in wholehearted agreement. It asks the government to take into consideration the advisability of giving clear titles to all soldier settlers who on March 31, 1944, held land under contract with the soldier settlement board.

Surely no hon. member can object to the government doing that. Surely no hon. member can object to the government reconsidering the whole matter and reviewing the whole subject. Not only do I think the government should reconsider and review the whole matter, but after they do that I hope they will see their way clear to give clear titles to these veterans as the resolution suggests.

I believe that a man should live up to his agreement and meet his obligations, but there are cases when it is quite impossible to do

this. I am convinced that the situation in which these veterans find themselves is one of these cases.

I met a delegation of veterans that came to Ottawa in June of last year to present a brief asking that these men be given clear titles. I was more impressed by the men composing that delegation than by their brief. One had only to meet them and talk to them to be impressed by the justice of their claim. One had only to look at them to realize that for years past they had faced a tremendously difficult task, that they had struggled with courage against great odds and had done the best they could under the most adverse circumstances. It was clear that the cards had been stacked against them and that fate had been unkind.

After talking to these men I realized that we could not afford to allow them to leave the land as they were doing. I realized we would be making a great mistake if we let men of their character and their racial origin and their families leave the land and perhaps have it taken over by other persons who might not and probably would not be so willing to come to the defence of their king and country in time of war.

I think the agreements that were entered into could well be changed in favour of the veterans on the ground of mutual mistake. The mistake on the part of the board was that they overvalued the farms in the first instance and sold them to veterans at too high a price. The mistake on the part of the veterans was that they thought the farms would produce a great deal more revenue than they did. The mistake was owing to the fact that the farms had been purchased by the board and sold to the veterans in boom times and in a period of inflation.

This matter does not affect veterans who live in the prairie provinces only, because, as the hon. member for Royal (Mr. Brooks) pointed out this afternoon, there are veterans in the maritime provinces who have faced similar difficulties. I could cite instances, although I do not propose to do so this evening. I would urge the government not only to reconsider and review the whole matter but to give these veterans clear title to their lands.

Mr. FERNAND VIAU (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in the discussion on the resolution now before the house as a soldier and not as a veteran, although the title of veteran has been attributed to me by the press ever since I have become a member of the House of Commons. I feel, however, that a veteran is one who has returned from a theatre of war or has experienced action on the battlefield. Although I enlisted as a volunteer, I have never had the privilege, through no fault of my own, to go across the sea and fight with my comrades against the enemy which was trying to deny not only to Canada but to the entire world that peace and freedom which have always been dear to those who live under democratic government. Neverthelss, as a soldier, I feel that I should express my opinion on the resolution now before us.

The resolution asks the government to wipe out a legal debt owing to this country, and as such, it presents a very serious problem which should be given careful consideration, by all hon. members, no matter on which side of the house they sit.

I wish to congratulate the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Fair) upon his sincerity and tenacity in bringing this resolution before the house. I was surprised to hear the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Wright) ask that immediate consideration be given to the request as submitted by the hon. member for Battle River. As he did establish himself under the Soldier Settlement Act which was passed by the government in power after the great war of 1914-18, and being thrifty, hard-working and an honest and conscientious farmer was able to pay back his debt to the government, that does not mean necessarily that all the debts still owed to the government for the same privileges that he himself enjoyed after the war of 1914-18 should be wiped off.

I also wish to congratulate the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker), whose political career in the House of Commons I have followed closely when an outsider, and for whom I have always had a great admiration for the attitude he has taken in this house in discussing this problem which concern the welfare of Canada's veterans.

It must be remembered that when the government in power after the last war introduced the Soldier Settlement Act, they did so without any experience whatsoever in that field. That was really the first time that Canada had sent troops overseas to join with our allies in defeating the Germans. The government when they passed that act were very sincere and thought they had passed an act from which every veteran of the war of 1914-18 who came under it would benefit, and that no request would be made to have the act amended as has been frequently done from 1922 up until this day.

It must also be remembered that during the period 1918-19 the wheat acreage in this country—I am speaking of western Canada—expanded, but in the southern area of the western provinces there was a large drought area where the board did not allow settlement by veterans who applied to get the full privileges granted by the Soldier Settlement Act. After the war of 1914-18 we had inflation for about a year and a half in Canada, and then the drought areas in western Canada came back. After the great war we still had a very large wheat surplus, but on account of the war ending so abruptly in 1918 there existed no purchasing power in Europe and we were unable to dispose of our agricultural products. That condition was accentuated by the fact that practically all existing governments, thinking they were placing their own economy on a sound basis, increased tariffs as high as Canada did under the regime of the Bennett government from 1930 to 1935. Therefore we were not able to sell our products to the other countries of the world.

In 1922, after many requests for amendments had been received from veterans of the war of 1914-18 who had settled under the Soldier Settlement Act, the government brought in an amendment which resulted in the interest on the debt owed by the veterans being waived for periods of from two to four years, depending upon the settler's date of establishment. Then in 1925 another amendment was made to the Soldier Settlement Act granting a reduction to the soldier settlers of forty per cent of the cost of the live stock purchased prior to October 1, 1920, and a reduction of twenty per cent of the cost of live stock purchased after October 1, 1920, and prior to October 1, 1921.

At a still later date, in 1927—in the meantime there had been a rise in the cost of living and in the cost of all commodities needed by every Canadian—a further amendment was made granting a reduction of the amount by which the price of the purchased farm exceeded 1927 values. That also was of great benefit to the soldier settlers. That was followed in 1930 by a reduction of thirty per cent of all the debts owed to the soldier settlement board.

Hon. members will notice that even though the Conservative government which was then in power was followed by the Liberals, and the Conservative government came back in 1930, an unbiased attitude was taken by all governments in power concerning the debts owed the country by the veterans who settled under the act. From 1930 to 1935 when the Conservative party was in power a remission was granted of one year's interest on all charges and also a dollar for dollar bonus respecting payment of all obligations then owing to the board; that is, for all debts falling due before April 1, 1936, which date was later extended, on further representations, to March 31, 1941.

During the Bennett regime was introduced the Farmers' Creditors Arrangement Act which granted benefits not only to farmers but also to veterans who had settled under the Soldier Settlement Act, which legislation was brought into force by the Conservative party. I worked under the Farmers' Creditors Arrangement Act and I know of the benefits received by the farmers of western Canada under that act. While I do not want to mention any case, I know of applications filed in the office, where I was assistant official receiver under the Farmers' Creditors Arrangement Act, of the benefits gained, when the case was brought before the board of review. The grants given to the veterans were really of great advantage to them. They consolidated the debt owing at the time at which the application was discussed before the board of review, and extensions for payment were granted up to ten, fifteen and twenty years at very low interest rates. But in 1942 there were still a great number of cases that remained unpaid through no fault of the veteran. Some soldiers had already reenlisted in the armed forces of the great war of 1939-1945, and there were others who, owing to sickness and also by reason of wounds received in the war of 1914-1918, or family troubles, or from other social causes, still had to apply to the government to receive certain relief in respect of debts owing under the act. That is why in 1942 the government authorized the treasury board, on the recommendation of the director, to reduce the indebtedness of the settler to the present and prospective value of the land. They were given time to file application until December 31, 1943, and even then, as I have stated, a great number of these settlers had reenlisted in this conflict and as such were unable to file application. But they were still granted the same rights, and recently I was informed that the government had given power to grant an extension; where no applications had been made, owing to no fault of the men; owing to service in this war or sickness, they were given the same privilege as granted those who applied in 1942.

I feel that the amount involved is not very high, but the fact remains that it is still a debt owing just like a debt owing to-day by

a farmer who might apply for a mortgage to any company who might advance money to farmers to purchase land, stock, machinery or cattle. I feel that the resolution as worded should never have been brought before the house but that the government must give the matter consideration; and as I have stated, certain action has already been taken in that respect in granting extension to farmers to pay their debts owing to the country in respect of the benefit they received on settling on lands in Canada for their services in the war of 1914-1918. As such the veterans coming back from this war will then feel able to file application and receive the same benefits granted under the Veterans' Land Act which was passed in 1942 as granted to the veterans settled under the Soldier Settlement Act in connection with the war of 1914-1918.

Mr. J. W. MacNAUGHT (Prince): I wish to express one or two sentiments on the resolution introduced so ably by the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Fair). I believe it was the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Pearkes) who said he represented an island in the Pacific. Well, I come from an island in the east, Prince Edward Island, and I think it might interest the house for me to tell of some of the experiences of veterans who took up land under the Soldier Settlement Act after the last war. I well recall many instances where these men were put on lands valued at three or four times their price. It was impossible for them to make good and they naturally failed.

I do not wish hon. members to misunderstand me. I agree heartily with most of the sentiments expressed this afternoon and evening, but I think the resolution as at present worded is most inadequate. In the first place, a measure of relief such as this should be uniform in its benefits, and the thing that strikes me about this resolution is the great disparity of benefits that will accrue from it. There will be no case where the equity in the land will be the same and therefore each individual will derive a different benefit under the resolution.

In the second place, some of the previous speakers have referred to the annoyances that may be expressed by those veterans who have already got title. Well, what about the poor lad who held on for quite a long while and then gave up? For that reason I submit that the resolution is totally inadequate because the benefits are not equal and fair.

Mr. W. A. TUCKER (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Veterans Affairs): One of the impressions that have been created by some speakers who have taken part in the debate this afternoon and to-night is that previous parliaments have consisted of men who had no interest in the returned soldier and were quite callous to what was happening to him. In fact, one hon. member has given expression to this thought: "I am interested in people and that is why I am here in this house." I have the honour and privilege of speaking now in the third parliament in which I have been a member, and I think I can say to that hon. member that in those other parliaments there were members elected to speak here who were also interested in people and interested in trying to do what was right by the people they represented and particularly by those who fought for our country in the first world war.

I am very glad that an attempt has been made to indicate something of what has been done for the returned soldier since world war I. It has been a popular pastime of some people to pretend that nothing whatever was done for the returned soldier. It has been said so often that I am sure some people have been led to believe that, no matter how carefully parliament has endeavoured to provide for the rehabilitation and reestablishment of the returned soldier of this war, they will also find that they have not been properly looked after. That is a natural assumption to make from the talk that has gone on among so many people in the last ten or fifteen years. However, I do not think the boys who went overseas in the last war are convinced that all the parliaments between the two wars were callous about their condition and did not do the best they could, and that suddenly a new race of men, with one woman added, has come into being here and will make all the difference in this parliament. If the idea is created that parliament is helpless and unwilling to do justice to those who have fought for the country, then a service is not done to parliament in any way, shape or form, and confidence is not created in the ability of this parliament and the willingness of parliament and the government representing it to do justly by those whom we are going to reestablish during the next four or five years.

As has been pointed out in this debate, there is no doubt that the people who set up the Soldier Settlement Act after the last war thought they were setting up an act that would work. They ran into the conditions

which are described in the resolution and with which most of us will agree. The preamble to the resolution reads:

. . . have in many instances suffered severe hardships because of purchase of land, live stock and equipment at inflationary prices, and low prices received for farm products. . . .

With that statement I think most hon. members will agree, and as a result the various changes were made which have been enumerated by the hon. member for St. Boniface (Mr. Viau). That is the first point which I would wish to make. All those parliaments were honestly endeavouring to deal with the situation as they found it. One of the things that moved those parliaments was that as between the returned soldiers who took up land under this act there should be an attempt to make adjustments which would benefit as much as possible all, that no adjustment would be justified if it discriminated between one group and another. I am satisfied that the only way we can justify in the eyes of the country any expenditure which we make is if it appears to deal justly with the people who have been endeavouring to pay for their land during the last four or five years. That is one of the things which I am sure will strike home to hon. members, namely, the fact that the man who during the last four or five years has struggled hard to pay for his land and has got clear title will say, if his neighbour next door, who perhaps has thought that ultimately the debt would be cancelled and has paid little or nothing, gets clear title, that he has not been dealt with justly. We then will have that claim made.

Be that as it may, I should like to lay before hon. members the effect of the various improvements which have been made in the situation from time to time and which have been enumerated by the hon. member for St. Boniface. Starting with the year 1922 and going on to the year 1944, these improvements have amounted roughly to $45 million, which were written off the debt of the soldier settlers of this country. The original indebtedness for the capital advanced was roughly $109 million. Therefore almost the equivalent of fifty per cent of the original capital advanced has been written off. I give this figure to do justice to previous parliaments; they were not callous about these things, and they did work for the returned soldier to the best of their ability.

With regard to the present situation, I would draw to the attention of the hon. members the fact that we have on the order paper a resolution which provides:

That a select committee be appointed,

1. To consider all legislation passed since the commencement of the war with the German reich relating to the pensions, treatment, and reestablishment of former members of His Majesty's armed forces and of other persons who have otherwise engaged in pursuits closely related to war.

I take it that this will provide for the setting up of a committee on returned soldiers' affairs, which will be very much like the committees which have sat in the last two parliaments and on which I have had the great honour and privilege of serving. These committees were made up largely of returned soldiers. They were noted not only by the members of all parties on the committees themselves, but by those who watched their operations, as committees which were perhaps the most non-partisan of any which sat on any problem during that period of nine years. I would say this to the new members who come into this house and who are inclined to lecture those who sat here in previous parliaments, that we sat many, many hours and gave very anxious consideration to the representations which were made by the authorized representatives of the returned soldiers throughout the country. Many changes were recommended to the committee, changes which were consistent with the recommendations of those recognized returned soldiers' organizations. These changes were recommended by the committees and accepted by the government. The government has now provided for the setting up of another committee. I believe there are now eighty-four men in the house who have given services to the country in the armed service in the first world war and in this war. Unless we have a committee that is much larger than usual we shall not be able to put all the ex-servicemen on that committee. I am very proud that the government is ready to trust the legislation in regard to ex-service men in large measure to the hands of at least one-third of the membership of this house who have actually served their country in the armed forces.

I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that that committee will have a chance to study this whole question; it will have a chance to hear the representatives of the various returned soldiers' organizations in the country, and what they have to say about it. It will have a chance to go into the way the acts have been administered; it will have a chance to examine into whether the officials of the soldier settlement board have discharged their duties with a

reasonable amount of consideration for the humanities of the situation. There will be on that committee returned soldiers from all parties and, if it is anything like previous committees, there will be the freest discussion on all those problems. Therefore I would say to the hon. member who moved this resolution that to have it properly considered I think it will be admitted that the place where that can be done will be before that committee where we can get the actual facts, get witnesses in front of the committee and hear what actually has been done.

I would ask the house to consider all the legislation that has been passed in regard to those who served with His Majesty's forces. In that legislation there is order in council P.C. 10472. In that order in council it was provided that any returned soldier could apply to the director of the soldier settlement board for a reduction of his debt. Then the appraisers of the board made a careful examination of the situation. They valued the land and made a report not only on the land but on the chance of the returned soldier paying the debt within a reasonable time; on his health, and on his record during the previous number of years. On the basis of this report the director was able to recommend a reduction which would give that returned soldier a chance to clear himself of debt within a reasonable time, based not only upon the value of the land but upon personal considerations as well. Then the treasury board was given power, on the basis of the recommendation, to write down the debt accordingly.

I understand that that order in council has been given a very liberal application, but the facts in that connection can be ascertained when this committee meets. If it is proved that the policy of the government in this matter has not been carried out liberally it will be the business of this committee to find out the facts and recommend accordingly. In any event, under that order in council an amount of $988,205.54 was written off the debts of the soldier settlers. Under the Farmers' Creditors Arrangement Act a total of $6,808,536 was written off. As I understand the law, any soldier settlement farmer in the prairie provinces who has not applied for and obtained an adjustment of his debts can apply under that act for an adjustment; and anyone who has observed the workings of the boards set up in western Canada under the Farmers' Creditors Arrangement Act will know that they have been very considerate and very liberal in their write-downs of debt.

So that the soldier had the chance to apply to the director of the soldier settlement board or under the Farmers' Creditors Arrangement Act for a write-down of his debt. He also has the right to make a second application under the Farmers' Creditors Arrangement Act if he obtained an adjustment before December 31, 1938. Some people did not apply under either provisions. As I understand the law, they can still apply under the Farmers' Creditors Act, and have the matter of adjusting their debts brought under the machinery of that legislation. I have had a certain amount of experience of the basis on which the officials acting under the Farmers' Creditors Arrangement Act write down debts in regard to soldier settlers. It is not done entirely on the basis of the value of the land. They take into consideration the record of the settler, his proved ability to discharge his obligations and so on, and they have written the debt down to a level where he could hope to be entirely free of debt within a reasonably short time.

Those provisions have been made, but in order to give another chance to those who have not made any application at all to have their debt written down, this government passed an order in council on the 28th of last month. I need not read the entire order in council, but it provided that those who had not applied through no fault of their own could still apply to the director of the soldier settlement board to have consideration given to the writing down of their debt, and gave the treasury board power to write it down.

Mr. MacNICOL: Does the hon. gentleman mean the order in council was passed on September 28?

Mr. TUCKER: Yes, three days ago. The effective part of the order in council reads:

> The undersigned accordingly recommends that the period within which such settlers may make effective application for debt reduction under the aforesaid order in council—

That is P.C. 10472.

> —be amended to March 31, 1946; and that decision as to whether the failure of any settler to make application on or before December 31, 1943—

That was the former cut-off date.

> —was or was not due to reasons beyond the control of any such settler shall be at the discretion of the director of soldier settlement.

With the consent of the house, and in the name of the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie), since I have not read the whole of the order in council I should like to table it.

Bearing in mind all that has been said and what I have just mentioned to the house as to what has been done and what has been provided for, I suggest that a proper approach to this problem would be to say, we will

have a committee made up, I expect, almost entirely of ex-servicemen, who will have a chance to go into the administration of these various orders in council and the Farmers' Creditors Arrangement Act. They will be able to look into these cases which are alleged not to have been properly dealt with under the existing machinery. Anyone who has had experience with the trial of cases knows that no judge will act in a serious matter on ex parte evidence, without hearing all sides That is a fundamental principle of British justice, that all sides of a case shall be heard. When I hear hon. members say, "We do not know what has been done; we do not know the actual facts, but we know someone claims to have been mistreated and therefore we are going to make a sweeping decision", then I suggest that at any rate it would do no harm to wait until a committee of this house composed of returned soldiers has had a chance to hear whether or not the returned soldier organizations of this country are in favour of this proposal. It can do no harm to give that committee a chance to look into these cases and see whether the paid servants of the government are not properly carrying out their duties, whether they are actually abusing those who defended this country in the first great war.

These are matters in which I believe we, as members of parliament, should be interested. We should ask to hear both sides before we undertake to act. It has been suggested that this soldier settlement scheme has been an entire and utter failure. Well, I am free to admit that owing to lack of former experience and owing to a desire to put the act into operation too quickly, mistakes were made. It was attempted to settle some 19,000 of these soldiers on the land in a matter of about eighteen months. Now, of course, we have learned by the mistakes made after the last war. From what I have seen of the boys coming back from overseas, they are not going to rush into things quite as quickly as was the case with those coming back after the first great war. I have talked to several returned men recently, and their attitude is that land values may be a little higher now than they will be two or three years from now, that perhaps equipment costs a little more now than it will cost in another year or two. As I understand it, this act will be so administered as to encourage the boys coming back from overseas to take their time before plunging into this proposition; to look around for a piece of land where they feel sure they can make a success, and not go into it until the time comes when they can get their land and equipment at reasonable prices. There will be no attempt to try to get all these gentlemen settled within a period of a year and a half. In other words, there will be an attempt to put everybody into a position where, if he is settled under the Veterans' Land Act, he will have a real chance of success—almost a 100 per cent chance of success.

There is a tendency to suggest that the various measures which this government has put into force, and which, I would draw to the attention of those people who jeer at those measures, have been approved by the people of Canada in the last general election, are not sufficient. I see the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mrs. Strum) laughing at that. I will ask her this question: Did she get half the people of Canada to endorse her attitude toward this legislation?

An hon. MEMBER: Did you?

Mr. MACKENZIE: More than you did.

Mr. TUCKER: I got the endorsation of those who elected me; and I got it on the basis of carefully laying before my people the government's programme, and asking for their endorsation of it. It will be time enough to suggest that the people of Canada did not know what they were doing and to laugh at their decision when we see whether or not those solutions actually work. So far as I am concerned, I am satisfied that they will work. Those who sneer at them and treat them as something only worthy of contempt are taking the attitude, indirectly, that the people of this country do not know what they are doing at the time of an election.

Well, that may be the attitude of my hon. friends in the C.C.F. I have heard the expression by hon. members of that party to the effect that, in this complicated system of government, the people cannot be trusted to decide their own affairs, that they must have boards of experts to tell them what to do, and that if they make decisions they will probably be foolish decisions. That sentiment was actually echoed on the floor of this chamber, when action this government has taken—action which was approved by the people at a general election—was sneered at as being unworthy of consideration and insufficient to meet the need.

As to the question of whether the old Soldier Settlement Act was a complete failure, let me say that I hold no brief for the board which operated under that act. But I do say that we should know the facts. Up to March 31, 1945, there were 5,028 accounts actually paid up under that act. During the past six years 2,436 were paid up, a good portion of

those having had adjustments under the various adjustment schemes which were provided in order that they might be paid up.

I would ask hon. members to bear in mind the attitude of one of those people, one among that group of 2,436, who, having managed to pay up his obligation, would turn around to find that this parliament, without any consideration for him, has given clear title to the 4,961 who have not done so.

If the resolution is asking that we do something for that group of returned soldiers who owed money at the outbreak of the present war and still owe money on their contracts, then it certainly should go so far as to ask for something for those who have worked hard, who have taken advantage of the various schemes to write down their debts, and who have cleared their lands and got their titles.

If we are going to do something like this, then let us do it on a fair basis for all. Whatever can be done should be fair to all. I submit that the committee to which I have referred can look into this matter and find out what can and should be done.

I hold in my hand another set of figures which I find most interesting and encouraging. These figures show that the contract instalments due by soldier settlers during the period between 1939-40 and 1944-45 were actually $5,873,242. The payments made during that time were $5,339,054. As hon. members can see, during that time those returned soldiers—men whom some hon. members have held up as being broken down, helpless and hopeless people—have paid off ninety per cent of their obligation during the last six years.

In addition to that, these same returned soldiers who are alleged to be broken down, helpless, hopeless and unable to meet their obligations, have prepaid $2,135,635 in the last five years. These are figures which must be given in fairness to our comrades who were settled on the land and who have made such a wonderful record, by meeting over ninety per cent of their obligations and prepaying almost another fifty per cent thereof in the past five years. I believe it is only fair to show on the floor of this chamber the splendid record of the men who fought in the last war who, to a certain extent, I feel have been put in a poor light by some hon. members this afternoon.

The suggestion is made in the resolution that the new soldier settlement scheme will be a failure. Well, if it is going to be a failure, it is not a good commentary on the foresight and on the ability to plan, not only of the government but of representatives of returned soldiers' organizations throughout the country and members of the House of Commons who sat on the committee which helped to plan the act and made the recommendations which were made effective by the government. Is it to be said or thought that all the conscience, all the good will, all the care and all the prescience sit with one little group in this chamber? That is the assumption which has been preached with a certain amount of success in Saskatchewan, but which has not been accompanied with much success in the rest of Canada.

My feeling is this, that it was preached with success in Saskatchewan because in that province we had had many years of crop failures and difficulties. As I pointed out the other day, great hope was held out for the new era described by the party seeking office. I have no doubt the people thought, Well, in the provincial field we will just see if they mean what they say, and if they are going to do something to bring in this new era. Let me call to the attention of the house again the fact that it was the leader of the C.C.F. who recently said, "Give us time," and that on another occasion a leader of the Conservative party who had promised to cure certain things or perish in the attempt, and after almost two years had failed to do so, said, "Give us time," when he was asked to do what he had promised to do. For the peace of mind of my C.C.F. friends from Saskatchewan I would ask them to remember what happened to the Conservative party in 1935 which held out certain promises and then failed utterly to carry them out.

As to whether this new scheme is bound to fail may I say—

An hon. MEMBER: What scheme? Explain.

Mr. TUCKER: I am going to explain if my hon. friend will restrain himself long enough for me to do so.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Another man looking for time.

Mr. TUCKER: I am referring to the Veterans' Land Act which was passed in 1942. I have already indicated some of the reasons why I am satisfied that that act will be a success. First, there is to be a careful examination into the qualifications of those who apply under the act. An effort will be made to see that they are fully qualified to make a success at farming. If not, courses in farming will be available in order that they may become qualified before they actually go on the land and risk their money.

Then, no attempt will be made to place them on the land within the first twelve months after the war has ended. Time will be taken to make sure that land is obtained at fair prices and that people have a chance to select the land they want. The men will be given help to get settled on good land and an effort will be made to see that exorbitant prices are not paid for such land and for machinery and other items. It was in this connection that veterans of the last war found themselves at a great disadvantage. They paid high prices for land and machinery, and after a period of four or five years they found that the land and machinery was worth only a fraction of what had been paid for them. That was enough to discourage any one.

Another aspect of the matter is the protection given to the veteran in connection with what he will get for what he produces. A floor has been placed under farm prices. As the president of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture said, this is the most radical reform measure that has ever been passed by any parliament in Canada. I have great faith in the effectiveness of the floor under farm prices bill, and I have great faith that it will provide real protection to the veterans in the years that lie ahead.

Then we have the Prairie Farm Assistance Act which will protect the veteran farmer on the prairies in the event of crop failure. I often think of the years from 1930 to 1939 when we had crop failure after crop failure in Saskatchewan and what it would have meant had we had the Prairie Farm Assistance Act at that time. Is it any wonder that thoughtful people think of the things that have been done by the present government? Is it any wonder that a good share of them stood by the Liberal party in the last election even though our election system resulted in only two Liberals being elected? However, I would remind my Tory friends that they managed to elect only one, so that there is nothing there about which they can crow. Incidently I will tell them that one of the reasons why that man was elected was, first, that he is an outstanding man and, second, that he assured his electors that he was just as liberal as any Liberal running in Saskatchewan.

There are other grounds, but I have not the time to go into them to-night. I regret that I have not the time. I have not mentioned the Family Allowances Act.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Five minutes more and you will have talked the farmers out.

Mr. TUCKER: I wonder how I came to pass over the Family Allowances Act. I say that feelingly and for reasons which are known to all hon. members. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle spoke feelingly and, perhaps, properly about the poor bachelor on the western plains. However, I could not help thinking that with all the surplus fine young women we are going to have in this country, any man who will not be satisfied to take a wife from that fine group of Canadian women will not deserve any sympathy such as the hon. member for Qu'Appelle has extended. I do not think there will be many returned soldiers who will actually be in that category when they get back from overseas or have been back for a year or so.

An hon. MEMBER: Three minutes.

Mr. TUCKER: Judging by what happened after the last war, I believe a large proportion, an overwhelming proportion of the men who take up land under the act will be in receipt of family allowances. Even a returned soldier cannot hope to have a family and have it grow up in much less than seventeen or eighteen years. During that time most of these men will be in receipt of family allowances which will provide a certain income and a basis for their living, no matter what may happen in the way of crop failure on our western plains.

Mr. MacNICOL: They will have plenty of time to increase the size of their family and get more allowances.

Mr. TUCKER: There may be a lot to be said for that. I have often said that the best immigrant is the one who arrives by way of the stork. I agree with the hon. member for Davenport and I am glad he is taking up this matter as well as the question of irrigation.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would remind the hon. gentleman that it is eleven o'clock.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Tuesday, October 2, 1945.

The house met at three o'clock.

CANADIAN INFORMATION SERVICE

TABLING OF ORDER IN COUNCIL—STATEMENT ON ORGANIZATION

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to lay on the table an order in council which establishes the Canadian information service. This service is being set up to provide for the distribution of information about Canada to the peoples of other countries.

The need for such a service has been generally recognized. Canada has a vital interest in international peace and prosperity, and an important part to play in the attainment of these objectives. It is essential, therefore, that our people and country be known and understood abroad.

Those with whom we trade must know our country and its possibilities; those with whom we are associated for the maintenance of world security must know with whom they are cooperating, and what may be expected of our cooperation. In short, both trade and diplomacy, to be carried out successfully, need a background of understanding based on factual information objectively presented.

During the war years Canada's diplomatic representation abroad has had to be increased to keep pace with our increased obligations. In 1939 we maintained only four missions; to-day we have high commissioners in all the capitals of the commonwealth, and ambassadors and ministers in many other countries. At the same time the network of trade commissioners is being increased with a view to giving the utmost help to Canadian trade, which means, in the last analysis, help to every Canadian. All these representatives need to be kept thoroughly informed about what is going on at home.

During the last three years, pioneer work in the way of supplying information abroad has been done through the wartime information board, in conjunction with embassies, legations and trade commissioners. It will be the first duty of the new service to develop adequate reference and information services for all these Canadian representatives abroad. For this reason it was considered advisable to retain an interdepartmental, rather than a purely departmental, service.

The service is to be directed by a committee on which departments and agencies primarily interested in external peace-time information are represented. This committee will be under the chairmanship of A. D. P. Heeney, deputy head of the Privy Council office. It will also include Norman Robertson, Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs; M. W. Mackenzie, Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce; Doctor Augustin Frigon, general manager of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation; the government film commissioner, and the director of the Canadian information service.

Geoffrey C. Andrew, who has been secretary of the wartime information board for more than two years, and more recently has been acting as general manager, has been appointed director of the new service.

I should like to pay a word of tribute to the work which the wartime information board, and before it the director of public information, performed during the war years. The establishment of an information agency was a relatively new venture for Canada. It was a necessary task, and a difficult one, and much useful work has been done. Since V-J day the board has been steadily cutting down its services within Canada. A few days ago the last general manager of the wartime information board, Mr. A. D. Dunton, returned to his peace-time employment as editor of the Montreal *Standard*. I think it proper to say that he takes with him the thanks and admiration of all Canadians who can recognize a good and difficult job well done.

SEED GRAIN

ANNOUNCEMENT OF SETTLEMENT OF LOAN TO PROVINCE OF SASKATCHEWAN

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): I desire to announce to the house that a basis of settlement has been agreed upon with the province of Saskatchewan in reference to the seed grain dispute, so-called, which has been going on between that province and the dominion government. Under this settlement the balance owing the dominion by the province of Saskatchewan in respect of the 1938 seed grain loan will be paid by the province as follows:

$6,626,664.68 to be paid monthly as collected from municipalities and to be paid in full as an obligation of the province by July 31, 1948.

$7,570,123.72 to be paid by the province over a period of eleven years.

Pursuant to this settlement the province will undertake to collect in the immediate future the amount owing by the farmer debtors under the compromise which the province made with them last year. As such moneys are collected from the farmers they will be paid by the province to the dominion. The balance of the total outstanding indebtedness will be paid by the province to the dominion, as I have said, over a period of eleven years and will be secured by non-interest bearing treasury bills of the province.

I may add that a statement substantially to this effect was given to the press last night, but it was reported as indicating that the dominion had undertaken to forgo the collection of some $2,272,000 of the principal. That is not correct. The $2,272,000 has been collected from the province already by way of deductions from payments to the province

under the tax agreements, leaving $14,196,788 still due, the settlement of which has been arranged in the manner I have indicated.

The matter, I think, has been settled on a basis satisfactory to both the dominion and the province, and my hope is that future relations between the dominion and the province in regard to this matter will be harmonious and cooperative, and that there will be no further dispute or misunderstanding arising out of the seed grain loans.

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): May I ask if it is a proper inference to take from this statement, that as a result of this adjustment there will be no loss to the dominion treasury, but that the adjustment is more in the way of postponing the payments due the dominion?

Mr. ILSLEY: And the forgoing of interest accruing from December 11, 1944, on. The principal and interest accruing to December 11, 1944, are all to be paid in the manner I have indicated.

Mr. BRACKEN: Then the government has lost interest for only one month, or less?

Mr. ILSLEY: No, interest spread over various periods. The instalments are spread over a term of eleven years. A fairly large amount is concentrated in the early part of that period, but to the extent that those payments were not made on demand the dominion government is forgoing the interest.

Mr. BRACKEN: Was that just an arbitrary adjustment, or was some principle involved?

Mr. ILSLEY: Oh, I may say there were negotiations.

Mr. LOCKHART: What was the total amount forgone by the dominion government?

Mr. ILSLEY: None in the way of principal.

Mr. LOCKHART: But in the way of interest?

Mr. ILSLEY: I do not know.

Mr. LOCKHART: You should know.

Mr. ILSLEY: There is no way of computing it with accuracy, because of the fact that the collections from the farmers are to be paid at the end of each month, as collected. If they are all collected at once, then there will be a smaller amount forgone in the way of interest than if they are not collected so quickly.

Mr. FRASER: May I ask the minister—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. FRASER: —a question in connection with the information board?

Mr. SPEAKER: The statement of the minister is not debatable.

Mr. FLEMING: I should like to ask the acting Prime Minister a question in regard to his first announcement.

Mr. SPEAKER: I just said the statement made by the minister is not debatable.

Mr. FLEMING: This is a question in regard to his first announcement.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not debatable.

WAR CHARITIES ACT

INCLUSION OF WAR MEMORIALS AS PROJECTS ACCEPTABLE FOR REGISTRATION

Hon. J. J. McCANN (Minister of National War Services) moved for leave to introduce bill No. 13, to amend the War Charities Act, 1939.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. McCANN: The purpose of this amendment is to enlarge the War Charities Act to include war memorials as projects acceptable for registration. As it is at present constituted, the act governs all appeals, charitable or otherwise, arising out of or connected with the war. It is felt that this interpretation of a war charity fund is not sufficient to bring all types of appeals for war memorials within the provisions of the act. This amendment clarifies the meaning of a war charity fund and ensures that war memorial appeals will require authorization under the act.

Mr. CHURCH: Is the amount under the act reduced or increased as a result of the amendment? It was $12,000,000 last year.

Mr. McCANN: That information will be given when the bill is in committee.

Mr. CHURCH: It should be cut in two; the war is over.

CANADIAN ARMY

DISMISSAL OF EDITOR OF "MAPLE LEAF"—TABLING OF EDITORIALS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): During a statement by the Minister of National Defence on September 24 in connection with the dismissal of the editor of the Canadian overseas army newspaper *Maple Leaf*, he promised to have the editorials in question placed on *Hansard* as

soon as possible. Will the minister be good enough to inform the house if he has received the documents in question, and, if so, when we may expect that they will be tabled, so that they may appear in *Hansard?*

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of National Defence): I now have copies of the *Maple Leaf* containing the two editorials, and perhaps I might lay them on the table of the house.

FAR-EASTERN COMMISSION

CARRYING OUT OF TERMS OF JAPANESE SURRENDER —CANADIAN PARTICIPATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): I should like to ask this question of the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs. Has Canada been officially invited to join the new far-eastern commission which will direct the carrying out of the Japanese surrender terms? If so, has Canada accepted? If we have accepted, who will represent this nation on the commission, and where and when will the initial meeting of the commission be held?

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs): My information is that discussions looking to the establishment of a far-eastern commission have been under way in London for some time, but have not yet reached the stage where official invitations have been issued.

Mr. GRAYDON: There was some intimation in the press concerning Canada's joining that commission; that is what prompted my asking the question.

NEWSPRINT

PRESS REPORTS AS TO SUSPENSION OF IMPORTS TO BRITAIN FROM CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. News dispatches seem to indicate that the British government has decided to suspend importations of newsprint from Canada. Has the Canadian government received any intimation officially or unofficially from the British government on this point? If so, what steps are being taken by the government to insure the continuance of this trade?

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I am grateful to the hon. member for having given me notice of the question. Although the government has received no official notification of this situation, we in the Department of Trade and Commerce have been notified of it unofficially and indirectly. We are now discussing the matter with the United Kingdom government. My department is fully aware of the importance of this matter, and is anxiously looking into the situation.

May I say we are not so deeply concerned with the immediate situation as with the long-term market considerations. As is well known generally, there is at the present time a much greater market for newsprint than we can supply. However, as I have said, we are going into this matter carefully with the United Kingdom government in the long-term interest.

MARSHAL ZHUKOV

INQUIRY AS TO VISIT TO CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Cariboo): I should like to ask a question of the Acting Prime Minister. It is my understanding from press reports that Marshal Gregory Zhukov is visiting America, and that he will be officially received in New York on Thursday. Is it the intention of the Canadian government to invite this distinguished warrior to visit Canada?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): That question was asked a few days ago. My reply at that time was that the government had no official information respecting Marshal Zhukov's visit. I am sorry that I have not been following the newspapers, and therefore I am not aware of what the hon. member has just said to the house. No plans have been made for extending any invitation to visit Canada, but I shall discuss the matter with my colleagues.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

PACKING PLANTS—THREATENED DISPUTE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. A. CHARLTON (Brant): I should like to direct the attention of the Minister of Labour to a matter of vital and immediate concern to the farmers of Canada. In view of the already congested conditions in packing plants across Canada, is the government considering any action to avert a possible labour dispute at present threatening this industry?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): I am informed that the situation is well known to the provincial authorities under whose jurisdiction this matter would come. I assume that both employers and employees will avail themselves of the machinery established for dealing with matters of the kind.

NANAIMO MINE WORKERS—MEAT RATIONING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. R. PEARKES (Nanaimo): Has the attention of the Minister of Labour been directed to a strike of the united mine workers at Nanaimo in demand for double meat rations? Will the government reconsider the question of allowing men who work in strenuous labour projects such extra rations?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): I want to thank my hon. friend for giving me notice of the question. I am aware of the strike at Nanaimo, and also of the strikes in Alberta and at the Crowsnest Pass. I believe that 400 are involved at Nanaimo, out of a total of about 9,000. Their demand appears to be for a double supply of meat under the rationing system. I would also like to tell the hon. member that the attitude of the men is in contradiction of the advice given them by the leaders of district 18 of the United Mine Workers of America.

The Department of Labour already has a man at Calgary, which is the headquarters for that district. We hope the good sense of the men will make them realize that the strike is ill advised, and that as a result they will return to work at the earliest possible opportunity.

STRIKE AT FORD MOTOR PLANT, WINDSOR

On the orders of the day:

Mr. FRED ROSE (Cartier): In view of the fact that the officials of the Ford Motor Company have refused to meet with members of the union, will the Minister of Labour tell the house what steps are contemplated to help bring this strike to an early conclusion?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): If the hon. member would direct his question to the people who are taking part in the dispute, and ask them what they are doing to bring this strike to a successful conclusion, it would be better. The Ford Motor company, rightly or wrongly—I think rightly—have raised objections to the pickets refusing to permit the management and clerical help to enter the plant. As a matter of fact the plant appears to be in a state of seige. I would ask my hon. friend, who comes from the good city of Montreal, whether he would have any objection if someone set up a picket around his house—remembering always that a Canadian's home is his castle.

As soon as the parties to the dispute come to an agreement I shall be very glad to sit down with the minister of labour of Ontario to make an attempt to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion.

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE

PARTICIPATION OF CANADA—POSSIBILITY OF INCLUDING FEMALE REPRESENTATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Labour arising out of a statement he made on Friday afternoon, when he set out the personnel who would attend the international labour conference at Paris on October 15. In view of the fact that on practically every other delegation there is a woman representative, and having regard to the fact that at this conference social and employment problems will be to the fore, was consideration given to the appointment of a woman as a representative from Canada, and if so, why was a woman not appointed?

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not see any urgency in the hon. member's question. It should be put on the order paper.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I bow to Your Honour's ruling; this, however is a matter which concerns women's organizations across the country, and one which can be decided only at this time, because the conference meets on October 15.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member's question may be one of great importance, but that does not mean that there is any urgency.

FARM IMPLEMENTS

PERMITS FOR PURCHASE OF TRACTORS OR OTHER FARM MACHINERY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. A. ROSS (Souris): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Finance arising from an article which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* of September 29, stating that farm implements are no longer rationed. Is it not necessary to procure a permit in order to purchase tractors or other farm machinery?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): That question should be placed on the order paper. I had no notice of it.

MEAT RATIONING

GRAVENHURST SANATORIUM

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. H. FERGUSON (Simcoe North): I should like to ask the Acting Prime Minister whether meat rationing is in effect at Gravenhurst sanatorium at the present time.

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Meat rationing is in effect everywhere.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I say to the hon. gentleman that I do not see any urgency in his question.

Mr. FERGUSON: It may be a case of life and death.

WAR AND DEMOBILIZATION

PROVISION FOR APPROPRIATION OF $1,365,000,000 FOR WAR PURPOSES, DEMOBILIZATION, PROMOTION OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY, ETC.

The house resumed from Friday, September 28, consideration of the motion of Mr. Ilsley that the house go into committee to consider a resolution to grant to His Majesty certain sums of money for the carrying out of measures deemed necessary or advisable in consequence of the war.

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (Macleod): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak on this resolution, although I did have it in mind that I might ask a few questions when the house had resolved itself into committee of the whole. However, the statement made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) before leaving for other parts of the world, and the statement of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) which followed in respect to this resolution, along with the subsequent debate, has led me to desire to say just a word.

I think we should recognize that this resolution is important. It asks for permission to call upon the Canadian people for the tidy sum of $1,365,000,000. There was a day when a few million dollars used to stagger us, but now we have reached the stage of astronomical figures; we talk in terms of billions, and it does not seem to bother us. The wide variety of subjects which this resolution covers means that this money can be raised and spent for almost anything the government may desire to spend it on. It may involve even diplomatic relations; it may involve matters of international trade and commerce, the setting up of diplomatic staffs in other parts of the world, and so forth.

I recognize that Canada does not live in a world by itself. Throughout the past few years Canada has gradually come to be recognized as one of the leading nations of the world, at least one of the leading small nations. I am not going to say that some credit is not due to the present Prime Minister in that respect, but I am afraid that when it comes to Canada's position in the world, particularly in the future world, sometimes the subject is talked of with some gloss and rather glibly, and terms are used that have not a great deal of reality. For instance, we hear from many sources, not the least being the lips of the Prime Minister, from time to time that we must cooperate in order to bring about a world community of nations. The words "cooperate", "cooperation" and "good will" are very agreeable terms to use. Perhaps I shall deal with them a little later.

There is another word that is used quite often in a glib fashion, and that is "aggression". When most people talk of aggression they always fancy that it is some other nation that is responsible for the aggression, just as though Germany and Italy and Japan, who just happened to be our enemies in war, are the only aggressors in the world. We must be realistic in the use of these terms.

Another word used quite often is "nationalism". Every man believes in his own country, but when he attempts to put his own country in order, or declares publicly that he believes his first duty is to his own country, he is immediately branded as an isolationist or an ultra-nationalist. Then the old propaganda machine gets going and the mighty and powerful propagandists lash out with their lying tongues against him. Social Crediters have been roasted for their stand, but what they really stand for is readiness to cooperate with the world, but at the same time giving to Canada what rightfully belongs to her.

The Prime Minister was in Edmonton not so many months ago. It happened to be during a political campaign, and I know that what is said during a political campaign always must be taken with a grain of salt. But it was the Prime Minister of Canada who was speaking. As he was in Edmonton, the capital city of Alberta, he could not leave alone the Social Crediters who have occupied seats in this house for almost the last ten years. His speech was recorded by the Canadian Press. By the way, before he attacked Alberta he took a nice little tap at a gentleman by the name of John Bracken. He said:

> I have not been devoting my time as organizer of a political party.

Of course we know what he meant. What had he been doing?

> I wiped out politics when this war began.

That is quite a statement.

An hon. MEMBER: A rich one.

Mr. HANSELL: A rich statement. I really think he was joking with himself when he said that. He went on then to say what the Liberals believed in contradistinction to what we in this corner of the house have proclaimed in this house and out of it. He said:

> The Liberals believe in and are determined to work to their utmost for the greatest measure of effective cooperation among the nations to keep the peace and to promote trade and industry, while the Social Credit party seem determined to uphold what they describe as national sovereignty in its most extreme form.

That is a timely statement. Mr. King went on to say:

> Social Credit members of parliament have consistently ignored the vital necessity of external trade to the prosperity and welfare of Canada, and particularly of Alberta.

Mr. BLACKMORE: A complete lie!

Mr. HANSELL: Yes; nothing was further from the truth than that statement is.

Let me deal for a moment with this charge that we are ultra-nationalists, that the Social Credit party seem "determined to uphold what they describe as national sovereignty in its most extreme form."

Let me ask, Mr. Speaker, what sovereignty is? Sovereignty simply means the freedom of the individual. It means the freedom of the individual to act as an individual soul in his own right and in his own sphere, free from any big bosses at the top. Sovereignty means that a municipality should be able to act freely within its own sphere and that a province should be able to act according to its own will within its own sphere. Sovereignty means that Canada as a nation should be absolutely free to act as its will chooses within its own sphere. That is what we as Social Crediters have been saying. That is what we believe national sovereignty to mean, and I ask, would any man stand up in this house and say that there is anything wrong with that? You may call me an isolationist, a nationalist, if you like; but personally I am proud to be a Canadian. Personally I think that the duty of members of parliament is to tell the people of this country that our first duty is towards them as Canadians—and if that is being a nationalist, then call us nationalists and we shall be proud of it.

The Prime Minister said that we consistently ignored the vital necessity of external trade to the prosperity and welfare of Canada, and particularly of Alberta. The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that over the years we have disagreed with the Prime Minister's particular policy of seeking world markets as the only solution of our internal problems. That is where we have differed with the Prime Minister. I do not like to bring in the hungry thirties, because the term and the references have been worn almost threadbare. But where was the Prime Minister and his government in those days when Canada was richly favoured with a vast abundance of good things, when we had almost everything our hearts could desire, when goods were piled upon our shelves and in our warehouses and in our stores, and yet the people were virtually beggars? What was the aim of the Prime Minister's foreign policy then? He looked around for foreign markets. He said to the world, in effect: Come along, you nations, we have many good things to sell to you here; will you buy?

We might have crept up behind the Prime Minister and pulled his coat-tails and said to him: Mr. Prime Minister, look around. If he had looked around he would have seen thousands of people in Canada on relief and in a state of malnutrition or starvation. What we were trying to do was to pull the Prime Minister's coat-tails a little harder so that he would see these people and so that we could say to him: What are you going to do about these people? Our policy was that you do not have to be entirely dependent upon foreign markets to be able to distribute the goods we have in Canada to our own needy people. The difference between the two parties was this: The Prime Minister wanted to sell Canada to the rest of the world, while the Social Crediters wanted to give Canada to the Canadian people. If that is what the Prime Minister means by saying that we are disinterested in foreign trade, then I will accept the charge; I do not mind it a bit. But I say to hon. members that what we were trying to tell the Prime Minister was this: We can offer our surpluses to the world, certainly we can, and yet at the same time by proper management of our monetary system we can also give to the Canadian people one of the highest standards of living in the world.

The world trade policy of the Prime Minister was simply this, to use a homely illustration. It does not matter how many eggs we have to fry; we must first feed the whole world with eggs before we can be permitted to fry our own. That was just about the Prime Minister's position with respect to foreign trade.

Of course, on that occasion the Prime Minister also had to tell the people of Alberta why we were not included on the San Francisco delegation. I do not say that he stated it as baldly as that. This is what he said, and I am quoting from the same dispatch:

Mr. King said it was true Social Credit members voted for participation in the San Francisco conference, but their position was hedged about with qualifications. He quoted John Blackmore, Social Credit house leader, as saying the only voices raised against the proposals for the San Francisco conference had been those of Social Credit members.

What does the Prime Minister expect from members of parliament? Does he expect us to sit here in our chairs, which apparently we are not to be allowed to take home with us, and to acquiesce in all that he says?

Mr. BLACKMORE: Be little yes-men.

Mr. HANSELL: Yes; does he expect that? If he does, here is one group that he is going to be sadly disappointed in. Did not the Prime Minister say that he wanted the views of the various parties in the house? Well, we gave him our views, and here is something for other groups to think about. I want you to notice the way his statement reads:

He quoted John Blackmore, Social Credit house leader, as saying the only voices raised against the proposals for the San Francisco conference had been of Social Credit members.

Therefore, says he in effect, I will take on my delegation only those who will not oppose me; the only ones that I want with me are those who will say "yes." That evidently is the truth of the situation, based upon the Prime Minister's own statement. I think other groups in the house should resent that statement. If they do not, they lay themselves open to the charge of being yes-men to the Prime Minister of Canada, who perhaps in the end became yes-man to the world's big power shots.

Mr. KNOWLES: The hon. member will recall that the leader of the C.C.F. group voted against the government on the question of the admission of Argentina.

Mr. GRAYDON: No, he did not.

Mr. HANSELL: I take cognizance of that fact.

Mr. GRAYDON: But he did not.

Mr. MacINNIS: He voted against it, anyway, to the extent that he was able.

Mr. GRAYDON: He did not vote against it.

Mr. KNOWLES: All I am asking the hon. member to do is to recognize that the leader of this group was not a yes-man.

Mr. BLACKMORE: He surely was, before he went away.

Mr. HANSELL: He was not on the question of Argentina. But I was going to say that I regard that as a very minor point indeed, because there were other nations which were seeking admission to the San Francisco conference. Let me ask this: Did the same man who objected to one nation raise his voice when the recognized government of Poland were not admitted to the conference?

Mr. JAQUES: No, he did not.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Why?

Mr. HANSELL: There is a principle involved there. However, I did not intend to get into that discussion.

An hon. MEMBER: Neither did they.

Mr. HANSELL: The Prime Minister goes on:

The people of this province who have taken so large a part in the achievement of victory do not, I am sure, want the fruits of victory thrown away in political isolationism and economic nationalism.

We want to nail that charge to the wall as a consummate lie. We never did want to throw victory away by any stand we ever took, and that the people recognize this is shown by the fact that we are the only party in the house every one of whose house members was returned in the last election.

Here is another term which is glibly used. You know, if a person rises anywhere in Canada, particularly in a public place, and especially on the floor of this house, and criticizes anything that Russia does, at once he calls down upon his head the anathemas of the red propagandists who saturate nearly all our worth-while institutions, and he is labelled a fascist. Yes, that is the term which is hung on him. Well, I am not so particularly concerned about what I am called. What I am interested in is what I am, and what I am and what I am called are two different things.

In the first place—and I am saying this because I am leading up to another point—I am a Christian. Not because I was born in England or am a citizen of Canada. I am a Christian because I have explicit and simple faith in the redeeming grace of Almighty God. That is first. Second, I am a Canadian. Being a Christian I must speak the truth in soberness; and being a Canadian I must be loyal to Canada, my country and to the people of Canada.

What I have said brings me to my next point, which relates to this matter of "world cooperation". World cooperation, yes; would anyone rise in this house and say he did not believe in world cooperation? Of course he would not. Would anyone rise and say he was not prepared to work towards world cooperation? Of course he would not. But we

must be realistic when we use these terms—"world cooperation", "good will", "world community", "the fuller life", and so forth and so on. For cooperation is not a one way street; it must work two ways. The fact of the matter is that there are two great philosophies struggling for expression and bidding for world recognition. We can talk about a world community and world cooperation, but wherever the world's diplomats meet, be it at San Francisco, Bretton Woods, Dumbarton Oaks, Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam or anywhere else, the one big question is, must God have His way in the world, or must those forces of anti-God have their way in the world? We are not selling peanuts when we go to these great conferences where the world's mighty men meet. Behind the scenes of human activity the greatest battle of the ages is going on. It is a battle for the destiny of worlds of men and nations; it is a battle between the forces of righteousness and the forces of evil. Now when it comes to a matter of cooperation, good cannot cooperate with evil. You had better put that down as a fundamental principle; it cannot be done. That which is Christian cannot cooperate with that which is anti-Christian. Do we want a Christian democracy, or do we want a world with God ruled out? That is the question that should be answered.

The other day the Prime Minister made a statement in the house—and while I am a severe critic of the Prime Minister in his political actions—I do have some respect for him just the same; I am not going to say I have not. I believe he is sincere and desires to do that which is right. Mark you, I will say this too: what I have already said about these forces the Prime Minister knows. My own personal view is that he is cognizant of these things and that he is not insincere in his recognition of them. I do not know, but I do not believe that he told us all that was in his mind when he made his statement in the house the other day.

Mr. FRASER: That would make some reading.

Mr. HANSELL: Well, I do not think that I need any levity at this particular moment. I mean what I say. I believe the Prime Minister is conscientious in respect to those forces, shall I say, of the unknown world, if I can put it that way, and I believe he wants to do the right thing. His intentions may be good. This is what he said in his statement the other day as reported at page 492 of *Hansard*:

> The task is not one of restoring the world as we knew it before the war.

I am inclined to think that he is going off into ethereal platitudes here, because we could ask him in what way the world has changed and I do not think that he could give us an answer. He says:

> The task is not one of restoring the world as we knew it before the war. That world has gone. The collective task is to get the new world moving along paths that will lead to peace, happiness and the general welfare.

Then farther on he says:

> I feel that I should see for myself something of the changed world in which Canada must make her way and take her part.

It is a very pleasant thing to talk about a changed world, but personally I cannot see that the fundamental and underlying principles that govern this world have changed at all. The only things that have changed so far as I can see, are the geographical and political boundaries. Apart from that, the world philosophies are still intact. The method by which we carry on our foreign trade is still intact. You may make a little adjustment here or a little adjustment there, but there is a great attempt to solidify the world trading facilities under one great and powerful international body, which is attempting to put us back on the gold standard, whereby no nation will be free to trade as it shall choose to trade unless it goes through those channels. And in that regard Canada is in danger of selling out her sovereignty.

How can we have what I should like to call a world Christian democracy? Can a Christian democracy cooperate in any way with totalitarianism? Personally I do not think it can. Jesus denounced the scribes and pharisees as hypocrites, but they were no more hypocrites than our ultra-internationalists who assume a sort of self-righteous attitude, and with their platitudinous phrases about world cooperation attempt to play into the hands of a programme to set up one huge world dictatorship. Can we cooperate with totalitarianism? Can we, as a democracy, cooperate with dictatorship? Dictatorship and totalitarianism mean the loss of freedom. Totalitarianism means force. It means compulsion; it means war; it means murder; it means plunder; it means political and economic gansterism. Therefore I ask the question, can any Christian democracy—if we put down as a fundamental thesis that we are one—cooperate with that?

I hold in my hand a clipping which contains the statement of a great man. This man, speaking before a certain body, said:

> With many of you, I hoped that Russia would work out its own problems and that their government would eventually become a peace-loving

popular government with a free ballot which would not interfere with the integrity of its neighbours.

That hope is to-day either shattered or put away in storage against a better day.

The Soviet Union, as a matter of practical fact, is a dictatorship as absolute as any other dictatorship in the world.

Who said that? None other than President Roosevelt, speaking before the American youth conference in Washington in 1940.

What is the record of this totalitarian state?

1. This state provoked, directed and supported civil war and aggression in Spain. They may have claimed the right to do so, I do not know; nevertheless that is what they did.

2. This state concluded a treaty of non-aggression with Germany in August 1939, an act which enabled Hitler to launch his offensive. Perhaps they will say they had a legal right to do so. I am not arguing the point.

3. From September, 1939, until June, 1941, this totalitarian state supplied Germany with various essential materials such as food and oil products.

4. On September 17, 1939, this state committed an act of aggression against Poland, thus violating a treaty of non-aggression concluded with that country.

5. Having occupied part of Poland, this state deported Polish citizens into various remote parts of Russia and confined them to concentration and labour camps under most inhuman conditions, comparable to those prevailing in German concentration camps.

6. Following the partition of Poland this state committed acts of aggression against Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia, deprived them of their independence, and subjected the populations to a rule of terror. Soviet Russia waged a war of aggression against Finland, violating the existing treaties.

7. In all countries of eastern and southeastern Europe Soviet authorities are behaving in a way which does not differ from that of nazi Germany.

I have placed those seven points on record and I ask: Can we as a democracy cooperate with that? Just the other day I picked up the daily paper on my way down to the house and read an Associated Press despatch from Warsaw. I will not read it all, but here is part of it:

War-ravaged Poland is experiencing one of the greatest migrations in her long turbulent history, and two bridges across the Vistula here are the teeming gateways to the east and the west. . . .

[Mr. Hansell.]

From early morning until midnight there is a steady stream of men, women and children carrying all their worldly possessions strapped to their backs, in bags, in suitcases and in sacks.

All faces show lines of strain and work. Scarcely one, whether he is going east or west, has the slightest idea of where he will finally settle. They only know this has to be done, and they tramp on.

I ask: can we cooperate with that? I hear also glibly stated the term "liberation"—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. I must inform the hon. gentleman that his time has expired.

Mr. HANSELL: Well, Mr. Speaker, I suppose I shall have to stop. Even if I were given permission to go on it would take me another two hours at least to say all I should like to say, so I shall abide by your ruling. I expect I shall be able to say what I have to say at another time, but I want the house to know that I am not through with this subject.

Mr. STANLEY KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, thus far this session it seems to have been a custom for speakers to say they had not intended to take part in the debate, and then to proceed to indicate that, as it may be said of me, they had always intended to do so. I will not make that commonplace beginning, but I will say that I would not take the time of the house at this point if I did not feel that the main matter about which I wish to speak is of very great importance. In introducing the resolution now before the house the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) called attention briefly to the fact that he is asking for an amount of $25,000,000 as a further sum to be set aside for the united nations relief and rehabilitation administration, and it is mainly in reference to the work of UNRRA that I felt I should like to say a few words at this time.

During the years of the war hon. members in all parts of this house recognized the indivisibility of the common cause, and on that basis we were prepared to vote huge sums of money for mutual aid and various other joint purposes, so that we might play our part in the struggle against the common enemy. The thought in my mind, Mr. Speaker, is that we now have before us a common cause, equally indivisible, which is, and I say this advisedly, infinitely greater than was the cause of war. I refer to the cause of peace. The peace we must now win is not merely the absence of conflict, though to achieve that may in itself be a

real task. To bring about peace calls for some positive steps. We must tackle immediately the rebuilding of a world that has been ravaged and torn by war, and the task of feeding and restoring to some measure of health and strength peoples all over the world who are suffering terribly from the effects of war.

The hon. member who preceded me (Mr. Hansell) had something to say—in a vein with which I do not agree, though I will not argue the point just now—about freedom, a concept dear to us all. Freedom is indivisible. So long as there is bondage or suffering, imprisonment, hardship, poverty and hunger anywhere in the world, we are not free, no matter how much we may feel that way here in this democratic institution. It is my belief and my earnest hope that this nation, which rose so well to the challenge of the last six years, will rise to the challenge of the peace and do what in my view has not yet been done—that is, put some real life and spark into the noble cause which was launched under those five letters, UNRRA.

Canada made a glorious start. At the first meeting of the council of the governing body, held in Montreal a year ago last month, the director general, the Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, said:

> It is peculiarly fitting that we meet in Canada. This nation has been a tower of strength in working out the arrangements for providing relief and rehabilitation supplies and services. The parliament has made available the full resources asked in the UNRRA financial plan —one per cent of the national income in the year ending June 30, 1943.

From that Mr. Lehman went on to emphasize the point that Canada had given leadership and had pioneered in the concept of UNRRA. The document I have in my hand lists the members of the Canadian delegation. We are proud of the fact that Hon. L. B. Pearson is the permanent chairman of the council. Other representatives of Canada at the meeting in Montreal were the present Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Claxton), the present Speaker of the House of Commons (Mr. Fauteux), Professor H. F. Angus, Mrs. R. F. McWilliams of Winnipeg, Manitoba, and Doctor J. G. Bouchard, assistant deputy minister of agriculture, together with an outstanding panel of advisers and assistants. Perhaps many hon. members will recall the publicity which was given to the meeting of the council in Montreal last fall. I know it sent a thrill through my being to listen to some of the radio broadcasts which were made at that time. I felt that here we were, before the war was over, beginning something that would carry over into the peace the crusading spirit, the realization that we stand or fall together, which was so outstanding during the years of the war.

In his remarks the other day the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) said that during the course of this debate there would be opportunity for discussion of matters relating to UNRRA. I take it from that that one of the ministers will make a report to the house. I know beforehand that when the report is made it will be glowing in its tribute to the work that has been done. My contention is that no matter how glowing that report may be, hon. members will have to admit that we have not tackled the work of UNRRA with anything like the spirit of determination with which we tackled the tasks of the war.

When war broke out we had one ministry of defence, but before long we found it necessary to have three. Then we added to that the ministry of munitions and supply. But there is no separate ministry for the tasks confronting UNRRA, and I suggest that this is a point the government might well take into consideration.

Frankly, the measure of the capacity of our civilization to survive, the possibility of our averting another war, and building a peace that is something more than simply an absence of conflict, depends upon our ability to arise now and do the job of relief and rehabilitation which must be done in the war-ravaged countries of the world, particularly on the continent of Europe.

Hon. members have read of the agony, the suffering and starvation prevalent in the old world. The Minister of Finance, in the impassioned plea he made last week for the support of meat rationing, told us something respecting the needs overseas. These conditions have been portrayed to us on the screen, and right now because of the national clothing campaign which is in progress a certain amount of publicity is being given to this subject. All these efforts are commendable, but they do not begin to scratch the surface of the problem. They do not reveal the kind of imagination we ought to have with respect to the seriousness of this problem of helping to rebuild a world that has been torn by six years of war.

The government might consider the possibility of establishing a separate ministry to deal with this whole problem. At the very least we should have a separate ministry of external affairs, which might deal with these matters in addition to many other problems that now require the attention of a separate department. Such a ministry could give a lead to the people of Canada, one to which

I am sure they would respond, and one which would help them realize that this challenge is just as great as was the challenge of war.

I was pleased to-day to hear the Minister of Finance, in his capacity of Acting Prime Minister, table an order in council setting up a Canadian information service. In saying this I do not necessarily approve the extent to which we now have government by order in council, but I do approve the step taken. I know—at least I suspect—that my hon. friends to the right who belong to the Progressive Conservative party will say that this new organization is just a continuation of the war-time information board, and the chances are that they will oppose it.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: The hon. member is not a mind reader.

Mr. KNOWLES: Well, I shall leave it to them; but it is not long ago that the hon. member for Lake Centre was asking that the wartime information board be discontinued. I take it that board has now ended its days and has been replaced by the Canadian information service. It would seem that the name is modelled after a similar set-up in Great Britain, where the name "British information service" is used. I hope the government will not listen too carefully to the pleas made by hon. members to my right against these public information institutions. In a democracy we cannot have too much information, and the activities of the wartime information board were all to the good.

In my view such institutions as the national film board and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation should not be limited by suspicion on the part of some on the opposition side of the house that they are used for purposes of political propaganda. Rather they should be given a freer hand to increase the dissemination of information of all kinds, not only in other countries but throughout Canada as well.

One task I should like to see the government give the new Canadian information service, the film board and the CBC, would be one in which those organizations would have a free hand to place before the Canadian people the importance of the task of rehabilitating war-torn Europe. In other words, let us get on with the job of supporting wholeheartedly the work of UNRRA, which got off to such a good start, but which, it seems to me, has been allowed to bog down under officialdom and red tape.

Not long ago Professor Earl G. Harrison, who is dean of the university of Pennsylvania law school, and a former immigration commissioner of the United States, was appointed by President Truman to act on a special committee to investigate conditions under which people are living in Europe, with special reference to the plight of the Jewish people. In his report, which was published, in the New York *Times* of Sunday, September 30, two days ago, Professor Harrison had a number of comments to make about UNRRA. The report is a lengthy one, and I shall not load *Hansard* with quotations from it. Professor Harrison makes it clear that UNRRA is trying to do a good job, but that it is handicapped by lack of competent and efficient personnel in the areas in which its work is being carried on. He points out further that it is hampered by a lack of the kind of cooperation which should exist between UNRRA and the military authorities. The whole picture is one of a noble idea failing for lack of the support it should have. All of this underlies the point I am trying to make, namely, that we have not yet had the imagination to see in UNRRA just as great a challenge as we had in the war itself. In fact, the challenge is really far greater.

I am not criticizing the government for anything it has done in connection with UNRRA, and most certainly I am not criticizing the Minister of Finance when he asks for $25 million. That sum is far too small, and my criticism is that we in Canada have not done enough for this organization. It has been treated as a sort of step-child in the hope that somehow it will grow up and be able to do the job assigned to it. The other day the Minister of Finance made this statement about the $25 million he is asking for UNRRA under the terms of the resolution now before the house. I quote from page 564 of *Hansard* for September 28:

> This is intended to enable us to furnish, before the end of our fiscal year, a portion of a second contribution to UNRRA, which the Canadian government has agreed to make, provided that the United States and other contributing nations will also make a second contribution.

I suppose that that is the way a minister of the crown would put it, and that is the way governments have to act. I do feel, however, that Canada should be not holding back in this fashion and saying; We will do so and so, provided that somebody else does his part.

The fate of civilization depends upon whether or not our generation has the imagination and the capacity to rehabilitate a world which we have had to tear apart by war. I plead with those in authority, with the government and with parliament, to face the seriousness of the question. I urge that we do our best not only here but in our constituencies and throughout the country to

arouse interest in UNRRA and other related activities. We have here some of the most glorious opportunities for service ever presented to any generation.

I take second place to no one in my concern for the people of Canada. Hon. members will recognize the persistence with which I have pleaded the lot of old age pensioners, and all citizens of this country whose problems need to be fought on the floor of this house. Hon. members will recall the fights I make for housing, and for the improvement of many adverse conditions found here in Canada. But alongside of that I emphasize the fact that it is useless for us to try to build up our own standard of living and our own situation here in this dominion if we are to let the world go to rack and ruin, as will happen if something is not done about living conditions in the countries that have been torn by war.

As I indicated when I rose, in speaking of the plight of the peoples in Europe I took as my motif the fact that none of us is free so long as there is bondage or slavery anywhere. I want to say a word especially about the plight of the Jewish people in Europe. I have referred already to the Harrison report which was made to President Truman, the full text of which appeared in last Sunday's New York *Times*. Professor Harrison summed up the plight of the Jewish people in Europe at the present time when he said to President Truman:

> As matters now stand, we appear to be treating the Jews as the nazis treated them, except that we do not exterminate them. They are in concentration camps in large numbers under our military guard instead of S.S. troops. One is led to wonder whether the German people, seeing this, are not supposing that we are following or at least condoning nazi policy.

That is a terrible statement. Professor Harrison gives the details of what he meant. He relates stories of the barbed wire behind which many Jews are still languishing. He describes the horrible plight of these people, hungry, displaced, not knowing where their friends and relatives are, many of them without medical care or adequate clothing. Some of these people, to their chagrin, are forced to wear German S.S. uniforms, with the result that they are subject to all kinds of abuse. Hon. members will have noticed from the press that President Truman was greatly exercised over this report and that he has given orders to General Eisenhower to take immediate steps to see that something is done about the whole situation.

It does seem to some of us that it is a sad state of affairs that this race of people, who have been the pawns of so many cross-currents and conflicts down through the history of mankind, should once again, just at a time when we thought we had finished with the horrors of war and were about to begin to build a new world, find themselves facing such hopeless and pitiful circumstances. I feel that I am only being human in rising in this parliament of Canada to express the hope that something will be done without delay to provide relief for these people from the sufferings they are undergoing.

Professor Harrison makes a number of recommendations in his report. The one he makes most strongly in that President Truman use his good offices to secure the abrogation of the MacDonald white paper of 1939 which prohibited, with a slight exception for five years, Jewish immigration to Palestine. Those who have been following the press on this point will know what has happened in the past few days. They will know that President Truman and Prime Minister Attlee have been in correspondence on this whole matter. We all recognize what a thorny question it is because of the position the Arabs are taking with respect to any change in Palestine policy. Incidentally I hold in my hand copies of an exchange of telegrams between the Mufti of Jerusalem and Hitler regarding the war in north Africa, made at a time when the armies of Rommel were rolling westward. I should like to quote the last sentence in one of the Mufti's telegrams to Hitler. It reads:

> The Arab people will further continue to fight on your side against the common enemy up to ultimate victory.

I suggest that these are not people to whom we should be applying any policy of appeasement; yet I am not one to belittle the tremendous problem facing those who are concerned about the situation in the Balkans, the Mediterranean and the near east. The whole question is one that should lie heavily on the conscience of the world. Hon. members will recognize my wholehearted support of the government now in power in Great Britain, and in saying that I speak for the whole of this group. But we insist that the British government must carry out its pledge to re-open Palestine to Jewish immigration. The leader of this group, the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), to-day issued a press release in which he said in part:

> The C.C.F. has officially stated its opposition to the unfair and discriminatory white paper. The permission for fifteen hundred Jews to enter Palestine monthly is pathetically inadequate for their needs. They must be allowed to enter their national homeland in larger numbers. Only in Palestine have they been permitted to build a progressive and cooperative society. Their record there, in terms of both social and economic justice, speaks for itself.

The C.C.F. has sent cables to the Right Honourable Clement Attlee, Prime Minister of Great Britain, and to Morgan Phillips, secretary of the British Labour party, urging that the British government give every consideration to a revised white paper which will provide European Jewry with the freedom to migrate to, and live in the mandated territory of Palestine.

The leader of this group sent that out on our behalf, and I take this occasion to say that we believe the hands of the British government need to be strengthened in this matter. We feel they are right in saying that any action which might result in trouble—I believe such threats are only a bluff, but the possibility has to be faced—should be taken as a joint responsibility by the British people and the people of the United States, perhaps indeed by the peoples of all the united nations. It is because I feel that the British government should have its hands strengthened in its effort to do the right thing in connection with this matter that I raise my voice in this parliament. I dare to assume that most hon. members will agree with me that the doors of Palestine should be opened, and that these people, who, God knows, have suffered down through the years far more than any human beings should have had to suffer, should get some relief from the terrible conditions which they have had to face in Europe during these last few years, and which, sad to say, appear to exist in Europe even at the present time.

I hope that the government of this country will interest itself in this whole matter and, along with the United States, declare to the British government its readiness to stand with them in connection with any policy that that government feels it should take for improving the position of these people.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Would the hon. member go so far as to say that Canada should provide soldiers to fight the Arabs to protect these people, if it should come to that?

Mr. KNOWLES: That is the kind of question which it is difficult to answer because it is hypothetical, for I firmly believe that the position taken by the Arabs is one of bluff.

Mr. MERRITT: Is the hon. member aware that only within the last week the British government has had to send a parachute division to Palestine?

Mr. KNOWLES: I am quite aware of that. I am also aware of the complications that have arisen because of the position taken by certain sections in India with respect to this whole question. I could indulge in a cross-fire argument, Mr. Speaker, but that is something I am anxious to avoid at this time.

[Mr. Knowles.]

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I was not being critical at all.

Mr. KNOWLES: I fully recognize that. My reason for trying to avoid argument is that I am trying to put this matter on such a plane that it will command unanimous support. The hon. gentlemen who have questioned me know what their own answers would be, but even so I detected in their words a note of sympathy with the position I am taking, and I pass that sympathy along to the government of the day.

I want to speak for a moment or two about another matter which, although on first thought, it may seem to be unrelated to what I have been discussing, is closely connected with this whole question of our playing some part in relieving the suffering that the war has left in its wake around the world. We cannot play our part simply by a national clothing collection such as we are having this month, no matter how much effort we put into that campaign. If we are to play our part in helping to rehabilitate war-torn Europe we should seek to maintain the level of production in this country at its war-time height, and so I urge again upon the government that it reconsider its whole policy of reconversion and its plans with regard to post-war employment. As I study the government's plans and try to see their point of view, it seems to me that they are thinking too much in terms of the needs of this country solely on the basis of the income that our people have or may have during the next few years. We should be planning our production not only to meet the needs of the people of this country, but also to be able to render some real contribution to the rehabilitation of war-torn countries.

In that connection I think, for example, of a plant like MacDonald Brothers aircraft factory in Winnipeg, which instead of being more or less idle to-day might be used for the making of prefabricated houses for shipment to these countries. It is a tremendous undertaking, Mr. Speaker, if one lets his imagination play upon it, for us to make the kind of contribution that I envisage. But I come back to this. What we undertook in the war was a tremendous task. If the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply had been told in 1939 that under their direction, if you want to put it that way, we would be producing in this country the volume of goods and services and munitions and supplies that we did produce in 1943 and 1944, I doubt that they would have believed it possible for us to do it. But it was undertaken because of the necessity of the task that lay before us. There is now the task of rebuilding

the world which we have torn asunder, and we now should be producing with the same determination that we displayed during the war. My contention is that the whole question of what shall be done with war plants, and our plans for reconversion, production and employment, should be worked out not just in terms of our own internal economy, but in terms also of what we can do to meet the needs of the world as they face us at the present time.

I might call to the attention of the government—I shall not take time to go into detail—the representations that have been made by both the major labour congresses in this country on reconversion and employment. I would urge upon the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply—I hope they will not think I am actuated by political considerations, because I am very serious—that Canada play its maximum part in producing sufficient goods and services to help rebuild the world and give us a chance to achieve the peace which we hope will be permanent after all the sacrifices we have gone through during these past six years.

Mr. BLACKMORE: May I ask by what means the hon. member proposes that the government should raise the money with which to buy the products of all these Canadian factories so as to render them available to the peoples of the world, perhaps through some such scheme as UNRRA?

Mr. KNOWLES: The government did not have much difficulty in raising the money, as the hon. member himself has often pointed out to the Minister of Finance, to purchase the supplies required for war. In fact, year after year when the Minister of Finance brought down his budget he simply borrowed the money that was required to balance the budget, partly from the chartered banks and partly from the Bank of Canada. The Minister of Finance himself said many a time—I note that he is in his seat and can correct me if I am wrong—that the huge expenditures of money we were making were not to be regarded as sums taken from a board which had to be put back, but were an index of our greatly increased production. When hon. members to my right and to my left have taunted the Minister of Finance about the size of the national debt, his reply has always been that if we would keep up our level of production we could handle any national debt that might develop under his financial leadership. I have my own ideas which I could go into if there were time, but I simply say that I think that the experience of the war years, even under a Liberal capitalist administration, has shown that it can be done if only we have the will. This is coming dangerously close to a political discussion, but I think hon. members will recognize from the tone of my remarks that I rose to-day not for such a purpose, but to speak on what seems to me is the task before us at this time, namely, that we should be gearing our economic activities, our production and our reconversion programme, not only to improving the standing of living in Canada, but also to playing our maximum part in the rebuilding of a war-torn world.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Would I be safe in assuming from the hon. member's reply that he would favour adding to the national debt of Canada at the colossal rate to which we have become accustomed during the war?

Mr. KNOWLES: The hon. member is not safe in assuming that at all. My quarrel with the Minister of Finance is that while I believe his declaration to be true that our huge war expenditures have been only an index of our increased production, he has permitted that index—simply a matter of figures—to be turned into additions to the national debt on which interest has to be paid for all time. That means taking a portion out of the national income each year from now on and giving it to a privileged few, which as I see it is completely unrealistic, and fails to recognize the basic factors in the production of goods and services, which are human labour and raw material.

I have had quite a bit to say about our producing and sending overseas supplies of one kind and another. There is one kind of material, however, which I hope Canada will stop sending to certain countries I could name. I confess, despite the explanations about it in the press which I have seen from the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon), to considerable concern over the shipment of aluminum to Spain this year. I am not going to make an issue out of it at this point, or debate it at length, but I want to put on record the fact of such shipment as it was contained in sessional paper 145 tabled yesterday by the Minister of Trade and Commerce in response to questions which I had placed on the order paper. In this return the minister indicates that from January 1 to August 31, 1945, Canada shipped aluminum in bars, blocks, ingots, sheets, et cetera, to Spain, in the amount of 4,408,500 pounds. That is the fifth largest quantity sent to the various countries to which we exported aluminum this year. I may make it a little plainer: we have exported aluminum to twenty countries thus far in 1945. The largest quantities have gone to the United Kingdom, the United States, Russia and

Switzerland, and the next largest is to Spain. Bearing in mind the political situation in Spain, and the experiences we have had with that country over the last number of years; bearing in mind too—I will try to say this with all the reserve of which I am capable, but I feel very deeply about it—the years past when we shipped scrap iron and other war materials to aggressor nations, I cannot but be deeply concerned that already we should be shipping this material, which is so useful in war, to a fascist nation. I hope that some member of the government will explain this, or, better still, indicate to us that it will be stopped. Let us this time refrain from sending war materials to any country which might use them for further aggression.

With that reservation, Mr. Speaker, I urge with all the power that I can that the government, parliament and the country put its shoulder to the wheel and get on with the tremendous task and the great opportunities which are presented to us in the aims and activities of UNRRA.

Mr. E. D. FULTON (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in this debate because I want to discuss one point which has already been raised; but before I come to that particular point, in view of the fact that a week-end has intervened since this debate started, and yesterday was private members' day, I crave the indulgence of hon. members while I run over some of the matters which have been raised, in order to make clear the subject with which I wish to deal.

In introducing this resolution the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) pointed out that we were being asked to approve the raising of a great deal of money, and at the present time the main purpose, as I understood it, was that the defence estimates might be got through.

The hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green) followed. Speaking, I might say, on behalf of the official opposition, he outlined the four principles which we feel should govern Canada in her attitude toward defence matters. The four principles, I should like to recall to hon. members, were: first, that Canada should maintain sufficient forces to guarantee the defence of Canada and also to enable us to fulfil whatever might be our commitments to the united nations organization; second, that the efficiency of those forces must be our prime consideration; third, that the forces must be allied with scientific developments; fourth, that there should be the maximum coordination of developments and practice with Great Britain and the United States in respect of our armed forces. Finally he suggested that there should be a parliamentary committee on defence along the lines of the military and naval affairs committees of the United States congress, in order that hon. members might be better informed as to the requirements for defence and keep the people of Canada better informed on these subjects.

The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), I am glad to say, supported in principle all the suggestions which had been outlined by the hon. member for Vancouver South. We had further talks from the leader of the Social Credit group in this house (Mr. Low) and from the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker), both of whom spoke in very fine terms of the prospects of peace under the united nations charter. The hon. member for Lake Centre directed the attention of the house to the question whether the moneys which we are to be asked to vote will be expended exclusively under orders in council under the terms of the emergency War Measures Act. He asked the specific question, is the war at an end? Do the provisions of the emergency War Measures Act govern all our actions? That is the point with which I wish to deal this afternoon.

I was going to base my stand on the statement that it is time, in my view, that we restore to parliament all its liberties and its privileges and recover in full the democratic system of government. I must confess that I had some doubts put into my mind in listening to the speech of the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker) when we were supposed to be discussing the question of the relief of settlers under the Soldiers Settlement Act, and he discussed Liberal candidates and how it was that he and the other Liberal members for Saskatchewan had been elected; how it was that the hon. member for Lake Centre was elected, and then the question of the size of families and the amounts of payments under the Family Allowances Act; and we even discussed—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must remind the hon. member that that question has been decided.

Mr. FULTON: I defer to your ruling. I was not trying to reopen the discussion; I was merely referring to it in connection with my own point. However, I will pass on to other matters.

Dealing directly with the question of whether or not we should allow ourselves to be governed under the provisions of the War Measures Act, I wish to refer again to the wording of that act. We find these words in section 6 of the act. I should like to explain

that after certain powers have been conferred, or perhaps after certain powers exercisable by the governor in council have been outlined in sections 3, 4 and 5 of the act, section 6 goes on to say:

> The provisions of the three sections last preceding shall only be in force during war, invasion, or insurrection, real or apprehended.

I wish to make it clear that it is only during war, invasion or insurrection that the powers exercisable under the emergency War Measures Act can be fairly invoked. How do we decide whether a state of war, invasion or insurrection exists? I shall refer hon. members to the provisions of section 2 of the act which reads as follows:

> The issue of a proclamation by His Majesty, or under the authority of the governor in council shall be conclusive evidence that war, invasion, or insurrection, real or apprehended, exists . . .

The section goes on to say that:

> . . . until by the issue of a further proclamation it is declared that the war, invasion, or insurrection no longer exists.

Therefore we are in this position, that the decision as to whether or not a state of war, invasion or insurrection exists is squarely up to the governor in council, a matter to be decided by the cabinet. I would direct the attention of the responsible ministers and of all hon. members to the fact that it is not a question of whether or not a state of emergency exists; there is no mention of emergency in the act in that connection. It is a question of whether or not a state of war, invasion or insurrection exists.

I should like to remind hon. members again that there is a great deal of significance attached to this question; because if it is decided that a state of war, invasion or insurrection exists, then certain things can be done by order in council, for instance, all the things which are to be done under the provisions of the bill, the resolution for which is now before the house. I should like to read the provisions of that resolution which are to be found at page 546 of *Hansard*:

> Hon. J. L. Ilsley (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following resolution:
>
> That it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide, *inter alia* . . .

I shall read only part of the resolution, but I should like to make it clear that the parts I am leaving out do not alter the sense.

> 1. That sums . . . be granted to His Majesty towards defraying any expenses . . . that may be incurred . . . under the authority of the governor in council . . . for
>
> (a) the security, defence, peace, order and welfare of Canada.

Those are very wide terms. Under the terms of the resolution there is very little that cannot be done by order in council. Consider the wording "the security, defence, peace, order and welfare of Canada". These words give to the cabinet even wider powers than are given to the dominion parliament under section 91 of the British North America Act. I should like to read the relevant words of section 91, which read as follows:

> It shall be lawful for the queen, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons . . .
>
> To enact these things:
>
> . . . to make laws for the peace, order, and good government of Canada.

We now have it "for the security, defence, peace, order and welfare of Canada." These powers are as wide as, in fact they are wider than, the powers originally given to parliament under the British North America Act. Further, the resolution contains these powers:

> . . . for the carrying out of any measure deemed necessary or advisable by the governor in council in consequence of the war.

If we allow that sort of thing to continue we are completely, and possibly for all time, surrendering the rights of parliament; we are giving to the governor in council powers for making and carrying out any measure deemed necessary or advisable in consequence of the war. That covers everything.

I again read from the terms of the resolution:

> For the expeditious demobilization of the Canadian armed forces.

That is to be carried out by order in council. Do we wish, Mr. Speaker—and I ask hon. members to consider this carefully—to entrust the cabinet with all the power to make every regulation with regard to demobilization? I submit that if we do so we are denying the democratic principle of responsible government. Under that system we are the ones who are supposed to decide on the validity or advisability of any measure introduced by the government of Canada, or any detail of the government of this country. Although under certain circumstances we may be justified in surrendering our responsibilities or handing over our responsibilities for a limited time, we are only justified in handing them over to those who by their attitude and actions show that they themselves are responsible persons and will safeguard the rights and privileges that we ourselves have put into their safekeeping. I suggest to the careful consideration of hon. members that we should not hand over the powers to make final and complete regulations for the de-

mobilization of our armed forces when the minister himself seems reluctant to assume the responsibility of making those regulations, when he seeks as he sought in this house on September 24 to hand over the responsibility to a general of the armed forces. I submit that is putting us in a position where, if we criticize the decisions taken, we are criticizing an officer overseas, not a responsible officer of the department, but an officer in charge of the armed forces. That is a denial of the principle of responsible government, and for my part I am not willing to hand over those responsibilities which I should exercise, if they are to be exercised in that manner.

In considering further the matter of demobilization of our armed forces I would ask this question: For whom did those forces fight, for the cabinet ministers, or for Canada? I think the answer is obvious, that they fought for Canada. Then, I suggest that it is up to us, the elected representatives of Canada and of those armed forces, to see to it that the regulations for their demobilization are approved by us before they are put into effect. If we adopt the other attitude I suggest we are going to allow all matters of defence policy to be determined by order in council.

Here I wish to refer to an incident which took place the other day. I should like to read an article which appeared in the Ottawa *Journal* of September 29, 1945. The dispatch is dated Vancouver, September 28, and reads:

> Canada's peace-time navy, "much larger" than before the war, will be divided evenly between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, it was announced here to-day by Rear Admiral V. C. Brodeur, R.C.N., commanding officer, Pacific coast.
>
> Admiral Brodeur said at a press conference the post-war navy will include cruisers, aircraft carriers, destroyers and frigates but no corvettes. Ships, men and training facilities would be divided fifty-fifty basis between the two coasts.

I will not read the whole dispatch, but this officer went on to describe in detail the constitution of the navy. This is the most complete statement of policy to have been made available to this house as yet on the subject of naval affairs; and this statement of policy came not from the responsible minister of the department or a responsible official, but from a naval officer in Vancouver, some three thousand miles away from this building, although the naval estimates were scheduled to come up first and the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green) had asked for an over-all statement of defence policy, which as yet he has not received. We were supposed to discuss and consider those estimates; that was our responsibility, but the only clue we are given is in this statement, made in Vancouver.

[Mr. Fulton.]

I realize that perhaps it does not do for a new member to come here and appear to lecture the house or responsible ministers of the crown, and I pause here to make sure to myself that I am not standing up here lecturing. I had certain ideas as to the responsibility of my job when I should come here, and as to the seriousness of that responsibility. I am surprised and alarmed to find that under the present set-up, so long as we have a continuation of this system of government by order in council, however well intentioned may be the motives behind those orders in council, I am not exercising my responsibility; and I feel that I cannot allow this situation to continue without bringing it to the attention of the other members of this house so that we may have an open and frank discussion on this matter and I may be informed in the net result as to whether or not I may have an overdeveloped sense of responsibility. I do not think I have, and that is why I am bringing this matter into the open.

To continue this discussion, this being the situation: the powers which I have described, and which appear in the terms of this resolution, being available to the government, to be exercised by order in council, with the serious consequences I have indicated in the matter of our own handing-over of responsibility, together with the fact that the existence of this situation depends upon the decision by the cabinet as to whether or not war, invasion or insurrection exists, I think we are entitled to call on the cabinet and on the responsible ministers to consider that question seriously and fairly. When the matter was brought up by the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) we saw in the attitude of the ministers of the crown indications that they have not considered it either seriously or fairly. The hon. member for Lake Centre read extracts from an opinion given by the council of the Canadian Bar Association. I should like to refresh the memory of hon. members by reading part of that opinion again:

> Your committee is of opinion that the state of war cannot and should not, even by the authority of a statute, be deemed to continue to exist when the war itself is over. Let us make the distinction here between the war emergency itself, which is the fact of a state of war, and an economic emergency which, though a consequence following the war, is not the war emergency itself. If the federal administration feel that there may exist, after the war, in relation to the economic condition of the country, a state of emergency of a most serious character, and national in scope, let them face the issue squarely, and submit to

parliament a new law, so as to affirm the existence, or the apprehension, and determine the exact nature, of that new emergency.

Hon. members will recall the attitude adopted by certain ministers of the crown when the hon. member for Lake Centre read that opinion. They will recall the attitude of the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Abbott) and also, I think, the inference correctly drawn therefrom by the hon. member for Lake Centre. I should like to read that exchange, referring to page 577 of *Hansard*.

Mr. Abbott: Which member wrote the opinion?

A little further down:

Mr. Diefenbaker: The chairman of the committee was Gustave Monette, K.C., of Montreal.

Mr. Abbott: That is why I asked the question.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Surely the Minister of National Defence does not suggest that the following members of the bar . . .

Then he named a list of distinguished members of the bar.

. . . would allow the signing of a report with respect to their understanding of the law to be influenced because a certain man happened to be chairman?

That is the inference drawn from the attitude taken by the Minister of National Defence which, in considering a constitutional question of this importance, I submit was a most irresponsible attitude. Yet this is a member of the cabinet which is asking to have all these powers, exercisable by order in council, vested in it. I should like to read further from the report of the Canadian Bar Association, this time from the report of the committee on legislation affecting civil liberties, as contained in the minutes of the mid-winter council meeting, at page 33:

Your committee reports that no further progress has been made towards obtaining the privilege of viewing legislation in the form of orders in council and board orders prior to adoption, in order that suggestions for the preservation of public rights might be made. After the experience with order 294 of the rentals administration section of the wartime prices and trade board, where any suggestions along the lines mentioned were invariably ruled out as being interference with policy, it was felt that there was little point in pressing matters as it was obvious that bureaucratic policy and preservation of civil liberties were incompatible. . . .

And further:

Your committee's conclusion must be that there is no hope for relief from this most undemocratic form of dictatorship under the guise of legislation, and that so long as persons having no real responsibility to constitutional forms of government are given the power to regulate the rights of the individual, many of those rights will continue to be subject to the kind of totalitarian rule which the free peoples are fighting to abolish from the world.

That report is signed by R. M. Willes Chitty, in case the Minister of National Defence may be interested. The point I am trying to make here is that responsible persons outside the government, acting in good faith—legal experts—have reviewed this situation and come to certain conclusions. I submit that these conclusions on matters affecting civil liberty should have the most serious consideration of all hon. members of this house, including the members of the cabinet. Therefore I should like to read, for the Minister of National Defence especially, a previous report written while the war emergency existed, and by that I mean while the war was actually going on. This is a report of the same committee on civil liberties, which appears at page 600 of the "Canadian Bar Review" for 1944.

Whatever opinion anyone might have as to any possible abuse by the federal authorities, or their delegated boards, of the wide powers so granted to them, and in spite of the civil encroachments this war legislation has developed against the liberty of the subject, your committee feel that this association ought not to do anything that might appear to antagonize, or even directly criticize, the principle of full control, during the war, of the citizen, his liberty, property and activities, to the extent that the government deem necessary for the safety of the nation. The government alone have full information of the necessities of the hour, and however well informed we, of this association, may be, we should not assume the risk of embarrassing in the least degree the government of the country in the paramount task of winning the war.

That was an opinion written in 1944, while the war was on, by the same body which submitted in 1945 a report at which the Minister of National Defence scoffs. I do not notice the government crying out against the terms of this report, and therefore I imagine it must be most acceptable to them. I should like to draw to the attention of the minister the fact that this report of 1944 is signed by Gustave Monette, chairman.

Possibly the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) will be pleased to know that, in order to relieve him of any anxiety, I do intend to refer to the statement of the Acting Prime Minister (Mr. Ilsley) in which he referred to the setting up of the Canadian information board. At the moment I am not referring to the question whether or not some such information service is desirable; I do not refer to that at all. But I do object most strenuously to the manner of constituting that board, while parliament is in session, when the war emergency has passed. I object to doing this by order in council, and without having referred the matter previously to the house.

After what I have said I would repeat the question asked on Friday last, I believe it was, by the hon. member for Lake Centre. I would ask hon. members to bear in mind what I have said, and the attitude which in my opinion should govern in a situation of this kind. This is what we find at page 576 of *Hansard* where the hon. member for Lake Centre is questioning the Acting Prime Minister:

Mr. Diefenbaker: . . . Are we still at war, within the provisions of the War Measures Act, or are we not? That is the question I am asking.
Mr. Ilsley: The answer is yes.
Mr. Diefenbaker: What is that?
Mr. Ilsley: The answer is yes.
Mr. Diefenbaker: "The answer is yes?"
Mr. Ilsley: Yes.
Mr. Diefenbaker: That is the legal opinion that is given, is it?
Mr. Ilsley: Yes.
Mr. Diefenbaker: That is the legal opinion given by law officers of the crown?
Mr. Ilsley: Yes.

There can be no doubt that in the minds of the members of the cabinet, as represented in the statement of the Acting Prime Minister, we are still at war under the provisions of the War Measures Act, although it must be confessed that we have not yet seen the opinion given by the law officers of the crown.

If this is so, I suggest that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) is not of the same opinion as the other members of his cabinet. His actions, his mental attitude and the precedent he has set are entirely different. In substantiation of that claim I would read to hon. members part of the statement made by the Prime Minister when he told us that he intended to go to the United Kingdom and to other countries in Europe. I submit that the statement of principle outlined by the Prime Minister, which influenced him in arriving at his decision to go over there is an exact statement of those principles which should govern us in asking the government of this country to hand back to us those rights which we voluntarily surrendered in war time.

I would ask hon. members to follow those portions of the Prime Minister's speech, which I shall read, to see if they do not agree with me when I state that the parallel is almost exact. Again I cannot take time to read the whole of the speech made by the Prime Minister on that occasion, but so far as I have been able, in respect of each excerpt I have taken care not to alter the general sense. Turning first to page 492 we find the Prime Minister reported as follows:

The world is still in a very troubled state. . . . These last months have seen many changes in Europe, brought new persons into responsible office and faced them with new problems.

[Mr. Fulton.]

I submit that exactly the same is true of Canada. Then he continues:

We in Canada are directly concerned with the solutions which they are seeking to these problems.

We in the House of Commons of Canada are very much concerned with the solutions which are found to our Canadian problems. Hon. members will realize that I am quoting from the Prime Minister's speech and then tracing the parallel which I claim appears.

Then, further down on page 492 he says:

In the shaping of the new world order, a good start must be made in the right direction during these next critical months. Decisions that will have to be taken during the coming months may shape and determine the kind of world we are going to live in.

I submit that exactly the same is true of the situation in Canada. Decisions which are taken in the coming months may determine whether we shall live under a full and free democratic system, or under a system of controls, bureaucracy and semi-totalitarianism.

Then the Prime Minister went on to say that certain questions—

. . . are important, but in the last analysis, many of them are of less consequence, even to the countries whose interests they affect most immediately, than are questions of attitudes and objectives. . . . What kind of world do we really wish to live in? What sort of effort are we ready to make to realize it?

What then, I ask hon. members, is our attitude to responsible government? What is our attitude to democracy? That is the important thing. It is more important even than the fact that something may be done more expeditiously by order in council. That is the frame of mind which induced the Prime Minister to take the serious step of leaving this House of Commons, and going to the United Kingdom.

What sort of effort are we making, what sort of effort are we ready to make to realize the kind of world we want to live in? With deference I would ask other hon. members to apply that question to themselves: What sort of effort are we ready to make to get back the power to carry out those rights and duties that are ours, an effort which I submit we can no longer shirk?

Then the Prime Minister goes on to say:

It is important that Canada should not merely be consulted, but that there should be clear recognition of Canada's right to effective participation in the great decisions where questions affecting the general ordering of the future peace of the world are under consideration.

It is important that parliament should not be merely consulted, but that there should be a clear recognition of our right to take part in decisions affecting our national life. The

Prime Minister continues:

During the war, for military reasons, it was necessary to acquiesce in the operation of war-time arrangements under which responsibility for major decisions on the direction of the allied war effort was concentrated in a very few hands.

This is similar to the process of handing over to the cabinet the power of government by order in council. Then he proceeds to say:

The continued use of methods such as were improvised to meet the urgent strain and hazards of war, whereby private settlements are arrived at between the great powers on issues of general interest, might well become a source of difficulty and even of danger.

I submit, finally, that now that the war is over, the continuation of those methods which we voluntarily allowed to be set up for the purpose of winning the war, will certainly become a source of potential danger and difficulty.

I should like to conclude my remarks by saying again that I do not intend to be taken as standing up and lecturing to this house or to the government. But I do feel that, however well intentioned the ministers of the crown may be in continuing to exercise their powers under orders in council, it is the mere fact of the continuation which constitutes the danger, not the motive in the minds of the ministers. I realize, as has been said here so often, that they are under a tremendous burden. They want to get things done expeditiously, quickly and efficiently. For the time being they consider it more efficient to carry on by order in council. We let time go on and the same thing is said again. In the meantime we get into the habit of government by order in council. It seems to be a good method of carrying on government and the ministers become a little more reluctant to part with their powers, but still with the best of motives. That I submit is where the danger lies. I want to make it perfectly clear that I am not questioning the motives of any minister in any of the remarks I have made to-day. I am merely asking the question: Have we not arrived at the stage when we must consider whether a continuation of this procedure offers a greater danger to our final achievement of full democracy than the possible loss of efficiency which may result if we stop government by order in council now?

For myself I am inclined to think the greater danger is in continuing government by order in council. Should the situation which I have in mind ever develop—and it may develop as a result of this practice of government by order in council—then all the sacrifices, all the efforts, all the losses and all the heart-break of the past six years will have been worthless. Therefore I feel justified in taking the time of this house to ask all hon. members to give serious consideration to this question.

(Translation) Mr. Speaker, I spoke briefly this afternoon on the restoration of the powers of parliament. To my mind parliament is the guardian of all our rights, both individual and civil, and even though we may have agreed, under the stress of war to waive our rights voluntarily, nevertheless, at this time when the emergency period has ended, we must insist upon the restoration of those rights and privileges which are inherent in the democratic system; otherwise, we shall be guilty of having betrayed the democratic cause for which we have fought.

I regret very much that my knowledge of the French language is not yet perfect, but I have begun this week to take lessons. Finally, I ask all my fellow-citizens to believe that I voice their feelings or their thoughts when I say that we should uphold our rights so that the Canadian people may enjoy that democratic freedom which is guaranteed to them under the existing constitution.

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Minister of Justice) (Translation): May I offer my most sincere congratulations to the hon. member who has just resumed his seat. As regards the statement he made when he informed us that he had begun this week to take French lessons, I must say that this is the second occasion on which I have heard him express himself in French in this house and I am sure that he has not begun the study of that language this week only since he has already acquired a fluency on which I congratulate him most heartily. I wish that he may frequently use the French language when participating in the debates of this house.

(Text) Mr. Speaker, I perhaps should offer a word of explanation for the fact that it is now twenty minutes to six on Tuesday evening when I rise to answer some questions that were suggested by the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) on Friday afternoon as being proper to be asked. I rise at this time because the hon. member finished his speech just about six o'clock on Friday afternoon; yesterday was taken up with matters which were appropriate to be discussed on a private member's day and when I came into the chamber this afternoon I found that Mr. Speaker had arranged for three hon. members to be heard before I could have an opportunity of making any answer. The delay

certainly is not because I did not wish to make an answer. The hon. member asked, as reported on page 573 of *Hansard*:

When will the proclamation be made that will terminate war in so far as the powers of the War Measures Act are concerned?

Then the hon. member went on to ask if the government suggested that to-day we are in the midst of war. He wanted to know if the minister suggested that it could continue the operation of the War Measures Act for one, two or three years or more hence when the government might by proclamation declare the war to be over. He stated that this was a matter of grave importance to the people of this country, and he wanted to know if powers were being exercised by the government to-day which were beyond the competence of the government to carry into effect.

That certainly is a serious question. It would be a serious situation for the Canadian people if any government undertook to exercise powers for which there was no legal basis. I can quite appreciate the concern that is felt in that regard. However, I think it is proper again to direct attention to the terms of the statute which it was found advisable to enact in 1914 at the time the first great war broke out.

The hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton) has expressed his views as to government by order in council, but I am sure that is not just what the hon. member meant. Of course government must be by order in council or by decisions of the ministers composing the council. It is quite a different matter though to have legislation by order in council. I take it that when the hon. member decried government by order in council he meant legislation by order in council. Under the terms of the British North America Act, which states that this country wished to have a constitution modeled upon that of the United Kingdom, it was declared in section 9:

The executive government and authority of and over Canada is hereby declared to continue and be vested in the queen.

That power is exercised by a high officer, styled the Governor General, on advice of the council composed of members responsible to the elected chamber, but the legislative power is to be exercised by His Majesty with the consent of the Senate and the House of Commons. When one complains of government by order in council I take it that what he means is the exercise of legislative powers by the governor in council.

It has been well established that the governor in council has no legislative powers that are not expressly given to him by parliament. He cannot exercise legislative powers without their being powers delegated to him by some act of parliament. This act of 1914 was passed by a government which was formerly composed of some gentlemen still members of the Progressive Conservative party; they submitted to parliament a bill asking parliament in case of war to edelegate to His Excellency in Council legislative powers that otherwise would have to be exercised by the ordinary procedure of bills introduced into one or other of the houses, read three times in each and adopted in the usual form. That parliament decided that that was a wise thing to do and adopted the statute which is now chapter 206 of the revised statutes of 1927.

There had to be some definite point at which the delegation would commence and at which the delegation would end, and that parliament, not the parliament of which the members of the present government were members but the parliament of 1914, said that the delegation would start when the governor in council proclaimed that a state of war existed; that that proclamation would be conclusive as to the starting point, and that the delegation would continue until the governor in council declared by proclamation that the state of war which brought about the delegation had ceased.

There was a proclamation in September, 1939, that a state of war existed, and that proclamation is still in force. Actual hostilities have ceased, but the state of war still exists at the present time, and that state of war created a situation which had to be dealt with by the exercise of the powers which had been delegated for the purpose under the statute.

Hon. members ask: When are these powers to be handed back? They will not be handed back. They will cease to be exercisable certainly when there is a proclamation saying that the war has ended. They will be diminished; they have been diminishing by the cessation of hostilities—

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: If the minister would permit a question at this stage, does he argue that if the government decided not to issue the proclamation for two, three or four years, that delegation under the War Measures Act would be continued?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: No, I was just dealing with that very thing when the hon. member rose to put his question. I say that even now the extent covered by the delegation has already been diminished by reason of the changing situation which has occurred, and that has been recognized.

The situation is this. Under normal conditions there is a distribution of legislative powers by the British North America Act, and property and civil rights are within the exclusive jurisdiction of the provincial legislatures. But it has been decided that when a state of war arises property and civil rights have to be dealt with under other than their normal aspects; they have to be dealt with in the interests of the security and safety of the state as a whole; and because of that, the ordinary jurisdiction of parliament is enlarged. Parliament at no time can delegate more than it has. When it has, because of a state of war, a wider jurisdiction than it has normally, and it delegates all its powers, it delegates more than it could delegate in normal times. An act such as the War Measures Act could, if it were thought desirable to do so, be passed at any time. I do not think there has been a parliament since confederation that has not delegated some legislative function to the governor in council. The right to delegate does not depend upon the existence or non-existence of war. What depends on the existence or non-existence of war is the enlarged jurisdiction that parliament can exercise during war.

The hon. gentleman has asked whether if a government chose to delay issuing the proclamation, would it continuously be empowered to exercise by order in council the whole of the powers of parliament with the possible exception of taxation and the appropriation of money, because the supreme court in a case which went before it said it was not deciding whether that had been or could be delegated because of the terms of sections 53 and 54 of the British North America Act? But if a government chose to do a thing of that kind it would not be proceeding within the spirit of the War Measures Act.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: What recourse would a person have?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: A member of parliament would have recourse by introducing at any time a bill to repeal the War Measures Act. The government is a committee of members of parliament, exercising powers because of the confidence placed in them by a majority in the House of Commons, and with no other right to do anything but the one that is based upon that fact.

I was not present when this statute was drafted. My impression on reading it is that the terms of section 2 were put there, not because it was felt that the powers would be abused, but because it was felt that there would have to be a definite starting point and a definite terminating date and that a government responsible to the House of Commons would properly comply with what would be supposed to be the desires of parliament and would make the proclamation at the proper time.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: There were only 450 orders in council issued under the War Measures Act in the last war.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: If the hon. member will wait, I will give the exact number of orders in council that have been passed.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Under the War Measures Act?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Not necessarily under the War Measures Act, because government has to be by order in council. I think I had better give the figures right away.

From September 1, 1939, up to September 28, 1945, the number of orders in council, including minutes of council, approved by the governor in council, totalled 58,402. During the same period the number of treasury board minutes passed was 36,329. Therefore the total number of formal acts of the governor in council during this period is 94,731.

Treasury board minutes deal almost entirely with appointments, resignations and other personnel matters in the civil service; with payments to firms and persons for services rendered; with remissions of taxes and the like. They represent approximately thirty-six to thirty-seven per cent of the total number of acts by the governor in council.

The total also includes minutes of council passed under the Munitions and Supply Act, authorizing contracts for the supply of goods or services necessary for the prosecution of the war. This group represents forty to forty-five per cent of the total.

About sixteen per cent consists of orders in council and minutes of council authorizing contracts for accommodation, supplies and services for government departments, appointments to senior positions in the public service and other instruments of a purely administrative nature and of no general interest.

The remaining two to three per cent which are of public interest is composed of regulations such as national selective service regulations, wartime prices and trade board regulations, and the defence of Canada regulations and other war-time legislation.

That is the situation. In this country and under our system of government we do by minutes of the treasury board, which are then submitted to the council and get their authority from the approval of the governor on the recommendation of council, and by orders in council, things which under a system like that of our neighbours to the south are

done by executive acts. A great many of these are purely formal. All these munitions and supply matters, if they involved a sum of more than a stated amount, had to be authorized by an order in council.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Would the minister permit a question: how many of these orders in council were passed under the provisions of the War Measures Act? I will elucidate that. In the last war the number was 450. Is it not a fact that the number under the War Measures Act during the period of this war is some eight or nine thousand?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I do not know. I have not had a calculation made, and I do not think it would be possible to make an accurate calculation. There may be that number in which the War Measures Act is referred to, but one would have to examine each one to see whether or not it was an order in council which would stand without the War Measures Act. The War Measures Act is frequently referred to in a recommendation to council as an additional source of authority for the recommendation which is being made, but one would have to examine each of those orders in council, and it would be an onerous task to determine how many would not have validity without the authority derived from the War Measures Act. I can assure the hon. member that I am not just trying to evade the question.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: They were able to do it last time. That was the answer they gave in 1922.

Mr. CLAXTON: But how much inflation was there the last time?

Mr. FLEMING: You mean, inflation in orders in council?

Mr. CLAXTON: No, inflation in prices.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I do not want to be provocative, but it is a recognized fact that this time the government, rightly or wrongly —rightly, I think, and I am under the impression that the majority of the Canadian people agree—undertook to control prices and to prevent inflation, and that required frequent orders and regulations and frequent modifications of those orders and regulations.

If I may come back to the point with which I was dealing, I would not like the house to remain under the impression that the Canadian Bar Assocaition had taken the stand which has been, I will not say asserted, but referred to, in this house. I do not think that would be fair to the Canadian Bar Association. The association comprises a very large number of eminent jurists who are quite cautious about their individual reputations as sound lawyers, and I do not think it would be fair to them to have it go out to the country at large that their considered opinion was expressed in the extracts which have been cited to this house. One of them was cited this afternoon; I had marked it for calling it to the attention of hon. members, and it contains the recognition at the outset that—

> Whatever opinion anyone might have as to any possible abuse by the federal authorities, or their delegated boards. . . . The government alone have full information of the necessities of the hour, and however well informed we, of this association, may be, we should not assume the risk of embarrassing in the least degree the government of the country in the paramount task of winning the war.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: What date was that?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: That was the 1944 report prepared by a committee of three, consisting of Mr. Gustave Monette, Mr. Johnson, and Mr. Brossard. That report was submitted and there was some discussion about it in the meeting. The report was not submitted for acceptance, but it was submitted, and Mr. Monette had moved in submitting it:

> That the work of complete scrutiny of federal and provincial legislation should be pursued and completed, with a view not to interfere in the slightest degree with the war effort, but to have our association prepared for sound and firm action immediately after the war, and possibly, in many cases, before the end of the conflict.
>
> Your committee also feels that the work of complete research and analysis of all material legislation in Canada, and of preparing an exhaustive report of conclusions and suggestions, and of arranging action with the proper legislative authorities, would require, for a considerable time, the full attention of able members of this association. And we recommend the appointment of a permanent secretary or reporter, or committee, to give continuous attention to complete this task, up to the end.
>
> We also recommend that the provincial committees already appointed be continued in office.

Mr. Monette stated that the report was a very lengthy one—someone said it was thirty-nine pages—and he had only a few copies of it. It was suggested that it be printed or mimeographed as quickly as possible for consideration on the Friday—this was a Wednesday. Mr. E. K. Williams, who is now president of the Canadian Bar Association, rose at that point and said:

> It seems to me that the motion that Mr. Monette made is the only practical motion so far as this association is concerned. I know something of the contents of the report. There are thirty-nine pages of it. The recommendations depend upon the reasoning contained in the report. Now, Mr. Monette will know that I am not speaking critically of the work of the committee, because I think they have done very good work, but I personally would not—

and I don't think any other member of this association would—be ready to express a decided view on the various matters contained in the report without the most careful consideration. Every line of it bristles with debatable points.

And a little further down:

I suggest, gentlemen, you should not vote on important matters of this kind on a blind vote to-day.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but I have to remark that it is six o'clock.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

DIVORCE

AMENDMENT OF ACT OF 1930—JURISDICTION OF COURTS IN PROVINCE OF MARRIED WOMEN'S DOMICILE

Mr. GEORGE BLACK (Yukon) moved the second reading of bill No. 2, to amend the Divorce Jurisdiction Act, 1930.

He said: In moving the second reading of this bill I do not know that I can make it any clearer to the house or put it in any better way than to read the explanatory note. It is sought to amend section 2 of the act which reads as follows:

A married woman who either before or after the passing of this act has been deserted by and has been living separate and apart from her husband for a period of two years and upwards and is still living separate and apart from her husband may, in any one of those provinces of Canada in which there is a court having jurisdiction to grant a divorce *a vinculo matrimonii*, commence in the court of such province having such jurisdiction proceedings for a divorce *a vinculo matrimonii* praying that her marriage may be dissolved on any grounds that may entitle her to such divorce according to the law of such province, and such court shall have jurisdiction to grant such divorce provided that immediately prior to such desertion the husband of such married woman was domiciled in the province in which such proceedings are commenced.

That last sentence is the unfair part of the act sought to be amended. The explanatory note states:

The purpose of this amendment is to vest jurisdiction in the divorce courts of the several provinces to try actions for divorce at the suit of a married woman deserted by and living apart from her husband where the woman has been residing in the province for not less than two years prior to the date of the commencement of such action.

As the law presently stands the woman may bring suit only in the province where the husband was domiciled immediately prior to the desertion. This condition of the law works a great hardship on the deserted married woman who by reason of such desertion may have been forced to move to another province from that where the desertion took place. It is unreasonable that she should have to take her action back to the former.

Let me illustrate. Suppose a woman resident and living in British Columbia is married to a man who comes from Ontario to marry her, takes her back to Ontario and there deserts her. She by force of circumstances must go back to her old home in British Columbia because she no longer has support and maintenance from her husband, he having deserted her. She remains living in British Columbia and has the necessary material or evidence upon which, in ordinary circumstances, to apply for and get a divorce from a court having jurisdiction in such matters.

The provision of the bill as proposed is that if the woman lives for two years in the province to which she has returned, after the desertion of her husband, she may commence her action for divorce in that province. For instance, in the example I have given she would not have to go back to Ontario to commence the action. That is what I ask the house to support.

Mr. JOSEPH ALFRED DION (Lake St. John-Roberval) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, as this is my first speech in the house, I take the opportunity of offering you my warmest congratulations on your election to the high position to which you have been named. Now that I am aware of the fine intellect, of the sense of justice and fairness which you have displayed in carrying out your duties since the opening of the session, I have no doubt that you are eminently qualified to fill the post for which you were chosen and will prove a worthy successor to your illustrious forerunners.

I also wish to congratulate the deputy Speaker elected last Thursday. I am not personally acquainted with him, but judging from the praise showered on him from both sides of the house, I have no doubt he is fully equipped to preside over our debates. I am happy to tender him my most sincere congratulations.

With reference to bill No. 2 before the house, I must say that I am opposed to it for the following reasons: first of all, on legal grounds, then I object to it for social reasons and finally on moral and religious considerations.

To deal first with my objection on legal grounds: as a matter of fact, if we read the amendment submitted to the Divorce Jurisdiction Act of 1930, we find that its object

is the extension, to a considerable degree, of the latitude granted those who wish to divorce in Canada.

First, let me quote the act as it is now. It reads as follows:

2. A married woman who either before or after the passing of this act has been deserted by and has been living separate and apart from her husband for a period of two years and upwards and is still living separate and apart from her husband may, in any one of those provinces of Canada in which there is a court having jurisdiction to grant a divorce *a vinculo matrimonii*, commence in the court of such province having such jurisdiction proceedings for a divorce *a vinculo matrimonii* praying that her marriage may be dissolved on any grounds that may entitle her to such divorce according to the law of such province, and such court shall have jurisdiction to grant such divorce provided that immediately prior to such desertion the husband of such married woman was domiciled in the province in which such proceedings are commenced.

It is intended to amend this section 2 and here is the text of the proposed amendment:

2. The court of any province of Canada vested with jurisdiction to grant a divorce *a vinculo matrimonii* shall have jurisdiction to entertain and try an action or other proceeding for divorce *a vinculo matrimonii* at the suit of a married woman who has resided in such province separate and apart from her husband for not less than two years immediately preceding the date of the commencement of such action or proceeding and on any grounds of entitlement to such divorce provided by the law of the province in which such court is constituted: Provided that she either was before or has been after the passing of this act deserted by and living separate and apart from her husband for a continuous period of not less than two years prior to the date of the commencement of such action or proceeding.

Briefly it means that a woman who has been domiciled with her husband in one of the provinces and who wishes to obtain a divorce merely has to live in another province, for two years to be entitled to apply for a divorce before a court of that province. In regard to the province of Quebec, where there are no divorce courts, a woman from that province might leave her husband, proceed across the boundary line into Ontario, a few miles from the province of Quebec, live there for two years and at the end of this period institute divorce proceedings against her husband in an Ontario court. In other words, this would enable married persons from the province of Quebec, where there are no divorce courts at present, to obtain a divorce in another province. This is my first legal ground against the proposed amendment. We certainly cannot, in this indirect fashion, allow the people of Quebec, where no divorce courts exist, to seek divorce in another province simply by living there for a period of two years, sometimes by common consent of the parties concerned, as is often the case in divorce suits, when there is collusion.

Another reason for my opposition to this amendment is that it concerns the question of domicile which falls under civil rights. Under the British North America Act, the province has exclusive jurisdiction in matters of domicile, it is a field of provincial legislation. In the province of Quebec, this question is dealt with in the provincial civil code. However, the amendment before the house would transfer to another province the domicile of the person seeking divorce. A married woman would only have to go to any province, elect domicile there for a period of two years, and she would then be entitled to take a divorce action against her husband. I claim that a federal measure cannot deal with the question of domicile which is exclusively a provincial field of legislation and that even were parliament to pass this bill, it would be ultra vires, because it would then be legislating on a matter out of its jurisdiction. In the province of Quebec the domicile of a married woman is where her husband has his domicile.

I am opposing this bill from a legal standpoint on two grounds. The first is that it indirectly makes divorce possible for the people in the province of Quebec, there they cannot obtain it before their own courts. The second one is that this involves the question of domicile, a matter which lies solely within the purview of the civil law of each province.

Another ground on which I oppose this bill is that it evidently aims at facilitating divorce, which is a social evil. It may be a necessary evil in some cases, but it is nevertheless an evil, and every evil must be curbed as much as possible but never encouraged. Divorce, as every one knows, entails as a main consequence the disruption of the family. From a social standpoint the family is certainly the backbone of society. The family is what ensures continuity to the individual, and provides for him a link with the past and the future. An outstanding French orator, Jaurès, has said that the individual is tied to life by the immutability of the tomb and by the rocking of the cradles, in other words, by his ascendants and his descendants. Divorce, or the separation of married people, gives the custody of the children to one party or the other, thus destroying the social unit and jeopardizing the very existence of society. It is certainly the worst evil of modern times.

I feel we are right in stating that we should object to all legislation which tends to make divorce easier, more acceptable or more defensible.

I know we will be told there are many wretched couples, especially since the great war when they met and married to live unhappily afterwards because of incompatibility. But must we, for that reason, intensify the evil by making divorce still more easily obtainable, which would increase the number of ill-assorted matches? That means that in five or ten years, even more people will be seeking divorce. Such a method of procedure, far from curbing the evil, is sure to spread it. Therefore, I believe we should oppose all measures which tend to facilitate the granting of divorce in our country.

As a last consideration, divorce, by setting itself against the indissoluble character of marriage is legislation of a purely pagan conception. I submit, therefore, that even if our country has no official religion, we are, nevertheless, a Christian nation. We are not ashamed to state it and I heard it proclaimed this afternoon. Further, daily, at the opening of the sitting, we invoke the Almighty and we express our faith in Christ. When peace was declared the leader of our nation did not hesitate to thank God, to make a confession of faith. If we are a Christian nation, if we abide by principles which distinguish us from pagan peoples, we must of necessity endeavour to prevent the adoption in our country of legislation tending to lead us back to paganism of olden times. History tells us that during the decline of ancient Rome, morals militated against the family and divorce was provided for in the laws. A woman no longer reckoned her age by the number of consuls but by the number of men she had married. Most assuredly, as divorce is made easier to obtain, the morals will become more dissolute and family life which is the backbone of society will be jeopardized to a greater extent.

For all these reasons I object to the proposed amendment: first, from a legal standpoint, it is proposed by indirect means to enable married persons in the provinces where there are no divorce courts to look elsewhere for such courts.

Second, because it involves the question of domicile, a matter which lies solely within the purview of provincial legislatures and because the proposed amendment would be unconstitutional if it were to be passed.

Finally, the third ground, as I said a few moments ago, is that a legislation tending to facilitate divorce would tend to disrupt society in weakening family ties. That is why, having at heart the welfare of my country, I suggest that we should reject this amendment, holding on to the present provisions of the act so that we may ensure the happiness of the nation and the prosperity of the people.

Mr. EUGENE MARQUIS (Kamouraska): (Text) Mr. Speaker, I consider it is my duty to say a few words about this measure. What is the purpose of this amendment? First, it is to facilitate the granting of divorces; second, to create a new jurisdiction for the granting of divorces; third, to oust the jurisdiction of our Quebec civil courts; fourth, to protect private interests to the prejudice of public interests, and fifth, to disorganize the family and society. The effect of the present amendment certainly would be prejudicial to the whole community. The rights of the husband are not protected. On what grounds can he base his defence if he is summoned to appear before a court in another province? It will be impossible for him to subpoena his witnesses. In many cases the wife will allege that her husband has abandoned her. If on the contrary the wife has abandoned her husband, the latter should have the right to prove the facts in support of his defence. Moreover, it would be conducive to serious abuses. The wife would have only to go abroad for four or five years, and then institute an action against her husband. If the common home were in Vancouver, the wife could take her action in Halifax. This would be a great distance from the Vancouver home, and would entail great expense if the husband wished to subpoena his witnesses and appear before the Halifax court.

As a matter of principle, a British subject has the right to be summoned before the court having jurisdiction in the place of his domicile, and there does not seem to be any serious reason for violating that rule. I contend, too, that this measure would disregard family rights. While a mother was abroad, the children might live with their father for some years. No matter what her behaviour might have been, she would have the right to take proceedings against her husband, who has kept the children. Social rights would be in jeopardy. Any measure which facilitates divorce divides the family, destroys the father's and mother's authority, and ruins the children's love.

(Translation) Mr. Speaker, I wish to sum up my arguments as briefly as possible and with my colleague, the hon. member for Lake St. John-Roberval (Mr. Dion), I invoke the main reasons for my opposition to this amendment.

The husband and wife must surely enjoy identical rights in connection with divorce. It cannot be presumed in advance that the husband is in the wrong and the wife in the right or vice versa.

Then, if they enjoy the same right, why presume, in the present amendment, that the husband is in the wrong, by allowing the wife to take action against him in any province of Canada, be it far removed from the home she previously inhabited in the company of her husband? I claim that the object of this provision is purely and solely to facilitate the granting of divorces in this country. There is no other reason, for if a wife be deserted by her husband, if she be forsaken, as it is claimed, if she be deserving of the sympathy of the house and the whole country, it is evident that she will take action in the very place where she can secure witnesses, where her neighbours may give evidence in her favour. She will not seek, at a distance of 200 miles from her home, the protection of an unknown tribunal. It is so clearly evident that it would be pointless to formulate further arguments on the matter.

Moreover, as I said at the outset, the other party, the husband, is thereby denied the opportunity or even the possibility of bringing his witnesses before the court. Were this amendment to be passed, any wife could desert her husband, travel all over the country and after a few years, the husband having then given up all hope of rebuilding his home, she could take legal proceedings against him in some place where he would be unable to send his witnesses, and where it would perhaps be impossible for him to appear before the said court. Therefore, he would be unable to enter a defence plea and he would then lose by default, which would mean the wangling by indirect means, of a divorce that could not have been obtained from a court sitting at the place of residence of both parties.

Mr. Speaker, to all intents and purposes, this brings into being a new jurisdiction. There are the jurisdiction *ratione materiae* and the jurisdiction *ratione personae*. It is an absolute right, recognized as well in the province of Quebec as in the others, that a person should be tried before the court of his domicile, and it is one of those rights which is most treasured by a citizen.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that the jurisdiction *ratione personae* must be respected and cannot be set aside by such an amendment.

Indeed, it is a very subtle amendment. It is said: this poor woman who has been deserted by her husband, why force her to incur expenses and compel her to return to the domicile where she lived with him? Let us allow her to go somewhere else and she will merely apply for divorce in the court of her choice. Well, Mr. Speaker, this goes very far, inasmuch as to-day in the province of Quebec we have no divorce court, we have safeguarded this principle, thank God. Thanks to the efforts of our predecessors in this house civil courts determine the rights of the parties. Under this amendment, the women of the province of Quebec could go to another province where a divorce court has been set up, live there for at least two years and then institute proceedings and obtain a divorce which they could not obtain in the province of Quebec. Further, this would result in granting new jurisdiction to a court of another province, a jurisdiction which it did not have over a person from the province of Quebec and to which in our opinion it is not entitled over persons under the jurisdiction of the province of Quebec.

Besides, and this follows from what I have just said, our courts would be deprived of their jurisdiction, they would be prevented from dispensing civil law in our province. In Quebec it is provided that the husband or the wife may appear before the court of their place of domicile, where in many cases conjugal disputes are settled amicably and family life continues.

If we agreed to this amendment, we would encourage divorce and prevent our courts from exerting the beneficent influence they have wielded in the past. Moreover, this legislation affects private interests, rather than general interest and public order and I believe that in such a matter public interest must be the first consideration. This amendment, whose purpose is to enhance a private interest, tends to facilitate the application of the divorce law which, in my opinion, cannot be accepted in a Christian and well ordered society.

Divorce divides the family. It obviously dissociates husband and wife who will thereafter live apart. Moreover, the children must be considered; they are parted from father or mother and, when remarriage follows with its consequent offspring, we behold incongruous multiple paternities, a state of things which should not exist in a Christian society.

I will go even further, Mr. Speaker, and contend that divorce also disorganizes the community. Family life is at the core of our Canadian society. No distinction is made between races, religious beliefs or other opinions. Here, in Canada, our community life is still based on the family unit which remains the cornerstone of our national structure.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MARQUIS: We still count on the family to ensure the survival of our Christian society, and our Canadian citizens, whatever their religious belief, are devoted to their family and want this social cell maintained in Canada. If we were to let divorce become easier to obtain family ties would become disrupted, paternal authority would be undermined and children would lose that love for their parents which the latter have instilled into them, and this would lead us inevitably and in a short time to atheism.

Mr. Speaker, sublime thoughts have been expressed in this house following the end of hostilities. Several members on both sides of the house have suffered personal losses; several have lost their sons, their relatives in battle. Why? To fight the forces of evil and to defend righteousness.

Right has emerged triumphant in this six-year struggle which unleashed the powers of evil against those of decency, and we may now look forward to an era of freedom and prosperity.

The forces of decency are vested in the family, they are based on love while those of evil are inspired by hatred. The ideology of our enemies rested on hatred while our own was founded on love.

We oppose divorce and roundabout means of promoting it because we favour a Christian society based on the principles of charity and love. If we want the forces of decency to develop, consolidate and flourish in our country, let us set aside this subtle little amendment which some want to insert in our laws. It is a trap which will end by allowing all Canadian citizens straightway to obtain a divorce wherever they may be. I feel convinced that even in provinces where divorce is recognized and where divorce courts are found, all well thinking people regret the existence of such anomalous conditions in our social legislation. I am sure the amendment will come to its natural end and it will not be necessary to add another chapter to this unfortunate legislation.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out that I am concerned merely with the future of my fellow-citizens, those of my own race and of others as well.

As a Canadian citizen, I yearn to see, all over the country, strong united families, where education, under the wise leadership of father and mother who are in full accord is directed to the thorough development of every potentiality and every talent. Let these families remain united, yielding to the full extent of their powers, flourish in a regulated order and we shall then enjoy liberty and happiness in our country.

(Text) Mr. ELPHEGE MARIER (Jacques-Cartier): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words about this amendment to the Divorce Jurisdiction Act, 1930. The bill as presented seems very simple, but in my opinion it has some far-reaching consequences. The hon. member for Lake St. John-Roberval (Mr. Dion) has already dealt with the legal rights of the province of Quebec. If my information is correct, I understand that there are only two provinces in Canada without divorce courts, Quebec and Prince Edward Island. If this bill is passed the province of Quebec will be affected. A wife will be permitted to go to Ontario, reside there for two years, then apply to the courts of Ontario for a divorce and in that way escape the jurisdiction of the courts of Quebec the court of her domicile. At the same time her husband would not be given the same privilege.

I am against divorce on religious grounds and because of the evils, both moral and material, that spring from divorce. I do not intend to discuss this bill from that angle, but I do insist that it would be against the civil rights of the provinces. I should like to refer to section 92 of the British North America Act which determines the exclusive powers of the provinces.

(Translation): I shall quote three paragraphs of section 92 of the British North America Act which is entitled: "Exclusive powers of provincial legislatures":

12. The solemnization of marriage in the province;
13. Property and civil rights in the province.
14. The administration of justice in the province, including the constitution, maintenance and organization of provincial courts.

Therefore, under the provisions of sub-section 14 of section 92 of the British North America Act, the province alone has the right to set up divorce courts. And in our province, it has not been deemed advisable so far to create such courts. If our province did not deem advisable to set up such courts, I do not see why a roundabout way would be resorted to in order to give certain citizens of the province the right to evade the jurisdiction of the court of their province by availing themselves of the rights and privileges granted in a neighbouring province. And this is exactly what would take place if the wife could avail herself of the court of a neighbouring province in order to exercise rights which her own province deny them.

In sub-section 12 of the British North America Act, reference is made to the solemnization of marriage. I have always understood that this paragraph reserves to the provinces the right to legislate on such solem-

nization as well as to determine the rights of the husband and wife arising from such marriage. This is the reason why there are in the province of Quebec as well as in the other provinces certain laws which control the solemnization of marriage and its consequences. Here again, the proposed amendment would tend to destroy or modify the laws or the obligations which arise from the solemnization of marriage.

Now, sub-section 13, which grants exclusive powers to the provinces concerning property and civil rights in the province would be set aside by the proposed amendment. Indeed, the civil rights of the provinces include right over persons and right over property. To my mind, the right over persons would disappear or rather would be curtailed if a person domiciled in the province of Quebec could get away and after residing two years in another province, could obtain a divorce under conditions and according to laws which are different from those of the province where she is domiciled. Especially in the province of Quebec, the law which establishes the domicile of the wife at her husband's residence would be violated. And not only the law regarding domicile would be violated but also numerous other rights arising from marriage. In obtaining a divorce either in Ontario or in New-Brunswick or in Nova Scotia or in any other province, there would also be another disadvantage for the parties concerned for the court granting the divorce could not affect the rights arising from marriage or the obligations pertaining thereto. Indeed, in our province, the question of joint estate, which does not occur in other provinces, must be taken into account. Therefore, a court of another province could not, in granting a divorce, determine the respective rights of the interested parties and as, in Quebec, divorce is not recognized, they might find themselves in an embarrassing position. After securing a divorce in another province, a person enjoying certain rights in the common estate, would lose her rights on account of the change in its status, because the common estate is not recognized in this other province.

The same principle would apply to gifts and privileges often resulting from marriage and which exist also in other provinces. If the court granting divorce is unable to grant the civil rights enjoyed by the interested parties the clauses included in the marriage contract could not be taken into consideration on account of the divorce granted, because the said court could not deal, in its findings, with the assets of the consorts and furthermore, no court of our province could settle the matter, as divorce is not recognized within its borders.

There is also the status of children. Sometimes, the marriage contract provides that children to be born will be entitled to certain gifts which could not be realized at the time of divorce because, I repeat, the province of Quebec would not recognize the divorce.

But the province of Quebec is not the only one concerned in this matter; in other provinces there are also numerous legislative measures relating to the assets of the consorts in case of separation or annulment of marriage. Several provinces, as I said, would be in the same position when having to determine the rights of spouses.

I need not elaborate further on the anomalous situation that would be created by an unconstitutional law. If the privilege of establishing civil rights belongs exclusively to the provinces, as it is clearly stated in section 92, I do not see how, through an amendment to the divorce act, an individual could be allowed to evade the laws of his province, provided he lived somewhere else for a certain period, while as a matter of fact his true domicile was there.

Therefore, from a constitutional standpoint, the bill should not become law. From the standpoint of provincial rights, and of the consequences which the passing of this amendment might entail in our province, it should not be enacted.

The time when we hear so much about union and brotherhood, speak of organizing to solve so many complex problems with which we are faced, to my mind, I say, such a time is ill-chosen for raising a question as important as that of divorce. A matter of this order might stir up animosity between certain provinces or sections of the country. We should not raise such an issue but instead tend to the serious problems submitted to our attention and which are far more essential to the future of our country that this amendment to the existing divorce legislation whose purpose is to render the decree more easily obtainable and is in the sole interest of a few people under particular circumstances. If there were no other means of redress I would agree that some amendment was needed to provide for the plan mentioned a short while ago by my hon. colleague. The required means, however, are already in existence and will adequately take care of the few exceptional cases in our province where no divorce court is found. I am therefore opposed to this amendment and hope it will be defeated.

Mr. BONA ARSENAULT (Bonaventure): (Translation) Mr. Speaker, to indicate my opposition to the bill under consideration, I wish to add a few remarks to those already so brilliantly made by my colleague.

We, from Quebec, believe that the ties of marriage can only be broken by the natural death of the consorts. As long as both live, marriage remains indissoluble. Such is the fundamental principle enunciated in section 185 of the province of Quebec Civil Code. We, of Quebec, believe that the indissolubility of marriage is at the very foundation of the family, which, as was stated a few minutes ago, is the primary cell of society.

As Christians, we, of Quebec, believe that divorce is opposed to divine law and, as Canadians, we claim that it is in contradiction with natural law, in this sense that the indissolubility of marriage is directly connected with the best interests of society.

The real object of marriage is not only the raising of future generations, but also the protection and education of children.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I claim that we should find among the most indomitable enemies of divorce all those who profess to be Christians, all those who think in terms of society, all those who have at heart the lofty interests of the Canadian nation.

If we refer to the figures published in connection with divorce in Canada, we are appalled to realize to what an abyss we are sinking. And we understand that the time has come to alter our course in the right direction, to pull ourselves together, and the only way to accomplish this is to make it harder to obtain a divorce in our country.

In 1901 there were only 661 divorces in Canada, for a population of 5,300,000; in 1911, 1,530 actions were taken and in 1921, the number had climbed to 7,401. Between 1911 and 1921, a period similar to the present one, inasmuch as it was marked by an armed conflict, the troublous times resulted in a five-fold increase in the number of divorces, which climbed from 1,500 to 7,401. In 1941, divorces numbered 14,032 in our country compared to 7,441 in 1931. This is an increase of practically 100 per cent. On the strength of these figures, unless we endeavour to curb this tendency, if the five-fold increase in the number of divorces holds for the period 1941 to 1951 as for that of 1911 to 1921, 70,000 homes will have been broken in Canada in the ten years previous to 1951.

Mr. Speaker, divorce is a national curse; in fact, it is national suicide. To-day every country in the world realizes how much divorce decreases the birth-rate and to what extent it constitutes not only a factor of family disruption and social disorganization, but also a threat of extinction for the population of some countries. Quite recently, on September 27, the British government stated that the numerical strength and even the survival of the British nation were endangered by the increase in the number of divorces and by birth-control. In that white book, published in conformity with a procedure reserved for official statements of major importance, it is explicitly said that there is an ultimate danger, quite real although remote, that the British people may gradually disappear—and that statement is made by the British government itself. That blue book emphasizes that in 1919, for instance, Great Britain had about 16,000,000 people under the age of twenty, while in 1939, twenty years after, she had only 14,000,000. So much for England.

Let us see what happens to-day in godless Soviet Russia. In 1943, the government of Soviet Russia discarded the communist principle of coeducation and reestablished separate schools for boys and girls. Last year—I quote from an article published on July 10 by the newspaper *Le Droit* of Ottawa—the soviet government itself announced that they—

—had just taken new measures with a view to ensuring the morality and the survival of the Russian family, threatened in its very existence by the devastation of war and by the ravages, no less serious, of the anti-family policy forced upon the Russians during twenty-five years of communist administration.

I quote further:

The Soviet authorities make divorce more difficult to obtain.

If Russia has come to realize that after twenty-five years of communism she must make divorce more difficult to obtain it is high time that we should realize it in Canada. Again:

Russian couples only had to sign a form and appear for a few minutes before an official in order to obtain the dissolution of their marriage.

That is what we do not want in Canada. It is why I oppose the bill of the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Black). Let me quote in conclusion, a most eloquent excerpt from a paper read by Mr. Léon Mercier-Gouin, now a member of the Senate, before a social congress held in Montreal in 1923. Here are a few lines which will certainly not fail to impress you:

Divorce is a demoralizing factor and it further checks the birth rate.

If there are children, divorce deprives them of the care and moral education they have a right to expect from their parents, for the latter have irrevocably separated and perhaps remarried. Thus the unwanted child is unnaturally divided between father and mother. Separation as to bed and board is a sad evil, sometimes necessary; it is a cruel hardship for

a child, but not an iniquitous injustice lacking all possibility of readjustment. Divorce does grievous wrong to tiny tots who did not ask to be born. Their young hearts are withered by this blot which, like cancer, gnaws at their conscience and sensibilities. Divorce destroys the family and thus shatters at its very base the whole social structure.

I maintain that divorce is anti everything that matters: family, society, legislation, contractual obligations, Christianity and nationhood. That is why we oppose it irrevocably.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but as the time allotted for the discussion of government measures has expired, the house must resume where it left off at six o'clock.

WAR AND DEMOBILIZATION

PROVISION FOR APPROPRIATION OF $1,365,000,000 FOR WAR PURPOSES, DEMOBILIZATION, PROMOTION OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY, ET CETERA

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Ilsley that the house go into committee to consider a resolution to grant to His Majesty certain sums of money for the carrying out of measures deemed necessary or advisable in consequence of the war.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Mr. Speaker, when the house took recess at six o'clock I was endeavouring to explain what had been done with the report presented in 1944 to the Canadian Bar Association. I have just one further word on that to complete the matter. The motion that had been made contained three recommendations, which are found on page 52 of the report of the annual meeting. He then added:

I therefore move the three last-named recommendations. And as to the rest of the report I move that the report be tabled, received and discussed either here or by the executive committee, to implement what is therein contained.

There was considerable discussion, and finally Mr. James E. Day said this, which is found at the foot of page 59:

Let the committee continue and put the recommendations in concrete form, seventeen suggestions, let these be put in printed form, and let the whole matter of their consideration come up on Friday.

The Chairman: That, ladies and gentlemen, is the amendment.

The amendment was then put to the meeting and on a standing vote was declared lost.

The motion was put to the meeting and on a standing vote was declared carried.

The matter came up again at a meeting of the council of the Canadian Bar Association which was held on the last day of August, 1945. There was no meeting of the association itself, because it would have been contrary to the orders of the controller of transport to have held the meeting.

The report was again taken up and the chairman of the committee proceeded to make the following remarks:

Our committee has also given additional consideration to some of the topics of the main report, and we wish to submit the following for attention:

1. Continuation of controls after the war. There appear to be many who believe that some measure of control, specially in relation to ceiling prices, should be had and continued for some time after the war as a transit and adjustment period policy. Otherwise prices might jump suddenly to extreme limits, and bring a chaotic situation.

2. Should the necessary controls be continued under the War Measures Act?

It is expected by some, feared by others, that the federal government, for such controls as may appear necessary to maintain, will continue to rely on the authority of the War Measures Act.

Now that the war is over, such a course would raise a very serious problem of constitutional law, as to controlling civil and property rights which are in relation to civil law, and fall normally, under the constitution within the exclusive legislative jurisdiction of the provinces.

Authorities are cited to show that it is well established that circumstances, very serious in nature, and amounting to a national emergency, such as a great war or other similarly wide and calamitous circumstances, would justify the federal power, by legislation, adequately to control the liberties, civil rights and property in the provinces.

We then come to the recommendations which are as follows:

Your committee recommend that the proclamation declaring that the war no longer exists be issued as soon as the war with the enemy is really at an end according to the established principles of international law.

Let us make the distinction here between the war emergency itself, which is the fact of a state of war, and an economic emergency, which, though a consequence following the war, is not the war emergency. It may be an economic emergency. The calamity against which we have to protect the nation is not the war itself, or a consequential defeat of our arms, or the invasion by the enemy, but is an economic state of affairs that may be most serious, and that may, or may not be adequately coped with by the provinces. If the federal administration feel that, after the war, and in relation to such economic conditions of the country, a state of emergency exists, of a most serious character, and national in scope, let them face the issue directly and submit to parliament a new law affirming the existence or the apprehension and determining the exact nature of the new emergency.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I appreciate the "hear, hear" from the other side of the house. As a

matter of fact, the speech from the throne had been drafted before anything of this became public, and if the hon. members will refer to it as printed on page 8 of *Hansard* they will find the following:

It is the intention of the government to abolish war restrictions in progressive steps as rapidly as that can be accomplished without occasioning inflation or other economic disturbances. Such controls as are essential to the welfare of our people will be continued for as long as they are necessary.

You will be asked to approve a measure to extend certain specified emergency powers to meet emergency conditions in the period of reconstruction.

As a matter of fact, I have before me a bill with that intent, which was printed evidently before August 28, because the stamp from my office bears the date of August 28, and just as soon as there is an opportunity that bill will be introduced and parliament will be asked to take its responsibility, because it will be a considerable responsibility. It would be a considerable responsibility for anyone to take to sweep out with one fell stroke those controls which have been so effective in preventing inflation in this country. In making that statement I am not departing from principles which were enunciated by the leader of the Progressive Conservative party in a speech he made in Montreal on April 23, 1945, in which he said this:

In thus referring to our war-time controls I do not suggest that these have been bad, or that they were an unnecessary product of autocratic power. Their necessity must be as clear to you as it is to me; but I insist that in assessing their virtues we should think of those controls in terms of the job they were intended to do. If we do that, then I am sure you will not find it contradictory for me to say that existing controls cannot be dropped willy-nilly the instant the job of making war is done. Certainly we must be rid of them as soon as possible, but in some cases they will have to be unwound very carefully and slowly and there will have to be planning to accomplish the unwinding.

That is not my language; that is the opinion of the leader of the opposition; and we find ourselves in company with the privy council in the Fort Frances case in which the following is stated at page 706 of the report.

No authority other than the central government is in a position to deal with a problem which is essentially one of statesmanship. It may be that it has become clear that the crisis which arose is wholly at an end, and that there is no justification for the continued exercise of an exceptional interference which becomes ultra vires when it is no longer called for. In such a case the law as laid down for distribution of powers in the ruling instrument would have to be invoked.

The question of determining at what time it will be proper to put an end to the validity of orders made under the War Measures Act is a matter of statesmanship. We do not pretend that we are the only statesmen in this house. The intention of the government, as stated in the speech from the throne, is to ask all the statesmen in this house to take their responsibility as to the proper time for putting an end to these controls. The matter will be gone into quite fully when the bill comes before the house.

I do not want to take the time at this moment when we are dealing with an appropriation of money that is necessary for purposes directly connected with the war, to discuss the reasons for the continuation of controls which will have to be discussed when the bill announced in the speech from the throne comes properly before the house for consideration; but I would refer hon. members to the reference book on economic controls which was put before the members of the dominion-provincial conference. Once again this is a matter where emergency conditions enlarge the powers of the dominion at the expense of those normally exercised by provincial authorities. The reasons given or suggested for it being necessary to continue that state of the legislation for a time were summarized in this reference book compiled under the direction of the committee on economic controls, of which F. P. Varcoe was chairman and C. Stein, secretary. This book contains submissions from the wartime prices and trade board, the war industries control board and the Department of Labour. The purpose of this material is—

. . . to describe the situation which brought various war-time economic controls into being and to outline the kind of problems which probably will continue to exist in these fields during the transition period.

This summary contains some thirty pages of double column print, to show why some, thinking they were taking the position of statesmen, suggested that careful consideration ought to be given to the possible consequences of too rapidly proceeding with decontrol. The policy the government of Canada submitted to the representatives of the governments of the provinces in that regard is set out on page 9 of the proposals of the government of Canada, which were put before that conference. There hon. members will find a long statement of the methods which the dominion government proposed as being best suited to the progressive elimination of these controls.

Another question which was put and which quite logically follows this portion of my remarks is: have the defence of Canada regula-

tions been repealed? Practically all the defence of Canada regulations which were of substance have been repealed by two orders in council which were published in the war orders and regulations. One was passed on August 16, the day after we heard of the intention of the Japanese government to surrender to the allied powers, and it did away with practically all those provisions of the defence of Canada regulations which interfered with the ordinary liberties of the individuals. The second was passed on September 14, 1945, and was published in the September 24 issue of war orders and regulations. It removed many of the other regulations, leaving subsisting practically only those dealing with protected places or areas, which were necessary because of very important works going on, as for instance at Chalk river, in plants belonging to the government. Other provisions were retained because of our international obligations with respect to the control of tonnage, and the provisions which give special authority for the placing of ships in harbours were also retained. It was felt necessary to retain those provisions for the safety of the men being brought back from overseas. They were passed subsequently to the list of orders in council which were tabled by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) at the opening of the session, which brought the tabling down to June 30, and I would ask leave to table those orders in council now.

Another question which arose and about which I am sure there is much unsatisfied curiosity in my own mind as well as in the minds of others is the date which will be fixed as that from which will run the two years for the refunding of the compulsory savings portion of the income tax, and the refundable portion of the excess profits tax. My understanding is that this date will be announced by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) in presenting his budget proposals. Likewise many of the previous controls which were found to be no longer absolutely necessary have been eliminated.

Is there anyone in this house who would have taken the responsibility, either on August 15 or on August 16, or on September 1 or on September 2, of saying the war was at an end, and that everything in our system of controls on which we depended to combat inflation would then come to an end? I do not think a single member of this house would have said at that time, or would say at this time, that it was proper to bring that system down without taking some means to substitute other authority for the maintenance of those controls. That is the manner in which the law officer has advised his colleagues; that is a matter the responsibility for which will be placed before this house as soon as it is possible to introduce and deal with the bill thus forecast in the speech from the throne.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, it would have been well if the minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent), who is also Attorney General of Canada, had given this opinion on September 11, the day I raised this question here. Notwithstanding that he read from some correspondence, it is a legal opinion. Ever since confederation it has been the rule in this parliament that the Minister of Justice, who is also Attorney General of Canada, should not give legal opinions in this house, even when he is asked for them. That question has come up on many occasions. The rule I mention has been followed since about 1886, and there are good reasons for it. In this country the courts are subservient to the legislature. One of the principles I have always enunciated is this. The Minister of Justice appoints the judges. One of the cardinal principles of our constitution is that we must have impartial justice and a judiciary free from any interference on the part of the executive. That has been the reason for the rule I just mentioned.

I brought this matter to the attention of the house on September 11 when, in reference to this resolution, in view of the fact that the war was over, I asked if the government did not consider that the War Measures Act had been automatically repealed and annulled, that it had expired through the effluxion of time; and I still believe that is the correct view. At that time I was not brushed aside, as some newspapers said. I am not in the habit of being treated in that way, because I know the facts of the case. At that time the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) replied to me:

> It is the opinion of the Minister of Justice that it is within the constitutional power of this parliament to pass this bill. Moreover, this bill, as I say, follows the precedent of the Demobilization Appropriation Act passed in June of 1919.

This war is totally different from the last one. Such an act as that passed in 1919 is not relevant in the house at the present time. I call the attention of hon. members to the statements made by the Canadian Bar Association, where they have given some opinions which the Minister of Finance has said were only matters of policy. I say they were not They were legal opinions on the whole question

Let us follow this to its logical conclusion In view of what the Minister of Justice said to-night, the whole control system is still in effect, despite the fact that the war is over. The war may be over in London and over in

Washington, but apparently it is not over here. They have taken action in Washington in connection with their controls. They have loosened them up, and have given large and small businessmen a chance. Let us follow their example.

Sometimes these controls need rationing. If they are continued large numbers of people will be summoned to law courts across this dominion. We know that many summonses have been issued already, and chiefly in the Toronto district. The charges and fines there seem to be about ten to one, so far as numbers are concerned, when compared with what they are in other cities. There is no equality of treatment at all. When these cases are before the courts the question will be raised whether this parliament has power, in view of the war being over, and the War Measures Act annulled, to follow the practice which it has followed of bringing in resolutions of this kind, followed by bills.

I referred to this matter the night war broke out in September, 1939. I referred to the very same principle which is now involved, and which has been discussed this evening by the Minister of Justice. I pointed out that when Great Britain is at war, Canada is at war, and that when Great Britain is no longer at war, Canada is no longer at war.

Then, on the matter of status, I say we were not at war, although war was declared on September 3, 1939. However, it was not until September 10 of that year that this House of Commons enacted legislation. On September 4 the *Athenia* was sunk, and I called attention of the house to the fact that we were bound by what had been done, and were at war on September 3, 1939. As a result of that we found out afterwards that under our new system of status we had to wait until September 10, for seven days, and all that kind of thing, before Canada declared war.

All I am saying is this, that no matter what we say or do in this house, this matter will come up in the law courts of the country. It will come before the courts the very moment it is proposed after the war to enforce these controls. The jurisdiction of parliament will be challenged, so far as its legislation in this respect is concerned.

Fines will be imposed and appeals will be lodged. In my view they should be taken right to the supreme court; that is where this matter should go. Under the Supreme Court Act the government of the day, on recommendation of the attorney general, can recommend submission to the Supreme Court of Canada of points such as those raised by me on September 11 and a few days ago in the speech of the very able hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker).

In view of what has been said to-night by the Minister of Justice, surely a clear case has been made out, if there ever was a case made out for reference to the supreme court under the Supreme Court Act. If ever there was such a case, it is this one now before us. The whole question of the system of controls as they are to be permitted in Canada after the war is over should be looked into.

I shall refer to one or two further points, and then I shall have concluded. My first point has to do with paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e) of the resolution now before us. We have seen the result of our system of controls in Canada. As I said the other day:

> All kinds of bodies, over the head of parliament, are spending money like water. Every principle for which the British nation struggled in the old land since the seventeenth century has been surrendered to the political caucuses. Parliament itself, which came into being to ensure that taxes shall be voted only by those who have to pay them, has become the institution through which those who do not pay them impose them on others.
>
> I want to emphasize to the committee that powers of legislation older even than the right of taxpayers to determine the national expenditure have been surrendered, and if we are to continue this sort of thing the power of parliament will be gone forever. Whole spheres of activity, involving the livelihood of every man, woman and child in this country, have been removed from the jurisdiction of the law and of parliament and reserved for the determination of tribunals, irresponsible, irremovable, governed by no control and subject to no appeal.

That is all I object to. If parliament is to be supreme we should observe its rights and privileges. Before going into committee we are told by the various ministers about the succes sof this system of control. In addition to that, some controllers are going across Canada making speeches about which, quite probably, the ministers know nothing. This is done over the head of parliament and while it is in session.

There was some legislation passed after the last war, when parliament was meeting, to require the submission of all these matters to the House of Commons. This has not been done. In addition to that, I contended at the time this war started, during the first ten days of the special session, that we did not need any proclamation or order in council; that war was on from September 3, 1939. We did not need any orders in council such as were passed by parliament on September 10, 1939. We did not need them, because when Great Britain is at war, Canada is at war, and when she is not, Canada is not.

I know it is in the public interest to have the removal of these government controls. There is no business, large or small, in Canada that is not suffering from them. Large business, wholesale business, retail business—all kinds of business have been suffering from these irksome controls.

I should like to draw to the attention of the house what has been done in the United States, because throughout the war it would seem that we followed Washington to a considerable extent. This pamphlet sets out the policy of the federal government in that country, and the measures taken by federal agencies. This booklet, which is issued monthly by the National City bank of New York city, in its September issue sets out what is being done at Washington. This is the action taken by the President of the United States on the advice of his officers, and particularly Mr. Snyder, director of the office of war mobilization and reconversion. It also contains suggestions by Mr. Krug, chairman of the war production board. These men occupy positions which would be the equivalent of positions in our Department of Munitions and Supply.

Perhaps I might say in passing, and before reading from the report, that our parliament might well follow what has been done at Washington in connection with the elimination of these controls and in respect of reconversion. In other countries the test of the ability to recover from a war and to return to a state of prosperity has been found in the capacity to produce goods and to supply them to the population. There is no other measuring stick than that found in the ability to produce, distribute and consume goods and services. If production is insufficient, then the distribution of money, whether in the form of international loans or relief, would be involved. Many industries do not have to reconvert at all, and those that do make their preparations well in advance. Industrial leaders throughout the United States generally know what they are doing and what they are going to do. They are moving forward, in a sense of public responsibility, and because they see vast markets awaiting their products.

Returning to the report of the National City bank, I find this, with respect to the removal of government controls, in the report of Mr. Snyder, approved in August by President Truman:

> Finally, and perhaps most important of all, the policies of the federal government and the measures taken by the federal agencies imply in general that reliance for rapid reconversion is being placed upon the ingenuity and resourcefulness of business men themselves, and not upon schemes for government direction and control. Nothing was more to be feared, either for the transition period or the longer future, than regulations subjecting every major decision of business to the approval of Washington, with the certain result of confusion, delay, mistakes and injustices. But the moves since the surrender have shown that the policy is to free business of interferences with production —in some respects at once and in others gradually—and put it on its own. The first step was to cancel war contracts promptly, in order to cut the cost and stop the waste of war, reduce the inflation danger, free materials, machines and labour for peace time goods, and clear the decks for a fresh start.

[Mr. Church.]

In a short paragraph, the policy of the director at Washington is set out, and this was reported to the president on August 15. It is as follows:

> Nor will we continue the manufacture of useless armaments for as much as one day to cushion the shock. We will not manufacture a single shell, nor a single piece of equipment above absolute minimum military needs, for the purpose of reducing the shock of terminating war work. We will not keep a single soldier or sailor in uniform longer than he is needed by the army or navy, in order to hold down the totals of temporary unemployment. This is the policy laid down by the congress, wholeheartedly carried out by this administration, and backed by the American people.

And again:

> The second step was to remove most of the war-time limitations on production and on the use of materials. Mr. Krug, chairman of the war production board, has moved rapidly, rescinding limitation orders except in the case of certain critically short items, and in general freeing the industries to go ahead without having, as the Truman committe report in 1944 said, "to go to Washington with hat in hand."

This man occupies somewhat the same position as our Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe), and this is what he said:

> It is necessary to get rid of regulations and production limitations as quickly as possible. They automatically put ceilings on initiative, imagination and resourcefulness, the very qualities the country will need most if we are to have a resilient and rapidly expanding economy after the defeat of Japan.
>
> The danger confronting us, as I see it, is that we will overlook the natural resilience of the economy—the capacity of manufacturers, wholesalers and retailers to readapt themselves to changed conditions and hence quickly to utilize the resources released from munitions production. If we were to attempt in Washington to see that every manufacturer, wholesaler or retailer got his exact share of released manpower or materials, we should be lost in a myriad of rules and regulations. We should get in the way of reconversion rather than speed it.

And again:

> As long as the policies of government are in harmony with these principles, the energies, abilities and experience of millions of business men will be at work, each on his own problems, to get factories retooled and speed production of civilian goods. No other forces that could be exerted in the situation could possibly be as effective.

And again:

The allegation that there has been a "lack of planning" does not stand analysis. Probably there has never been a time when planning, at the level where it counts most, has been as widespread and as ably done.

And further down:

The overwhelming majority of the American people, however, believe that detailed regulation of business in peace time would be wholly impracticable and disastrous in its consequences upon production and employment.

If we are to avoid widespread unemployment the government must release some of these controls and leave large and small businesses free to carry on. I notice in the newspapers that estimates are being made of unemployment. One made by the president of the C.I.O. in the United States is as high as 10,000,000. The same predictions were made at the end of the last war. I notice it is estimated that there will be 500,000 unemployed in Canada. These are rot, and some restraint should prevent the circulation of such predictions. I believe, with the experience gained in the war, the reconversion of industry in Canada will be carried on more rapidly than was the case in the last war. If private business is allowed to function free of control, as is the case at Washington reconversion will be much shorter.

If there is to be any danger of the suffering which occurred in this country after the last war during the first winter occurring now that this war is over, the government should be ready to look after those who may suffer because of lack of shelter, food or fuel.

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to detain the house at any great length, but there are one or two things I should like to say. One point was mentioned in the debate and another deals in a general way with the war appropriation. First, I should like to refer to the statement made this afternoon by the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell). I do not want the hon. member to feel that I am criticizing him except to say that I think the statement he made this afternoon was unwise, no matter how fundamentally true he may consider it to be.

Because of the gravity of the international situation, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) left the country while parliament was in session. I do not believe we should say anything here that will add to the difficulties of the situation. We all must feel disturbed about the general international situation today. The hon. member for Macleod said that a Christian democracy could not cooperate with a totalitarian state, and then he went on to make it quite clear to which country he was referring. His statement sums up to this: Canada, which I assume is a Christian democracy, Great Britain, the United States and perhaps a number of other countries cannot cooperate with the Soviet Union.

I might pause here to say that if there is anyone in this country whom the people who set themselves as the friends of the Soviet union hate, it is myself. Consequently I cannot be accused of appeasing the Soviet Union. The implication in the statement of the hon. member is that we cannot cooperate. If we cannot cooperate, then there is non-cooperation. If there is non-cooperation, that in my opinion, will lead inevitably to another conflict. We have no recourse but to cooperate. Cooperating is not the same as appeasing.

I think we all admired the minister for external affairs of Australia, the Hon. H. V. Evatt, for setting out, at both San Francisco and London, what he considers to be the rights of the Australian nation, of the Canadian nation and of many other small nations. But I want to go a little farther than that and point out that we found ways to cooperate in war. It was through the cooperation of the Soviet Union with the Christian democracies, if you want to use that word—I have known of Christian totalitarianism—that we were able to defeat our enemies and achieve peace, at least peace in its negative form, namely, the absence of war. Should we say now that we cannot cooperate and bring that peace to the full fruition that we expected? I believe that we should at least try. We certainly should not do anything at the present time that would interfere with that desired end.

I concede to my hon. friend the right to criticize to his heart's content in this free parliament, but while democracy gives freedom, it does something else; it puts the onus of what we say upon ourselves; we must consider what effect our words will have on our country's affairs. I am afraid that in dealing with this, perhaps the last war appropriation, we may run into some difficulty. I have no fear that the appropriation as placed before parliament will not carry, but I believe that a good deal of harm has already been done by the public press and by various individuals both in the government and in different groups in the house in urging that the war is over now and that we should get rid of controls at once. I should like to tell hon. members again that the war is not over and will not be over until we have achieved those things for which we went to war. Those things were: freedom from fear; freedom from war itself; freedom from want. Those things have not been achieved in their full measure or achieved

so that we know of a certainty that we have them, and in my opinion those are the things for which the young men of Canada fought and died. Either they died for those things or we lied to them. Let me say again that those things will not have been achieved until we have restored the countries we have liberated. We gave our young men in liberation of those countries; we poured into them our wealth, and now there is a danger that we are going to quibble over the small amount that it will take to help those people to restore their strength and build up their own economy so that they can get on their feet once more and perhaps pay us back, if not in material things, at least in the return to this earth of peace and order. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would just warn the house and, if I may presume to do so, the country that our help is needed now just as much as it has been during the last five years.

There was a point raised this afternoon by the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton) in connection with orders in council, and the discussion was carried on from another angle by the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent). I am now an old member of this house, and I have observed over the years how it conducts its business. When I heard the Minister of Justice in his eloquent peroration just a few moments ago I was almost prepared to call myself not an old member of the house but an elder statesman, but I decided that that probably would be going over the verge of modesty and so I will not say it.

I have listened to statements that we have government by order in council, that parliament has ceased to function, and similar phrases. I would just like to tell the members that we must do one of two things. We must either stream-line the procedure of this house, or the government will have no alternative than to legislate by order in council. In the British parliament at Westminster, where the business moves much faster than it does here because they have improved their procedure, they are beginning to realize that there must be a further stream-lining of procedure. We here are faced with the alternative of parliament becoming simply a word factory if we do not stream-line the procedure.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): You are to blame for the word "factory" quite a bit.

Mr. MacINNIS: I admit that, and I am not blaming anyone any more than I blame myself. But I am caught as it were, like the rest of us, in a sort of machine—

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Lots of us are not in that boat.

[Mr. MacInnis.]

Mr. MacINNIS: —so long as we have the present procedure, and I do not think I would be doing my duty either to this house or to my constituents or to the country if I just let my hon. friend talk and out of my wisdom did not reply.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Perhaps what I say is more sensible than what you say.

Mr. MacINNIS: That is a matter of judgment, and I would not doubt at all that my hon. friend's judgment is as good as mine. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think we should give thought to organizing the procedure of this house so that when the government does stop legislating by order in council it may legislate through an improved procedure. That is all I have to say, and I hope that I have not taken up too much time.

Mr. JOHN T. HACKETT (Stanstead): Mr. Speaker, we have all listened with interest and with respect to the words that have recently been pronounced by the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent). He has told us many things which we know. He has failed to tell us that which we want to know; that is, when the government is going to declare the war at an end. The government is now acting under legislation which permits it to govern by orders in council. The words of the enabling statute are: "by reason of the existence of a real or apprehended war, invasion or insurrection." The house is interested in knowing when the government is going to declare under section 6 of the War Measures Act that the war is at an end.

The reason for this query is not mere vulgar curiosity. It is one that affects every member of the house; it is one that affects the entire population. If government is to be carried on by order in council, if parliament is to be denied its elementary function until it suits some hon. gentleman to say that the war is at an end, it is as well that we should know that is part of government policy.

We are told on the highest authority that emergencies may arise that justify the transfer to the dominion of powers which ordinarily reside in the provinces. The reason and the only reason under the statute which is relied upon to enact these orders in council is the "existence of real or apprehended war, invasion or insurrection." I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there is no existing war or any apprehension of war, invasion or insurrection, and that in consequence the right of the government to enact by order in council legislation which affects the whole country and which stultifies and annihilates parliament has ceased.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) has relied upon the Fort Frances case, and he has told parliament that there is a case in which valid orders in council were enacted after the cessation of hostilities, and that in consequence it is a precedent for the conduct of the government. I have read, somewhat hurriedly I must admit, the decision of the privy council in that case. I do not find that the question now at issue was raised directly. I do find that the law lord who rendered the judgment in that case did say that it was not the function of a court of justice to say, under section 6 of the War Measures Act, when the war had come to an end; I quote now from page 706 of "Law Reports, Appeal Cases (1923)," in which Lord Haldane said:

> It may be that it has become clear that the crisis which arose is wholly at an end and that there is no justification for the continued exercise of an exceptional interference which becomes ultra vires when it is no longer called for. In such a case the law as laid down for distribution of powers in the ruling instrument would have to be invoked. But very clear evidence that the crisis had wholly passed away would be required to justify the judiciary, even when the question raised was one of ultra vires which it had to decide, in overruling the decision of the government that exceptional measures were still requisite.

Therefore, if I have correctly interpreted the words of Lord Haldane, he went no farther than to say that it was not the function of the courts to say when the war was at an end. It was the duty of the government to say when the war was at an end. It is because we believe that that is the duty of the government, that we ask the government to state definitely what everybody knows to be a fact, namely, that there is no longer any reason to fear the "existence of a real or apprehended war, invasion or insurrection."

There may be dozens of crises. There may be an economic crisis; there may be a financial crisis, there may be a social crisis. Such crises may be reasons to introduce other legislation. I would say to the Minister of Justice that it is not very consoling to hon. gentlemen who have come here to take a part, and a full part, in the enactment of legislation, to be told day after day that somebody or some body other than parliament is legislating for the country.

The effort which the opposition is putting forth is toward a return to normal conditions. I am willing to admit with the Minister of Justice that it might have been imprudent to abolish all controls at one fell swoop. There is the widest divergence between such an act and the course that wisdom would suggest and what the law requires, namely that legislation be brought down stating that an emergency other than the existence of war, real or apprehended, or of invasion or insurrection, is to be relied upon for the enactment of further orders in council. I do not think extravagant language makes a case any better than it really is, but does anybody in the country doubt for a moment that the war is at an end? Does anybody question that hostilities have ceased? Under the statute the government was authorized to rule by order in council only so long as there was an existing war. If other emergencies are to be met, let it be stated in a bill submitted to the house what the emergency is; I know of no tribunal more competent and more willing to pass upon that issue than parliament. Parliament after all had a function. It has lost it. For the last six years it has been a mere looker-on. Until a declaration comes from the administration that the war is at an end, and until new legislation is enacted warranting further orders in council, I submit with great deference that the government is acting outside the law, and that there is nothing in the decision of the privy council in the Fort Frances case which runs counter to that statement. Every day we are told that orders in council are passed, which in the normal course of events could only be enacted by parliament. Nothing is more tenacious than the lust for power. Once a man has tasted the blood which enables him to make his wish law to a great number, he becomes inebriated by the draught and finds it most difficult to recede into the position which is properly his. I suggest to hon. members opposite that they should cease making orders in council under the War Measures Act. I make the suggestion with full knowledge of the difficulties of government at the present time. Everybody, whether he sits to the right or to the left of the Speaker, knows that government is now a difficult task, and in so far as I am able to interpret the sentiment of those who sit to your left, Mr. Speaker, they realize the difficulties of government and they do not wish to resort to any petty means to improve their political position. But that being admitted, they feel that it is their duty to insist that the rights of parliament be restored to parliament; that the electorate of Canada, in so far as it has found representation in the house, be allowed to express itself, and that when a measure is about to be enacted it should be subjected to the criticism, and to the betterment which inevitably follows the criticism of parliament.

That sums up my commentary on the statement of the Minister of Justice. His statement was clear but it did not answer the ques-

tion. His statement was truthful, but it did not give any enlightenment as to the time that the government intends to rehabilitate parliament and do away with the method of government which is one of the ills of war, to which we bowed as a necessity of war, and from which we wish to be relieved now that the war is over.

Mr. H. G. ARCHIBALD (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words about the matter of controls. This subject has always interested me more from the point of view of historical processes than anything else. I have listened to the various speakers. For instance, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) mentioned the other evening that—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would inform the hon. member that he cannot refer to debates which have previously taken place during the present session.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It has been mentioned here at various times that Manchesterian Liberalism would solve the problem, and to-night we have the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) advancing the position that he did not know when these controls would be lifted, but that they were necessary at the present time. Controls are the very opposite of Manchesterian Liberalism. Manchesterian Liberalism is the right to buy and sell freely before the law. Now we have the state entering into the very keynote of production; government orders regulating trade. The tendency is to increase rather than decrease as the years go by.

The opposition is criticizing the government for maintaining these controls. Yet the former leader of that party, the Right Hon. R. B. Bennett, was the first in this country to advance a planned economy from the point of view of the old-line parties. The process that we see will end up with the state ultimately becoming the sole capitalist. That is advanced by such men as Frederic Engels and Karl Marx. It is bound to come about. The necessity for state control came through the war. The government recognizes that a crisis is still with us and this crisis will continue with us as the years go by; therefore we are going to see the absolute continuation of government control within private industry.

It is interesting to me to see what is happening to the social groupings because of those price controls. For example, I have received letters from small meat-packing concerns claiming that under the quota system they cannot get into the export market, and they cannot sell sufficient on the home market to make it pay because they cannot get the meat.

This means that they are dissolved, that they are being wiped out and that the big meat-packing concerns are taking the whole business. The individual commodity is losing all value, and more and more commodities have to be exported in order to make any profit whatsoever. Therefore on the home market we are facing a scarcity and we have the quota system as it is applied in the meat markets. It is applied there by government law,, but actually it is in effect to-day in nearly all industry because they cannot get the material. Clothing stores are under the quota system to all intents and purposes. They cannot sell enough to maintain their position; therefore they go out of business. Consequently we are seeing the liquidation of the small trading class. It is interesting to note the effects that this is having on the political arena. Such groups as can be seen to the left, the C.C.F. and the Social Credit party, are an expression of protest from the small middle class, such as the small working class. This tendency will go on and we shall gain more and more support from that small middle class. Therefore at the present time the government is cutting the ground from under its feet because it is wiping out the very support by which it maintains itself. From the point of view of a socialist I would say, more power to the government, because it is hoisting itself with its own petard.

Mr. G. R. PEARKES (Nanaimo): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to make any address such as "Praise God and pass the ammunition" or to enter into any discussion regarding controls. But while the government is considering the questions which have been put to them to-day, I should like to raise one point. I have no desire whatever to be provocative or anything but constructive.

We have just come to the victorious conclusion of campaigns in northwest Europe and in the Pacific. Perhaps I use the word "campaigns" advisedly, because I must admit I am a little confused as to whether or not the war is over. One of the principal lessons we have learned from those victorious campaigns is that it has been essential that there should be coordinated effort between the navies, armies and air forces of the allied nations. A few weeks ago we had the privilege of seeing the models and films of "Mulberry", which was the development of the ports for landing on the coast of France on V-day. I think everyone who saw and studied those models must have been convinced that a vast amount of skilful and detailed planning had been carried out beforehand in order to ensure the success of the men who were fighting on the

beaches, because without that forethought no amount of gallantry would have been of any avail. From the earliest inception of these plans soldiers, sailors and airmen worked together as one staff, closeted in rooms, considering every detail of the parts which those three services should play when the great day came. I may say equally that this practice was followed in the great amphibian operations which were carried out in the Pacific theatre of war.

I submit that we are in the planning stage now when we come to consider the estimates of the three defence services, the planning stage in order that we may preserve the hard-won peace during the next two or three years. I know that is referred to as an interim period; I am not suggesting that the planning is going any farther than this interim period, but I suggest that this is an important period and quite possibly a dangerous one. Therefore I would plead that we do not lose sight of the great lesson we learned during the war, that there must be proper cooperation between the navy, the army and the air force as a prerequisite to any success. I do not believe the ministers of the government and their executive officers have been working in water-tight compartments during the preparation of the estimates they are about to submit for this interim period. I am sure they must have progressed beyond those unhappy days when service estimates were prepared behind closed doors, with the greatest secrecy, because one service was competing against the others for what defence funds the government of the day were prepared to make available.

I do not wish to retard the business of this house. On the contrary I believe that the estimates of the services would be considered more efficiently and dealt with more expeditiously if, before we take up these estimates in committee, some member of the government would give us the results of their deliberations and tell us the over-all picture, so that before we consider each individual service estimate we can see what is the defensive policy of the government and make sure that the three services are coordinated. Otherwise we shall be arguing in the dark, discussing this service and that service without having an over-all picture.

Mr. DOUGLAS G. ROSS (St. Paul's): In the beginning of my remarks, Mr. Deputy Speaker, may I congratulate you upon the honour which has been bestowed upon you in your appointment to the position you now hold.

At a time like this, after a period during which conditions have been so disturbed, and when we find the Big Five having a great deal of difficulty, I think we should consider for a few moments what should be the position of Canada. My ancestors, like those of many others in this house, came to this country years ago. People of many nationalities came to Canada, and they came here because of the British traditions which are followed in this country. They wanted to be free; and when you read the history of Canada you find that all our institutions are founded on the freedom of man and on democracy, based on British traditions. For more than a year Britain stood alone against the whole of Europe. No country helped her except the nations of the commonwealth; and, thank God, Canada was one of those nations. I think it is now about time we supported her in the difficult position in which she finds herself to-day. Everything we have that is good, everything that means freedom, comes to us from those traditions which we have had handed down to us and for which our forefathers shed their blood. They are not new; they are old, the foundation of democracy as we have it to-day, and I think the least we can do is to give Great Britain our support in these difficult times.

The world to-day depends on Great Britain and the United States, a country which has followed our traditions. Let us support Great Britain as one of the members of the Big Five. Let us see to it that we support Great Britain and the United States in their fight for freedom.

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on Friday last the Minister of Finance explained the reasons why he is now bringing forward a proposal to ask for $1,365 million—

Mr. ILSLEY: Mr. Speaker, just on a point of order, this is a rather important point of order, as the hon. member has already spoken in this debate.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On Friday the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) did speak. He can speak again only with the unanimous consent of the house.

Mr. MACKENZIE: By consent of the house.

Mr. POULIOT: Give him a chance.

Mr. ILSLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have no objection, with the unanimous consent, but—

Mr. BRACKEN: If there is objection to my proceeding I will sit down right now. But I explained when I spoke the other day

that I was giving way to the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green), who had been called away. I could not say it at the time, but the fact was that he had been called away on account of the death of his father on the preceding day. But I do not propose to go on if there is any objection from anybody in this house.

Mr. ILSLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to unanimous consent; but I must firmly insist that a speaker in this house has no right to speak a second time in debate, without the unanimous consent of the house. I never have heard of that rule being broken in the twenty years I have been in parliament, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think that is the rule. Of course, in this case, we shall be going into committee, and the leader of the opposition would have an opportunity to speak then.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Unanimous consent.

Mr. GRAYDON: You will surely not cut him off!

Mr. POULIOT: Go ahead.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Golding in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE
FOR NAVAL SERVICES

Mr. GRAYDON: That is about the worst I have seen.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Pretty small onions.

Mr. ILSLEY: I did not refuse unanimous consent.

Mr. GRAYDON: You could not have thought, surely, or you would not have said that.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go ahead.

Mr. BRACKEN: Go ahead and make your statement.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): Shall the item carry?

Mr. ILSLEY: Before the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Abbott) begins, I wish to make my position very clear in this matter.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): You did.

Mr. ILSLEY: I think it is exceedingly important that no one in this house be allowed to speak, as of right, a second time in debate. I have no objection whatsoever to the hon. member's being given unanimous consent, and I so stated.

[Mr. Bracken.]

Mr. GRAYDON: Not the first time, you didn't.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Yes, he did.

Mr. ILSLEY: Just a minute. I raised the point as to whether anybody in this house should speak a second time in a debate. And I stated, when someone said "by unanimous consent," that I had no objection to the hon. member's speaking with unanimous consent. I wish to have that made clear, because it is not a matter about which the leader of the opposition should express indignation. That would be entirely unjustified. It is a matter of adherence to a very important rule in this house, the rule which provides that no one has a right to speak a second time in debate, with Mr. Speaker in the chair, except with unanimous consent. But I had no objection to the giving of unanimous consent.

Mr. BRACKEN: Mr. Chairman, since permission has been given the Minister of Finance to make a statement, I might be permitted to say a few words. On Friday, after he spoke, I said only two things. I asked for permission to have the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green) proceed, because I knew what the house did not know, namely, that he had been called home because of the death of his father on the previous day; knowing, too, that he would take a prominent part on behalf of this party in this debate.

The only other thing I said was to offer support of the victory loan proposal made by the Minister of Finance. Let me say this other thing, that on purely technical grounds, no doubt the minister and the government are correct, but on grounds of substantial justice they are wrong.

Mr. ILSLEY: The hon. member was not stopped from proceeding, because it was made clear to him that he had unanimous consent of the house to proceed.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes, it was. I will not let the impression be given that he was stopped from speaking in that debate. When he talks about grounds of substantial justice he is using language which is entirely unwarranted.

The contents of the speech he made last Friday afternoon are not in issue. The question is whether he made a speech at all or not. I think it is important that the point be made clear. Let us suppose that it is not. Let us suppose that the point had not been raised at all, and that in a future debate in the house some hon. member rises and tries to make a

second speech. He may be stopped, and immediately he would say that one rule is being applied to the leader of the opposition and another rule being applied to private members. That would be the first thing that would be said.

If the rules of this house are to be upheld, and especially in a ruling of this kind—and it is a most important ruling—it is my duty as Acting Prime Minister to raise that point, particularly when I coupled with it the clear indication and statement that I had no objection to the hon. member's proceeding, because I said I had no objection to unanimous consent being given. I wish to make that clear, because I am surprised that this matter is being treated in this somewhat emotional manner by the opposition. It is just a simple point of observing the rules of order and decorum in this house.

So far as justice is concerned, the hon. member now has an opportunity to make any speech he wishes. He will have that chance, and he had a chance a few minutes ago.

An hon. MEMBER: No, he did not.

Mr. ILSLEY: But he refused to take it. He had it, by unanimous consent of the house.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): He did not.

Mr. FRASER: Mr. Speaker did not sit down, and he did not give the hon. member a chance to rise.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): Order.

Mr. FRASER: Mr. Speaker did not sit down.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): The business before the committee is this vote of $1,365 million. Shall the item carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Steam-roller.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): Just a minute; I would ask the hon. member for Souris to withdraw that statement, please.

Mr. GRAYDON: Nothing wrong with "steam-roller".

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I did not know there was anything wrong with that. I read the remarks which appeared in *Hansard* for Friday afternoon, where my leader made a few observations in which he said that he was giving way to the hon. member for Vancouver South, who had then been called home because of the death of his father. Then he said a few words about the victory loan which the Prime Minister was launching at a future date, and then sat down. I challenge any hon. member in this house to read what was said on Friday afternoon, and then to interpret it in any other way than that the leader of the opposition was giving way to the hon. member for Vancouver South, and that he would speak again on the resolution stage. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) who had moved that the house go into committee said—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. CLEAVER: Why did he not speak before?

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Where is the point of order? Who has the floor now?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Withdraw.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I do not have to withdraw anything for the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Cleaver).

Mr. CLEAVER: The Chair is asking you to withdraw. Are you going to?

Mr. ROSS (Souris): What is the remark the hon. gentleman just made?

Mr. CLEAVER: The Chair has asked the hon. member to withdraw an objectionable remark.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): What have you to do with it. I will bow to the ruling of the Chair at any time. I have no desire whatever to be discourteous in any debate in this chamber, whether the Speaker is in the chair or whether we are in committee with the Chairman in the chair. I will bow to the ruling that is given at any time.

An hon. MEMBER: Even when it is wrong.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Yes, even though it may be wrong. I would like hon. members to read what appears on *Hansard* and judge whether it was becoming for the leader of the government to object at this stage as he has. I bow to your ruling, Mr. Chairman, if I have said anything unbecoming to the dignity of this parliament.

Mr. BROOKS: I should like to call attention to what the leader of the opposition said at that time. He said:

> I am sure that the house has listened with a great deal of interest—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. BROOKS: I am speaking on a point of order. I continue:

> —to what the minister has had to say. It is not my intention to speak at this time.

The leader of the opposition did not speak at that time. He gave way to the hon. member for Vancouver South. I think the mistake

that was made to-night was that the Speaker put the wrong motion. I believe it was the intention of hon. members on the other side to give unanimous consent and I think they expected that the Speaker would put that motion. But the Speaker put the other motion and thus the leader of the opposition could not speak.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN(Mr. Golding): I would point out to hon. members that the incident is now closed and the leader of the opposition has an opportunity to present his point of view in regard to this matter.

Mr. BRACKEN: You may be sure you will hear it. Now that the house with its rules has put us into committee of the whole we propose to hear what the government has to say in justification of these expenditures. I suggest with all deference that it is the responsibility of the government to give that statement now.

Mr. ABBOTT: Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset that I had a certain personal interest in hoping that the house would give unanimous consent to the leader of the opposition, because frankly I am reluctant to commence my statement with respect to the navy, which I propose to do, at almost twenty minutes to eleven o'clock.

Mr. BRACKEN: I am not responsible for that.

Mr. ABBOTT: I am quite ready to do it, but as I say I would have preferred to start at a time when I could deliver my statement all in one piece, as it were. However, I shall go as far as I can this evening, and the committee can have the deferred pleasure of listening to the rest of my statement at some later date.

It has been the practice in past years during the war to commence the statement with respect to the various service departments with a brief operational summary, and I should like to follow that practice to-night. This is probably the last occasion on which a service minister will make a report on operational matters. The last report of this kind was made by my predecessor, the Hon. Mr. Macdonald, on April 3 which, as the committee will realize now, was not very far from V-E day.

From the beginning of April on the Canadian navy continued its primary function of convoy duty on the north Atlantic, and this was continued until after all danger of German submarines was over. As the committee will recall, two of the U-boats surrendered to our forces, one off Nova Scotia and one off Newfoundland. One was brought into Saint John and the other to Shelburne. Mine-sweeping operations were continued in the channel up to very recently, but our mine-sweepers have now been withdrawn from that duty and are on their way back to Canada.

In addition, during the past four or five months ships of the Canadian navy have been engaged in ferrying operations. Six old river-class destroyers have been employed between the United Kingdom and Canada and between Newfoundland and Canada. In addition, a number of our frigates have assisted in transporting Canadian service men from Newfoundland to Quebec. The anti-aircraft cruiser *Prince Robert* was in Sydney at the time of the Japanese surrender. She was then and had been for some time operating with the British Pacific fleet under the command of Sir Bruce Fraser. She was able to proceed and did proceed to Hong Kong with the units of that fleet to accept the surrender of that port, at the same time carrying badly needed supplies for our prisoners who were there. She is now at Manila, refueling, still under the command of the commander in chief of the British Pacific fleet. Our latest information is that she will return shortly to Esquimalt, bringing with her a number of prisoners of war. I cannot say definitely when she will be there, but it will probably be in three or four weeks time, according to the latest information we have.

The cruiser *Uganda,* as the committee knows, was serving with the British Pacific fleet for several months. She went out early in January and participated in several actions, taking part in the bombardment of Shakihimo island and Dublon island and in the engagements off Okinawa. She returned to Canada a few months ago to enable those of her personnel who had not volunteered for Pacific service to be replaced by others. In the circumstances, it turned out that she got back to Canada just about the time of the Japanese surrender.

Our second cruiser, the *Ontario,* was commissioned in April. After her working out in the Mediterranean she proceeded to the far east, arriving about a month or six weeks ago. At that time she proceeded to Hong Kong where she is at the present time. She has been and will continue for the immediate future under the command of Admiral Fraser, with the British Pacific fleet.

I feel that I should not leave this summary of operational matters without referring to two incidents which do not relate directly to operations but which have been much in the public eye during the last three or four months. I refer particularly to the disturbances at Halifax on V-E day and to the explosion

which took place later on in the naval magazine in Bedford Basin. I have no particular comment to make on the V-E day disturbances. As I said in the statement which I issued after the findings of the royal commission had been made known, no one could do other than regret those disturbances, but I am sure that all Canadians will remember that many of the naval ratings who took part in those disturbances were the same men who had earned their country's gratitude for their courage and endurance in the long and arduous Atlantic campaign. The government appointed, as the committee knows, Mr. Justice Kellock a royal commissioner to inquire into the causes of that disturbance. He made his report, which has been tabled in the house, and I have no particular comment to offer upon it. He found in substance that the naval command had not done all that it should have done and that the discipline of the navy in Halifax was not perhaps all that it should have been. But those of us who served in the last war know that one's emotions on the day of victory are likely to run fairly high and that if a thing of that sort is not checked in the early stages it is apt to run to extremes, and that I am afraid is what happened in Halifax.

The findings of the royal commissioner were that the causes were those for which the navy should be held responsible, and the government accepted financial responsibility for the loss to Halifax merchants and residents caused by the disturbances. Personally I hope that it is sufficiently remote in time that the people of the country will realize that there were extenuating circumstances and that the high reputation which the men of the navy have justly earned during six years of war will not be imperiled as a result of the unfortunate incidents of that one day.

The explosion in the Bedford magazine—both of these unfortunate incidents took place shortly after I had been appointed minister—coming as it did so close after the V-E day disturbance, must have made the people of Halifax regret that they were living in a naval port. The consequences of this explosion so far as damage to property was concerned were rather extensive, but fortunately the loss of life was slight. There was only one man killed. He was a naval rating who had been a watchman on the jetty on which the initial fire apparently took place. He was killed, but there was no other loss of life.

Immediately after the explosion a naval court of inquiry was set up, and when the report of that inquiry was received I gave a statement to the press, since the house was not sitting at the time, summarizing the findings. At the same time, with the collaboration of my colleague the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe), a committee of explosive experts was appointed, headed by Lieutenant-Colonel Ogilvie, charged with the responsibility of investigating the arrangements at the magazine, of inquiring into the design and location of the present buildings, and of reviewing the circumstances and conditions leading up to the explosion. That committee visited Halifax shortly after the explosion took place. I asked them first to make a preliminary inquiry to ascertain whether in their opinion the steps which were being taken to clean up the magazine area and to dispose of damaged ammunition and the like were being properly taken and were satisfactory. I am glad to say that they reported that in their opinion the steps which were being taken to clear up the danger area and to remove the damaged ammunition were completely satisfactory, and they complimented highly the officers in charge of that work. The committee has now returned to Halifax and is carrying on the main purpose of its inquiry, namely, to inquire into the design and arrangements of the magazine itself and to report whether or not any changes should be made in those arrangements to ensure so far as humanly possible that there would be no recurrence of such an explosion.

In addition to these measures Rear Admiral Brodeur was appointed inspector general of naval ordnance and has been charged with the duty and responsibility of examining naval magazines throughout the country and reporting as to their sufficiency, and in addition reporting on the quantities and methods of stowage of naval ammunition.

I mention those points because in view of the unfortunate explosion in the Bedford magazine I thought that perhaps the people who may live near other magazines may feel that the design or arrangements are not all they should be, and I wanted to make sure so far as possible that every precaution is taken to see that they are. So much for the operations and activities of the navy since the report was made by my predecessor on the 3rd of April last.

On the question of operations may I say that early in the war it was felt that attention should be paid to the matter of making the story of the navy permanently available to the Canadian public. Accordingly, in 1941 a full-time naval historian was appointed to collect material and to write an official history of the navy.

Present plans envisage three volumes. The first volume will cover the period from 1909 to 1939. The second volume will deal with the

shore side of the navy after 1939, with particular emphasis on the work of getting the ships to sea properly manned, armed, and supplied and of maintaining them there. The third volume will be devoted to operations and it may be that some of the photographs produced in the navy's photographic section will be used to illustrate the text.

At the time the last report on naval affairs was made to the house by my predecessor on April 3, 1945, the service had reached the peak of its expansion in personnel. It then had some 95,000 men and women on active service both afloat and ashore. Within a period of little more than three months from the time that report was made, both Germany and Japan had surrendered and the need for maintaining the war-time strength of the Royal Canadian Navy was over. Recruiting and training for war were abandoned. The problems of demobilization, rehabilitation and readjustment took their place. It required almost six years to increase the Canadian naval strength fifty-fold. It is expected that by March 31, 1946, the personnel in the service will have been reduced to about 10,000, and that number will include the members of the permanent force supplemented by members of the reserves who engage for service during a two-year period.

The navy's plans for participation in the Japanese war called for the employment afloat of some 13,500 men, plus a reserve pool of some 3,500. Actually, some 38,000 had volunteered for Pacific duty. Of the remaining 57,000 in the service on V-E day, May 7, some would have been required for continuing commitments elsewhere than in the Pacific; the balance were to be discharged.

By mid-August, however, Japan had surrendered and partial demobilization gave way to a policy of general demobilization, based, as in the other services, on the principle of "first in, first out." This principle applies generally but the service must of course reserve the right to retain certain few key men essential to the orderly demobilization and disposal of surplus ships and establishments. In common with the other services, some exceptions to the general rule are necessary to expedite discharges on compassionate grounds, the discharge of students returning to their studies, of farmers, of ex-prisoners of war and the like.

On September 26, more than 19,000 personnel had been discharged from the navy, and almost 22,000 were on leave awaiting discharge, representing in all close to one-half of the total strength as it stood on V-E day. Within the next four months an average of 10,000 should go out each month, and by March 31 next the size of the service in men should be down to approximately 10,000.

Recruiting for the Women's Royal Canadian Naval Service was discontinued early this year. Demobilization of the women's service has been proceeding for some time. Since April 1 of this year, approximately 1,000 W.R.C.N.S. officers and ratings have been demobilized. As of August 31, the total strength of the group was 5,424. Some 50 per cent of this strength will be required until the end of 1945 principally for work connected with demobilization. I should say here, that the work of the Women's Royal Canadian Naval Service in connection with the demobilization organization has proved to be most valuable to the service. By the end of the present fiscal year, however, all W.R.C.N.S. should be demobilized.

The authorized strength of the permanent Royal Canadian navy is 771 officers and 8,003 ratings. The actual strength is 534 officers and 3,383 ratings. It is now proposed to supplement this permanent force by the addition of volunteers from the reserve now on active service who will engage for a two-year period. In due course, it is expected that permanent transfers from the reserves, new enlistments and cadet entries from the Royal Canadian Naval College will supply the men required for the force

The committee may be interested in an outline of the discharge procedure followed by the navy. A man designated for demobilization is drafted from his ship or establishment to a discharge transit centre. The main discharge transit centres are at Halifax, N.S., and Esquimalt, B.C., although there are certain other small centres elsewhere. At the discharge transit centre he undergoes a complete physical examination, including X-ray; blood test; teeth inspection, et cetera. If medical care is required, the necessary arrangements are made with the Department of Veterans Affairs. Gear and clothing on loan is turned in; service papers and records put in order; leave due is authorized and transportation to the naval division nearest his home is arranged.

At the naval division, upon completion of leave, the discharge routine is concluded. All back pay is received; civilian ration books, national registration cards, discharge certificate and war service badge are issued. Rehabilitation grant and plain clothes gratuity are paid and final medical check is made. The application for war service gratuity is completed and if the dischargee lives outside the point where the division is located, he is provided with transportation to his home. Re-

habilitation officers and employment counsellors are provided at the discharge transit centre and at naval divisions and are available for advice and help with reference to schooling, employment, references to the re-employment officers of selective service and to the Department of Veterans Affairs.

I turn now from the subject of men to the subject of ships. A very large percentage of the ships in Canada's navy and of the equipment in those ships was produced in Canada by Canadian workmen of Canadian materials. With the exception of the Tribal destroyer building programme which was in progress in Halifax on V-E day, all major warship construction for the Canadian account had been completed. There were a few orders outstanding for auxiliary vessels when Germany surrendered, and these were cancelled immediately.

Before sending out ships to the Pacific war we had to equip them for conditions to be encountered in the tropical waters there. Considerable readjustment was necessary for these vessels which had been serving in cold weather of the north Atlantic. Arrangements were accordingly made to "tropicalize" them.

Upon the surrender of Japan this work was stopped. The effect of this action was to reduce public expenditures but it will of course curtail employment in shipyards which have done great service in the cause of the war at sea.

The Tribal destroyer building programme has not been interrupted. On September 14, H.M.C.S. *Micmac,* the first Canadian-built destroyer, was accepted by the navy at Halifax. Two more Tribals will be completed in 1946 and the fourth should be available in 1947. All these Tribal destroyers will be of value to Canada's post-war fleet and it is consistent with the government's policy to complete the programme.

At the time of Germany's surrender last May, Canada had the fourth largest fleet actively engaged in the cause of the united nations. In six years there had been a sixty-fold increase in its size, and this increase was a modern record. The fleet on V-E day included some 374 fighting units and over 566 auxiliary craft. Twenty-four Canadian ships of war had been lost up to V-E day, but on the other hand, the ships of Canada's fleet destroyed or assisted in the destruction of seventy-five enemy surface and submarine vessels and in the damaging of forty-three others.

At no time during the European war was there a surplus of naval craft available to the united nations. Canada did all she could to help supply this great need. Early in the war we decided to build naval craft, and we turned our hand to the type of ship which would be of most value for the work which we felt we could do best. That work was convoy, and the naval craft required was the escort ship.

We began with the building of single screw corvettes which proved their value in the emergency. Our shipyards later produced larger escort vessels, notably the frigate. Both corvette and the frigate are in the category of relatively small specialized naval vessels. They proved their worth as the figures on convoys show, but many of them were pretty well worn out when the war ended. Escort craft are not the type of ship which could be retained as the main component of a naval force.

Gradually the Canadian navy commissioned larger warships and at the end of the German war we possessed cruisers, carriers and destroyers as well as escort vessels.

The plans of the Royal Canadian Navy for the Japanese war called for the operation of a modern force of some sixty warships. In this number were to be included two carriers, two cruisers, one anti-aircraft cruiser, at least twelve destroyers, and about forty frigates. It was proposed that the remaining warships of the fleet, with the exception of a few training ships, some ships for patrol on Canada's west coast and the necessary auxiliaries and harbour craft, were to be paid off.

It is now little more than a month since Japan capitulated and the process of paying off ships has developed rapidly. To date 178 ships of war have been de-stored and laid up. These include destroyers, corvettes, minesweepers, converted yachts and motor patrol vessels. In the neighbourhood of 100 auxiliaries and harbour craft have been removed from service. It was originally expected that the navy could dispose of an average of one major and one minor ship of war per day. In point of fact the rate achieved has been three major craft and two minor craft per day.

The end of hostilities has called for the closing down of many bases where there has been a very high level of employment maintained during the war. I am aware that local business interests and local labour groups will be affected by this policy. The committee will realize, however, that it cannot be otherwise. The navy's size will be considerably curtailed and, accordingly, the requirements for the services which these bases provided in war time will no longer exist.

At Halifax, the main fleet base on the east coast will be operated. So, too, will H.M. Canadian dockyard on a scale necessary for the

requirements of the base there. The main fleet base on the west coast will be at Esquimalt, B.C., and the scale of its operations will be governed by requirements as they exist from time to time. The principal ammunition depots of the service will be at Renous, N.B., and at Kamloops, B.C. Naval service headquarters will remain in Ottawa. No policy has yet been formulated with reference to the future use of the building which now houses naval headquarters.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Eleven o'clock.

Mr. ABBOTT: It would take me about five or ten minutes to finish. I am in the hands of the committee.

Some hon. MEMBERS: It is eleven o'clock.

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Wednesday, October 3, 1945.

The house met at three o'clock.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

REQUEST FOR USE OF NO. 32 AIRPORT, SOUTH OF MOOSE JAW, AS MENTAL HOSPITAL

Mr. THATCHER:

1. Has the government received a request from the Saskatchewan government, requesting that the buildings of the former No. 32 airport, south of Moose Jaw, be turned over to the provincial government for use as a mental hospital?

2. If so, what action is being taken by the government?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West):

1. Yes.

2. None. The matter was considered several times but the latest information received shows that this site is no longer required by the provincial government of Saskatchewan for a mental hospital.

SURPLUS CROWN ASSETS

Mr. SHAW:

1. Does crown assets allocation committee and/or War Assets Corporation keep a systematic record in classified form of all crown assets declared surplus to requirements by war plants, the army, the navy, and the air force?

2. Has crown assets allocation committee and/or War Assets Corporation a systematic record in classified form of all crown assets rendered to scrap at Penhold, No. 2 T.S.U.?

3. Is the record referred to in question 2 available to members of parliament?

[Mr. Abbott.]

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. Yes, when surpluses of crown assets are reported in detail. Certain surpluses, however, are reported in blanket form and records are built up as these are taken over by the War Assets Corporation.

2. A systematic record of surpluses rendered to scrap at Penhold No. 2 T.S.U. is available.

3. The record will be made available to the committee or subcommittee of the house to be set up to investigate war expenditures and matters of this kind.

WAR ASSETS CORPORATION—AIRCRAFT WHEELS

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North):

1. Is it the policy of War Assets Corporation to sell materials only in the locality in which they are situated?

2. How many aircraft wheels from Anson, Moths and Faireys have been sold?

3. How many permits have been issued to buy such aircraft wheels?

4. What is the total number of wheels for which permits have been issued?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. No. Surpluses are offered for sale firstly in the areas where they become available, except where they occur in sufficiently large quantities as to permit of national distribution.

2.	Anson	Number
New	Main wheel tubes	2
	Tail wheel tires	946
	Tail wheel tubes	659
Used	Main wheel complete.....	789
	Tail wheel complete	208
	Tiger Moth	
Used	Main wheel complete	231
	Tail wheel complete	75
	Fairey Battle	
New	Main wheel hubs	16
	Main wheel tires	1,970
	Main wheel tubes	1,966
Used	Main wheel complete	601
	Tail wheel complete	142

3. No permit is issued or required for the purchase of wheels only. Permits covering 8,492 tires and 8,492 tubes have been issued as of September 30, 1945. Records are not readily available to show the actual number of permits issued, as a permit may cover one or more tires and tubes.

4. Answered by No. 3.

PUBLIC SERVICE—NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES IN WAR WORK AND NON-WAR WORK

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's):

What is the total number of employees who have been appointed since March 1, 1944, (a) for work not directly associated with the war; (b) for work directly associated with the war?

Mr. MARTIN: The other day I suggested that because of the impossibility of answering

this question, it be dropped. The hon. gentleman was not in his seat at the time and I agreed to let the matter stand until he returned.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I am willing to have the question dropped if it cannot be answered.

Question dropped.

TORONTO POST OFFICE BUILDINGS

Mr. CHURCH:

1. What action has been taken to turn over the new mail order post office building to the post office at Toronto?
2. Who occupies this building at the present time, and for what purpose?
3. When will the Toronto post office have the use of this building?

Mr. FOURNIER (Hull): In March, 1943, representations were made to the Department of National Defence to vacate the city delivery building in order that it might be fitted up as originally intended for postal use. As a result of these representations, approximately one-half of the ground floor was made available. Further representations are now being made to the Department of National Defence that the remainder of the building be made available at the earliest possible date.

PRISONERS OF WAR—BOWMANVILLE BOYS' TRAINING SCHOOL

Mr. STEPHENSON:

1. Was the Bowmanville boys' training school, Bowmanville, Ontario, taken over by the government for a German officer prison camp?
2. If so, on what date, and on what terms?
3. What steps have been taken or are being taken to return this property to the school authorities?

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. Yes.

2. These premises were taken over at a nominal rental from the province of Ontario on Nov. 3, 1941, for the period of the present war and six months thereafter and beyond the six months period from month to month for so long as required. Dominion to pay all charges for maintenance and operation of the premises and to restore the premises on termination of the lease to the condition when taken over, reasonable wear and tear only excepted.

The dominion is to reimburse province for salaries of engineers and firemen, $6,175 per annum plus cost of living bonus, and to pay rental for temporary school buildings at rate of $1,260 per annum.

3. These premises have been vacated and declared surplus to requirements of the Department of National Defence and the crown assets allocation committee of the Department of Reconstruction has authorized the Department of National Defence to proceed with termination of the lease and restoration of the premises. Arrangements have now been made with the Department of Public Works of the province of Ontario for return of the property to provincial control and steps have been taken in conjunction with that department for the restoration of the premises to their original condition. It is expected that contracts for restoration will be called for within the next two weeks and that restoration should be started within one month.

VETERANS' LAND ACT—BUILDING MATERIALS

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

1. Has the board under the Veterans' Land Act a stock of, (a) building materials; (b) bath tubs; (c) other plumbing supplies?
2. If so, what are the values thereof, and how many bath tubs are included in the stock?

Mr. TUCKER:

1. (a) Yes. (b) and (c) No.

2. (a) Approximately $2,306,000; (b) and (c) Answered by No. 1.

*INCOME TAX—REFUNDABLE PORTION

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough):

With reference to the repayment of the refundable portion of income tax for 1942, and with reference to section 93 of the War Income Tax Act, (a) will the time limit for repayment run from 2nd September, 1945, or from some later date to be fixed; (b) if from some later date, when will such date be fixed?

Mr. McCANN: The answer to the first half of part (a) of the question is no, and the answer to the second half is yes.

The answer to part (b) of the question is that the date will in all probability be announced in the budget address of the Minister of Finance.

ARMY PERSONNEL ON EXTENDED LEAVE

Mr. TUSTIN:

1. How many army personnel are on extended leave?
2. Are any N.R.M.A. personnel on extended leave?
3. If so, how many?

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. As of 12 September, 1945: 15,938 all ranks (including N.R.M.A.).

2. Yes.

3. As of 12 September, 1945: 8,567.

WARTIME HOUSING LTD.—STAFF-HOUSE FURNISHINGS

Mr. FRASER:

1. What staff-house furnishings such as beds, chairs, couches, linen, etc., have the Wartime Housing Ltd., sold or disposed of?
2. From what staff-house did these articles come?
3. What was the original cost of these articles?
4. What was selling price?
5. To whom were they sold?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. No staff-house furnishings have been sold or disposed of by Wartime Housing Limited except those transferred in bulk, at cost price, to the Department of Pensions and National Health and declared as surplus to our requirements through the Department of Munitions and Supply.

2, 3, 4 and 5. As follows:

From what staff house did these articles come?	What was the original cost?	What was the selling price?	To whom were they sold?
Women's hostel, Kingston, Ont., W.H.L. Project 3....	$71,428 83	$71,428 83	Department of Pensions and National Health through D.M.S. May 5, 1945.
Men's hostel, Peterborough, Ont., W.H.L. Project No. 4	57,184 14	57,184 14	Department of Pensions and National Health through D.M.S. March 1, 1945.
Men's staff house, Amherst, N.S., W.H.L. Project No. 1	5,183 43	5,183 43	Transferred to cafeteria committee, D.M.S. September 27, 1945. (Approval not yet received.)
Staff house No. 13, Eastern Passage, N.S., W.H.L. Project No. 3.....	3,017 73	3,017 73	Transferred to Department of Munitions and Supply, July 26, 1945. (Approval not yet received.)
Staff house and commissary, Eastern Passage, W.H.L. Project No. 5.....	5,508 34	5,508 34	Transferred to Department of Munitions and Supply, July 26, 1945. Approved and passed to War Assets Corporation. 19/9/45. File 225 W.8 (22)
Staff or bunk house No. 1, Sorel, Que.....	12,342 65	12,342 65	Transferred to Department of Munitions and Supply, July 27, 1945. Approved and passed to War Assets Corporation. August 20, 1945. File 225 W.8 (18)
Staff or bunk house No. 3, Sorel, Que.....	6,310 42	6,310 42	Transferred to Department of Munitions and Supply, July 27, 1945. Approved and passed to War Assets Corporation. August 22, 1945. File 225 W.8 (19)
Prince Rupert, B.C.....	Staff houses Nos. 3, 4, 5 and 6		Inventories now being made up. Furnishings not yet declared surplus. So far buildings only have been declared surplus.
New Glasgow, N.S.....			
Fort Erie, Ont.....			
Pictou, N.S.....			

[Mr. Lapointe.]

CANADIAN ARMY—PACIFIC

Mr. TUSTIN:

1. What was the strength of the Pacific army, (a) on June 30, 1945; (b) on September 1, 1945?

2. How many were volunteers from Canada who had no service outside Canada?

3. Is this force now disbanded?

4. If not, when will it be disbanded?

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. (a) at 27 June, 1945 (closest strength return date) there were none actually posted to the Canadian army Pacific force; (b) on August 29, 1945, 24,055 all ranks were actually posted to units of the Canadian army Pacific force.

2. Information not readily available and would entail a search of individual documents of all those on strength.

3. Yes.

4. See 3 above.

CANADIAN ARMY—CANADA AND OVERSEAS

Mr. TUSTIN:

1. What was the strength of the Canadian army on V-E day?

2. What is the strength of the Canadian army now?

3. What is the strength of the Canadian army overseas; in Canada?

4. Does the army strength figure include personnel on extended leave?

5. If so, how many are so included?

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. 491,942 all ranks.

2. As of 12 September, 1945 (latest return available)—426,135 all ranks.

3. As of 12 September, 1945: Overseas, 210,898; Canada and adjacent territories, 215,237.

4. Yes.

5. 15,938 all ranks.

PENHOLD, ALTA., AIR STATION

Mr. ASHBY:

1. Has the air force station at Penhold, Alberta, been closed?

2. If so, what disposal is being made of the buildings and equipment?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West):

1. Yes.

2. (a) Buildings are being declared surplus to R.C.A.F. requirements; (b) the majority of the equipment has been removed to R.C.A.F. equipment or repair depots. It is expected that all equipment will be cleared from this site by October 16, 1945.

SHIPMENTS OF FOOD AND CLOTHING TO ITALY

Mr. FRASER:

1. Has Canada supplied any food or clothing to Italy and Germany during the last year?

2. If so, what has been supplied and in what quantities?

3. Under what terms were these goods supplied?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1 and 2. Canada has supplied no food or clothing to Germany during the past year through the Canadian mutual aid board or as military relief.

During 1944 and up to Aug. 31, Canada has supplied as military relief destined for the Italian area, the following items:

Item	Quantity (L. tons)	Value
Wheat	382,826	$24,883,690 00
Newsprint	2,629	170,421 00
Pickled Herring ..	1,254	211,960 00
Dry Salt Fish.....	357	156,660 00
Calcium Carbide ..	444	56,000 00
Iron Catalyst	24	15,788 00
Mining Supplies (Explosives, Fuse Blasting Caps) ..	various	165,000 00
Carbon Paper	3,000 boxes	2,205 00
Candles	215,000 only	9,500 00
Clothing	Nil	Nil
Total Value at Seaboard..		$25,671,224 00

While the above items were called forward by the combined civil affairs committee (Supply) for the Italian area, the theatre commander may have diverted considerable quantities of the above items to the Balkans or perhaps southern France, and it will not be known for some considerable time of any such diversions. All of the above figures are in Canadian dollars at seaboard. Any additional charges for ocean freight would only be charged to Canada if shipment went forward in a Canadian flagged boat. In the past, 90 per cent of all Canadian military relief items have been carried either in American or British flagged ships.

3. Under the terms of military relief, the Italian government or any government receiving any of the above stores will be presented with a bill for their cost and payment will be expected.

*REVISION OF STATUTES

Mr. DANIEL:

1. When is the next consolidation and revision of the statutes of Canada to be made?

2. Is a special commission to be appointed for that purpose?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: No decision has as yet been arrived at in respect of either of these questions.

VETERANS' LAND ACT—RETURN GRANTS

Mr. HATFIELD:

1. How many of the ex-service men, now on farms, are receiving awaiting return grants?

2. How many of the ex-service men or women, who have entered other businesses, are receiving awaiting return grants?

Mr. TUCKER: Return at October 2, 1945:

1. 807.

2. 374.

MINES AND RESOURCES—SEED GRAIN AND RELIEF ADVANCE ACCOUNT

Mr. BARRETT:

1. What is the present total of the seed grain and relief advance account administered by the Department of Mines and Resources?

2. Of this, how much is principle and how much accrued interest?

3. How much, (a) principal; (b) interest has been collected in each of the last three fiscal years?

4. How much was written off in each of the past three fiscal years?

5. Upon whose recommendation and under what authority are write-offs made?

Mr. GLEN:

1. $6,139,105.14 .

2. Principal, $2,525,263.99; interest, $3,613,-841.15.

3. (a) Principal: 1942-43, $15,312.47; 1943-44, $40,318.77; 1944-45, $70,693.70; (b) Interest: 1942-43, $8,408.58; 1943-44, $29,424.44; 1944-45, $40,884.15.

4. 1942-43, $116,375.12; 1943-44, $100,433.63; 1944-45, $148,052.18.

5. Adjustments are authorized by treasury board, pursuant to section 1, chapter 51-17 George V, 1927.

The recommendations are made by the Minister of Mines and Resources and are based on reports obtained from seed grain adjustment boards.

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

Mr. PEARKES:

1. How many conscientious objectors are still compulsorily retained in work camps in Canada?

2. How many of these are Jehovah Witnesses, and in which camps are they located?

Mr. MITCHELL:

1. 196 as of October 2nd, 1945.

2. 169 of these 196 are Jehovah Witnesses. They are located in the following alternative service work camps:

Petawawa forest experiment station, Chalk River, Ontario, 29; Riding Mountain national park, Wasagaming, Manitoba, 24; Jasper national park, Jasper, Alberta, 25; Banff national park, Banff, Alberta, 46; Kananaskis forest experimental station, Seebe, Alberta, 16; Kootenay national park, Field, British Columbia, 29.

[Mr. St. Laurent.]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

SURPLUS WAR ASSETS—ARGENTINA

Mr. COLDWELL:

1. Has the War Assets Corporation or any department of the government disposed of any aeroplanes, corvettes, or other war equipment to the republic of Argentina or agency on behalf of Argentina?

2. If so, (a) what type of planes, what quantities and what prices; (b) what number of corvettes, and at what prices?

3. If not, has any government department issued any permits for the export of planes, corvettes, or other war equipment to the republic of Argentina? If so, what are the numbers in each case?

CIVIL SERVICE—ASSISTANT DEPUTY MINISTERS

Mr. TUSTIN:

1. Since January 1, 1940, have any persons been appointed to the rank of assistant deputy minister other than by the civil service commission?

2. If so, what are the names of such persons, and what salary is paid to each?

3. By what method were each of these appointed, and what was the reason for the use of that method in each case?

PAYMENTS FOR TAXI SERVICE, SHERBROOKE, N.S.

Mr. STANFIELD:

What amounts, if any, have been paid by, (a) departments of national defence for navy, army, air; (b) Department of Labour; (c) Department of Munitions and Supply since September, 1939, to the Sherbrooke Taxi Service of Sherbrooke, N.S., and/or to Mr. J. E. Fraser of Sherbrooke, N.S., for taxis, repairs and other services and supplies?

ARMY AND R.C.A.F. EX-WAR PRISONERS OVERSEAS

Mr. BOUCHER:

1. How many ex-prisoners of war of, (a) the Canadian army; (b) the R.C.A.F., are still overseas?

2. When is it expected that all army and R.C.A.F. ex-prisoners will be returned to Canada?

3. For what reasons have these men not been returned to Canada prior to this?

CANADIAN ARMY—UNITED KINGDOM—REPATRIATION

Mr. HENDERSON:

1. What units of the Canadian army in the United Kingdom have been designated for return to Canada before October 15?

2. What units have already arrived in Canada?

3. What percentage of each unit is made up of, or will be made up of, N.R.M.A. personnel?

4. What number of each unit have served with such units for a period exceeding six months?

CIVIL SERVICE—DEPUTY MINISTERS

Mr. BRADSHAW:

1. What are the names of all persons who have been appointed to the rank of deputy minister since January 1, 1944?
2. What are the qualifications of each such person?
3. What salary is being paid to each such person?
4. What was the salary paid to the predecessor of each such person?

FISHERY PRODUCTS

Mr. REID:

1. What was the total value of all fishery products, including fresh and salt water fish products, during each of the years 1930 to the end of 1944 inclusive?
2. What was the total value for each province during each of the above mentioned years?
3. What were the total quantities by weight, in pounds, for each of the various provinces, giving the total quantities and value of, (a) salmon; (b) herring; (c) halibut; (d) cod, of all varieties, during each of the years 1930 to end of 1944, inclusive?

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

RADIO BROADCASTING—PORT ALBERNI, B.C.

Mr. GREEN:

For a copy of all correspondence, reports and other documents in the possession of the government, dated during the past three years, referring to or concerning the issuing, extending or transferring of a permit for a radio station at or near Port Alberni, British Columbia.

CROWN COMPANIES

Mr. FRASER:

For a statement showing, (a) the names of all crown companies incorporated since September 1, 1939; (b) the purpose for which each such company was incorporated; (c) the present activities and operations of each such company; (d) the names, addresses, ordinary occupations and salaries of the directors and principal officers of each such company.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S WARRANTS

Mr. FRASER:

For a copy of all governor general's warrants issued between January 1, 1944, and the present date.

CIVIL SERVICE—WAR DUTIES SUPPLEMENTS

Mr. BLAIR:

For a statement showing, (a) the names of all civil servants who have been paid a war duties supplement; (b) the amounts paid to each; (c) the ordinary duties of each such person and the special duties in respect of which the supplement was paid.

Mr. MAYHEW: Parts (a) and (b) can be readily answered, but I would ask the hon. member for Lanark if he would redraft part (c), because it entails the investigation of some 6,500 accounts. This would take a great deal of time and would involve considerable expense. Perhaps his purpose would be met if he would redraft part (c).

Mr. BLAIR: I understand that some of the civil servants are getting considerable by way of additions to their ordinary salaries. This information is important. I will agree, however, to rewrite or to reword part (c) of the question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do I understand the whole motion is withdrawn?

Mr. BLAIR: No, just part (c).

Motion as amended agreed to.

DISALLOWANCE OF PROVINCIAL LEGISLATION—ALBERTA

Mr. COLDWELL:

For a copy of all reports of the Minister of Justice recommending disallowance of, (a) an act to amend the Limitation of Actions Act, 1935 (Alberta), disallowed March 25, 1939 (P.C. 676); (b) an act to amend the Limitation of Actions Act, 1935 (Alberta), disallowed October 4, 1939 (P.C. 2949); (c) the Debt Proceedings Suspension Act, 1941 (Alberta), disallowed March 27, 1942 (P.C. 2350); (d) the orderly payment of Land Debts Act, 1941 (Alberta), disallowed March 27, 1942 (P.C. 2350); (e) the Municipal District Act Amendment Act, 1941 (Alberta), disallowed March 27, 1942 (P.C. 2350); (f) the Limitation of Actions Act, 1935, amendment act, 1941 (Alberta), disallowed March 27, 1942 (P.C. 2350).

STEVENSON AIRFIELD, WINNIPEG

Mr. KNOWLES:

For a copy of any plans prepared by the Department of Transport since May 1, 1944, with reference to the enlarging of Stevenson field, at Winnipeg, or a copy of any alterations made in the plan tabled on the above date as sessional paper No. 287 of that year.

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

RATIO OF PRICE LEVELS TO NATIONAL INCOME—MOTION RULED OUT OF ORDER

On the order being called:

The following proposed resolution—Whereas agriculture has seldom received its fair share of the national income of Canada;

And whereas the cost of producing all agricultural products varies considerably from year to year;

Therefore be it resolved,—That, in the opinion of this house and in the interest of the nation as a whole, the government be requested to set the prices of agricultural products at such a level that it will guarantee to the farmers of Canada at such yearly percentage of the national income as will have the same relation to the national income as the agricultural population bears to the national population of Canada.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The first resolution under notices of motions stands in the name of the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Johnston). I must rule the motion out of order, for the following reasons:

The question of establishing a price structure for basic farm products either at levels of ninety per cent or at parity with other services and products was fully debated on amendments to the address which were negatived on Thursday, September 27.

The hon. member's motion deals also with the percentage of the prices of the same products. In view of the extensive debate which took place on this price question, and the vote given by the house last Thursday, I am afraid that consideration of the motion of the hon. member for Bow River would be a repetition of debate.

Beauchesne's third edition, paragraph 245, page 104, reads as follows:

> It is a wholesome restraint upon members that they cannot revive a debate already concluded; and it would be little use in preventing the same question from being offered twice in the same session if, without being offered, its merits might be discussed again and again.

Therefore I rule that this motion is out of order.

OLD AGE PENSIONS

AGE AND INCOME REQUIREMENTS—PROPOSED INCREASE IN AMOUNTS PAYABLE

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East) moved:

> That, in the opinion of this house, the time has arrived when consideration should be given to amending the Old Age Pension Act by lowering the pensionable age to sixty years, by increasing the amount of the pension so as to enable the recipients to live in health and self-respect, and by deleting the income requirements for eligibility.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of confidence that I rise to open the discussion on this resolution, because I know that members of all parties in this house are agreed that something should be done to improve our old age pension legislation. This feeling has been manifest in this house for a number of years, but nothing has been done. Whether the house is prepared to accept the resolution as it stands on the order paper is, of course, a different matter, because there may be disagreements on this point or that. These, however, can be brought out in the debate.

The resolution resolves itself into three parts. I am asking that the house approve three changes in our old age pension legislation. I am asking, first, that the pensionable age be reduced to sixty years; second, that the amount of pension be increased to enable the recipients of pensions to live in health and self-respect, and, third, that the means test be removed. Those are the three points that I wish to discuss.

I do not think I need labour the first point, that is, the lowering of the eligible age from seventy to sixty years. I am convinced that it is agreed throughout the country and in this house that this is something long overdue. I base, on various grounds, my request that the pensionable age be reduced. So far as I know, Canada is the only important country in the world that has a pensionable age of seventy years. Speaking to a resolution on old age pensions moved in the house in the session of 1938, I put on the record the eligible age in most of the important countries in Europe, in the different countries of the British commonwealth and in countries in other parts of the world. At that time the only countries that had an age limit of seventy years were some of the states in the republic to the south. I do not know whether the states that had an eligible age of seventy years at that time have since reduced the age limit to sixty-five years or lower. I would draw attention to the fact that in New Zealand, and I think in Australia, the eligible age in 1938 was sixty for women and sixty-five for men. However, this age limit has since been reduced in both countries to sixty years for both men and women.

It is a generally accepted policy in almost all of our large industries, and in small industries as well, that employees retire at sixty-five or even at an earlier age. In any industry where the work is heavy, very few people are able to carry on until the age of sixty-five. It is only in industries where people work with their brains rather than with their brawn that they are able to carry on very long after sixty years of age. In the government employ the retiring age is sixty-five. I am informed that there is considerable agitation to make the retiring age sixty years. Even from the government's own point of view, a person has outlived his usefulness after sixty-five years of age. After they have left their employment, whatever it may be, there are few who have put enough by to take care of themselves. Consequently most people must be looked after by some form of charity, by members of their family or by other means.

More than ever this is the age of the young people. Very few businesses will take employees for permanent employment who have reached the age of thirty-five years unless they have some particular experience or skill in a certain line of endeavour. During

the depression years, when people over fifty lost their employment, they found it almost impossible to get back into any sort of permanent employment. Those conditions will come again—I do not mean the depression—and many people will find it impossible to get anything but intermittent employment. When we get back into normal production, when we resume our normal course of living, it will be more difficult than ever, because inventions have improved our means of production immensely during the last six years.

If we think in terms of social need and the social welfare of our people we will come to the conclusion that in order to provide security for those who are finishing their life's work and to provide opportunities for those who are beginning their life's work we must have a retiring age at somewhere around sixty.

At this point the question will arise, I suppose, in some hon. gentlemen's minds: Can the country afford to pay pensions to all its citizens when they reach the age of sixty? While the question may not be asked of me, members will no doubt be proposing it to themselves: Have we considered what the cost will be? My answer is that the country can afford to reduce the pensionable age to sixty, and I have considered the cost before answering that question. I will try to show what it would cost in money terms, although I do not think that money terms is the proper way at all in which to look at the question. However, as we measure things in terms of money, I will bring the question down to that basis.

If everyone on reaching the age of sixty were to receive a pension of $50 a month—I think that was the figure mentioned by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) a few evenings ago—what would the cost be? Of course any figures stated at this time would be only an estimate, and I do not want my figures to be taken as anything more than that.

From figures recently given me by the bureau of statistics I find that according to the 1941 census there were in Canada 1,174,966 persons sixty years of age and over, as of June of that year. If it is of interest to the house, the number of men was 609,466 and the number of women 565,500.

I also ascertained from the bureau of statistics the number of persons over sixty years of age who were gainfully employed at the time this census was taken, and I draw attention to this figure particularly because I think it is significant. Of the 1,174,966 persons sixty years and over, 410,336 were gainfully employed in industry or working for themselves, in farming or some other business. That means that there were 765,000 persons over sixty who were not gainfully employed in 1941. I also draw the attention of the house to the fact that in June, 1941, we were approaching the end of the second year of the war, when employment conditions were improving rapidly, and many persons sixty years and over had been absorbed into production who had not worked very much during the depression years. Let us say that to-day the number of persons in Canada sixty years and over is 1,200,000; the actual figure may be a little more or a little less. To pension or superannuate that number at $50 a month would require the sum of $720,000,000. That is a large sum of money, and before the war, before we began talking in billions instead of millions, he would have been a brave man indeed who would have suggested that we spend that amount on anything whatsoever, and particularly on social services. I remember that in the debate on a resolution similar to this in 1938 the then minister of finance, Hon. Mr. Dunning, referred to the enormous sums of $65,000,000 and $75,000,000. But to-day the government itself is proposing expenditures on old age pensions that will amount two or three years from now—I do not know exactly when they expect their proposal to go into effect—to $230,000,000 or $240,000,000 a year. That figure was mentioned in the dominion government's proposals to the provinces at the recent dominion-provincial conference.

Can we afford to spend that sum of money? But the real question is: Are we able to provide the people of Canada of sixty years and over with goods and services to the value of $720,000,000 annually? On our record during the last two or three years I think we can. I think there is no doubt about it at all. Further, that if we do not do something of the kind we shall have thousands of young men and young women idle in this dominion.

I have at hand the average unemployment figure for 1938, when there were 401,000 persons unemployed in Canada in that year. There would be more people employed in some months than in others, but that was the average unemployment figure for the year. In 1939, the year the war began, the average unemployment figure was 388,000. When people tell me that we cannot afford to spend the amount of money I mentioned a moment ago to provide pensions for people sixty years of age and over, I would ask them to compute the wealth that three or four hundred thousand men and women could produce in the course of a year. What I am suggesting to-day, therefore, is not that we raid the

treasury to the extent of $720,000,000 a year but that we so plan and organize the resources of Canada that we can produce that amount of wealth. When we resolve the problem into one of producing goods and services, instead of thinking of it merely in terms of dollars, it is no problem at all.

Hon. members, I suppose, have received the second annual report of the mutual aid board, which was distributed at the opening of the session. This board has considerable authority behind it, and I would like to read to the house the names of the members of the board. Perhaps hon. members already know them, but in order that the solidity of the board may be appreciated, I will give the names.

The chairman is Hon. C. D. Howe, Minister of Munitions and Supply. Other members of the board are: Hon. J. L. Ilsley, Minister of Finance; Hon. J. G. Gardiner, Minister of Agriculture; Hon. L. S. St. Laurent, Minister of Justice; Hon. J. A. MacKinnon, Minister of Trade and Commerce. Also mentioned here is "Hon. A. G. L. McNaughton, Minister of National Defence". I do not know whether he is still a member of the board; however, it really does not matter.

I will now quote two brief paragraphs from this report. On page 1 it says:

> In it a dollar value is set upon the volume of mutual aid goods furnished by Canada during the past fiscal year. But the true worth of mutual aid can no more be estimated in dollars than can the heroism of allied fighting men or the labour of war workers. The real value of mutual aid is that it has been, and will continue to be, a factor in the victories of the allied armies.

So that it is the real value we have to consider in respect of the pensions we can provide for the people of Canada, in the same way as we provided mutual aid. Pensions will give security and comfort and a feeling of general well-being to those who have reached the age of sixty, many of whom would otherwise be in distress.

Turning to page 2 of the report, where it refers to the productive capacity of this dominion, I read:

> A country small in population, Canada has for many years stood high on the list of the world's food-producing and industrial nations. But only during the war have Canadians learned for the first time the true productive capacity of their country. Month after month during the five and one-half years that this nation has been at war production records have been shattered.

Production records were shattered because we geared the production of the country to meet the needs of the war. But it was not difficult to shatter the production record of the depression years. At times during that period, over half a million, yes, six hundred thousand people were unemployed. All the goods and services produced during the war, or goods and services of equal value, could have been produced during that period of depression if we had set for ourselves an objective and geared our economy to meet it.

Again let me say that, with the knowledge of what we can produce, and with the knowledge that what old age pensioners consume is not money, but food and clothing and shelter and fuel and medical care and all those things which go into the social life of each individual, we can provide these things; and surely we are not going to be held back because the figures, which after all are only the way we measure our production, seem to us larger than we have been accustomed to.

Keep in mind that I mentioned the sum of $720 million annually as the amount which would be required. In the mutual aid report to which I have already referred, on page 6, you will find that Canada gave to our allies loans and mutual aid by way of goods and services to the value of $4,500 million. I am not quite clear as to the period which that covers; very likely it was from 1941 to March 31 of this year. About one-third of that assistance was in loans which may be repaid, but two-thirds, or about $3,000 million, was an outright gift. I say again that if we can do that for others, surely we can do it for our own people, the people who produce Canada's wealth and have made of Canada what it is.

I would therefore urge hon. gentlemen to approach this question, not from the point of view of the money concerned, but in the same way as we approached war production. That is, if we have the raw materials,, the labour and the technical skill, the money can be found to put that raw material in the form in which it is required for ultimate consumption.

At about this point someone will want to ask: How are we going to raise the money to pay these pensions? I have no objection to such questions being asked. Shall we raise the money by taxation? Shall we raise it by what my hon. friends to the left call debt-creating loans; or shall we raise it by some other smooth, painless and perfect method? I am not very well versed in the matter of money, but I believe I have a more or less logical mind; I see how things operate, and I have tried to reduce this question to a simple formula, though without, I believe, over-simplifying it. I would say that if we are to provide social services we must make

up our minds that they cannot be financed ultimately in any other way than by taxation. For whatever service is provided, if we pay a pension it is paid in terms of money but what it buys is the real payment.

Let us suppose that, instead of 12,000,000, our population consisted of 1,000 persons—I have reduced the proportions in order that we may grasp it—and that of these 1,000, one hundred were over sixty and consequently not producers, that is, under my proposal. Let us suppose that two hundred were under the age of sixteen, thus being also non-producers. We have therefore only seven hundred left. Now it is obvious to me that if the three hundred and the seven hundred as well are to be fed, clothed and sheltered and provided with the necessary comforts and luxuries of life, it can be done only out of the labour of the seven hundred who work.

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): Half of them would be married.

Mr. MacINNIS: I should hope that there would be half of them married, but the women also would be producing, in a sense. But I was going to go a little beyond that and point out that there would be others who would not be producers. There would be certain civil servants, there would be an army and navy, there would be an air force, there would be criminals, there would be people who would be looking after the criminals in gaol; and all these would be non-producers. Then we would most likely have a senate and there would be members of parliament. Most people take it that we are not producing very much, and sometimes they say we only raise hell. Whether that is true I do not know, but in any case to the extent that you do or do not, you are blamed. You are blamed by your enemies or by the opposition for creating too much hell and by your friends for not creating enough.

What I wish to call attention to particularly is that after all it is production that matters, and you cannot by any system of money manipulation that I know of take the burden of producing for the needs of the whole community off those who do the actual work. What we should be concerned with, therefore, in our social service schemes and also in our taxation is, first, what we get in return for our taxes, and second, how to increase the pool of production out of which taxes will be paid.

That brings me back to the statement I made earlier, that I am not proposing a raid on the treasury. What I am suggesting is that we plan and organize our economy so that we may produce, now that the war is over, wealth in the same measure as during the war, or in greater measure; because we can produce in greater measure since we have more people to do it than we had during the war.

This brings me to my last point, namely, the abolition of the means test. I do not think that anything in connection with old age pensions is more criticized than the means test.

Mr. MacNICOL: Or more unnecessary.

Mr. MacINNIS: Or, as my hon. friend says, more unnecessary. I notice that the government, in the proposals made to the provinces, have recommended that the means test be eliminated for persons over seventy years of age. If the means test is undesirable for persons over seventy, then it is undesirable for persons under seventy. You cannot make the means test palatable under any system whatsoever. I will bring the government itself as my witness on this point. At page 37 of the proposals of the dominion government I find this, under the heading "Deficiencies of the Present Scheme."

> The means test is generally recognized as undesirable after a certain age.

I do not know what bright young man came to that conclusion; he has evidently not reached the age of sixty-five yet.

> It has been noted that about forty per cent of all persons of seventy years of age and over make application, satisfy the means test requirements and receive the pension.

That is to say, forty per cent of the persons of seventy years of age are destitute and consequently satisfy the means test and receive the pension. The statement goes on:

> There is little doubt that a very considerable number in addition are not able entirely to support themselves, but are dependent upon their family, and refrain from applying for pensions because of the embarrassment occasioned by the means test.

Right there you have the argument, the complete argument, for the abolition of the means test in any old age pension scheme.

I notice that my time is almost up. I will conclude by just making one more point. With the proposals made by the government, I think we have made a little progress and there is a considerable social security legislation programme as between the provinces and the dominion; but what I think we should aim at is a coordinated social security programme that would provide for every hazard that a man in modern society is apt to meet.

If hon. members will allow me to refer to New Zealand, I note that they have accomplished that very thing. I have before me a list which I should like to read of the monetary benefits paid under the New Zealand social security programme: Universal superannua-

tion at the age of sixty-five; age benefit at the age of sixty—I should like to elaborate on this, but I have time only to mention each item without comment. Then they have invalids' benefits; widows' benefits, orphans' benefits; family benefits; miners' benefits; sickness benefits; unemployment benefits. Then there is an emergency benefit to meet any case not covered by those I have already mentioned, and besides that they have free medical services, which is a part of the social security plan, so that when a man becomes ill he immediately receives his free medical service. I say "free", but none of these things are free, because we cannot get things free. In New Zealand the social security services are paid for to some extent by the five per cent income tax. But a man receives medical attention, hospital care and nursing service, though the doctors are not cooperating fully as yet. Again, a man will get a monetary benefit if he is ill and unable to work; his wife, if he has one, and the members of his family also will receive a monetary benefit. That, I think, is what we should aim at; and may I say that such a programme should be free from any taint of charity. It should come to every citizen as of right, because as a citizen he has given his services to the country.

Mr. P. E. COTE (Verdun): Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my agreement with the aim translated in the resolution moved by the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis), to better the situation of the old people by improving our Old Age Pension Act.

It is common knowledge that all workers in the community contribute to a greater or lesser degree to the economic welfare of the country, by the extent that they share in the production at large and by the amount that they spend for their own upkeep and that of their dependents. We can all agree, I think, that the citizen of this or any other country can no more be considered an isolated entity than a nation in this twentieth century can consider itself and act as though it were isolated from the rest of the world. True solidarity exists, and rightly so, between the individuals themselves on the one hand and between the individuals and the state on the other. The individual receives some benefit from the toil of his neighbours, and on the other hand he must discharge a responsibility toward those same neighbours. The same applies to the state, which receives benefits from the contribution of the individual to the economic and social life of the country. I feel that the state has an accumulated debt of gratitude and a responsibility to those individuals who have given their all in the development of the country, and that this responsibility should be discharged if and when that is found necessary in view of the particular needs of some of those individuals.

In a few words I should like to review what has been done in Canada for our aged citizens, what has been done by our government to come to the rescue of old people who are destitute or approaching destitution. Since the very beginning of this century the question of assisting our old people has occupied the minds of our social workers and members of parliament. An observer would find that in 1906 the first debate took place in this house in this connection. At that time a resolution was adopted expressing the desire of a majority of the members for the adoption of such legislation. During several sessions following that time similar debates took place with practically the same result. In 1924 a special committee of the house was set up, having as its particular duty to study the details of the whole question. That committee made a report to the house, but the report was not implemented until 1927, when the discussion was resumed and the first act of parliament passed, laying down the principle of old age pensions and calling the provinces into equal partnership with the dominion government on the basis of $20 a month, with a means test which has continued to the present time, although many other improvements have since then been made in that legislation. Under that measure the provinces were left free to increase the amount of pension if they cared to do so, but at their own expense. In the early thirties the proportion of the dominion's contribution was increased to seventy-five per cent and the share of the provinces reduced to twenty-five per cent, and during the course of the war the basic maximum pension was increased from $20 to $25 a month.

In reviewing the history of old age pensions in Canada an observer will note that throughout these years the principle of assisting aged people has been upheld more and more strongly. It has been considered that the state owed this much at least to those who had contributed to the development of the country. One after another the nine provinces agreed on the principle, the last province coming in during 1936; and as a result we can say that the entire population is unanimously in favour of more and more improved old age pensions in Canada.

The resolution of the hon. member for Vancouver East calls the attention of this house to the inadequacy of the present system. I wish to compliment him on this

thought, with which I fully agree. Among the constituents whom I have the honour to represent in this house, as among those in every district throughout this great country of ours, there are many cases of hardship among old people who are not treated with sufficient generosity under our present legislation. They are not getting a reasonable reciprocity for their past services to the country. To my mind, therefore, our legislation should be substantially improved.

The first difficulty which presents itself in a discussion in this House of Commons, however, is that we must restrict our debates and our legislation in the social field to matters concerning the welfare of the great masses of the population. That is so, and it will be so when the time comes to choose another basis for the fixation of the age limit in the application of the old age pension.

Parliament has not given any definition of old age or old age pensioners in any legislation of the past, or in any legislation still in force. The only thing by way of definition that the Canadian legislature has given has been a fixing of the age limit at a certain age. Up to now that age has been seventy years, and one must attain it before having a claim to any pension provided by the act.

This basis of payment has been of a somewhat arbitrary nature, because it has not yet been proved in Canada or elsewhere that old age should start at seventy, sixty-nine, or any lower age. The resolution before the house suggests that the limit should be set at sixty years. In doing so, the hon. member who sponsors the resolution lays down the principle that the retiring age of the average citizen in Canada has been set at sixty years.

I readily agree that there are unfortunate cases of hardship in the category of citizens of that age; but I do not feel that there are enough in proportion, to consider that the productive activity of the average citizen in a young and wealthy country, such as Canada, ceases when the age of sixty years has been reached.

If these cases of hardship affecting people of sixty years, or slightly more than that, are not considered an important proportion of the citizens of that category, then I consider that this matter of assistance and the rescue of others should rest primarily with the local governments, including municipal authorities and others.

I think a better case could be made in the advocating of the age of sixty-five years as a pension limit, so far as the dominion government is concerned. This age has been already recognized as a sound basis by the actuaries of most of our insurance companies and by the important financial, industrial and business corporations. They have set the age of sixty-five years as that at which their insured people and personnel might retire on pensions. Then, the federal, provincial and municipal governments, have set the same age of sixty-five years for the purpose of their superannuation and retirement funds.

This government has already accepted the age of sixty-five as a fair basis in the proposals it made to the provinces last August. These proposals provided for a fair ground of discussion with the provinces for the improvement of the treatment already given to the aged people throughout the country. Those between the ages of sixty-five and seventy would be cared for jointly by the dominion and the provinces, through the payment of a maximum pension of $30 a month, representing an increase of $5 over the amount set out in the Old Age Pensions Act. The administration of the pensions of this group is to be left with the provinces and the means test is to be retained so that the pension may be reduced by whatever amount represents the excess income of the pensioner over $125 a year.

In this particular instance I have no great objection to the means test, because I consider that it will affect the intermediate group between those people who do not receive old age pensions, and those who, under the new plan, would be receiving pensions at seventy years without any means test. The dominion proposal calls for only a federal contribution to pensions paid to those seventy years of age and over, on a basis of $30 a month, and without any means test. This would be paid to all residents of Canada who have spent at least twenty years residence in this country. I consider that these proposals by the dominion government to the provinces would cover the situation very well.

This concrete proposal should be of great assistance to the provinces in their study of this question, and in their offer of any amendments or counter-proposals when they reassemble with the federal authorities in, we are told, the not too distant future.

In view of the fact that the provinces are now being consulted in this connection, and that a definite proposal has already been offered by the dominion government, a proposal which represents a substantial improvement on the existing legislation, I submit that the resolution of the hon. member is premature and inappropriate at this time. It deals with a subject which should not have been brought into discussion until the conference with the provinces has been resumed,

until those provinces have expressed their views, and until there has been some measure of accord with the dominion government and some reasonable and justifiable conclusion. Those conclusions, I presume, will be brought before the house and the country as preambles to further legislation the government will have to present, if it is to give effect to the results of the conference with the provinces.

There is another feature which I should like to bring to the attention of the house and concerning which I should like to make a few remarks before concluding.

Old age pensions, important as they may be, are nevertheless but a small fraction of the broader field of social insurance or social security. I doubt whether the approach to a question of this kind is well chosen, if it is not studied in constant relation to other measures of social security already on our statute book, or in process of becoming law.

After all, the responsibility of the state is not so much one of providing relief by itself as one of contributing and offering assistance to ensure a maximum of welfare and security to the citizens of the country. In a democracy such as ours the initial and the chief responsibility and initiative in that field should be left with the individual; and that responsibility is passed on from the individual, in a lesser degree, to his family, his social organizations, his municipality and his province. The dominion government should only lend a helpful hand, either by suggesting initiatives to local governments or individuals or by granting financial assistance. In implementing such a policy the central government should always keep in mind that its social legislation has for its aim the preservation and development of the human assets of the country rather than a tendance to reduce them.

Such measures as unemployment insurance, veterans' reestablishment, housing, labour legislation, health insurance, public health services, family allowances and others definitely tend to set a minimum of well-being and increase the expectancy of life and the productive activity of the individual. The more that measures like these can accomplish, the better it will be for the future of the country.

I am all in favour of old age pensions, but not as a direct aim of social security in itself. I favour them to the extent only that they can cover the majority of cases which have not been and could not be taken care of by other measures of social security, such as I mentioned a moment ago. Old age pensions should be considered as the last recourse of the state to remedy a social deficiency. Therefore I consider it a theoretical principle that the state would be making more progress if circumstances could allow it to increase the age limit in proportion and to the extent that other social measures are developed, that medical knowledge gets closer to perfection and that public health services become more adequate. On the other hand, it would be a sign of growing deficiency on the part of the state if the age limit for old age pensions has to be constantly lowered. I do not share the views of those who measure the value of an old age pension scheme by the age which has been set as the limit, without due consideration being given to the general aspect of other social security measures in force in or contemplated by the country. In a word, the best Old Age Pensions Act is not necessarily the one which provides for the lowest age limit.

We have had the good fortune of witnessing a conference between the federal and provincial authorities last August where definite proposals were made to the provinces to help them improve their treatment of the aged. Other social measures were considered as well as the general financial relations between the provinces and the dominion. In view of this conference, in view of the fact that the provinces are actually working on these proposals and preparing amendments and counter-proposals that they intend to submit on the resumption of the conference in a couple of months, I do not think this is an opportune or appropriate time for the House of Commons to consider amending a proposal which was made to the provinces last August.

The provincial authorities are highly authorized representatives of the people to deal with such matters as old age pensions, since this is a matter of their specific jurisdiction. Therefore, while favouring the improvement of our Old Age Pensions Act along the lines of the dominion proposal to the provinces, I am of the opinion that this resolution is premature and inappropriate at this time and should not be adopted.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, there is no more important matter for this parliament to deal with than the subject of the resolution moved by the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis). To-day we had our first snow flurry on parliament hill. It is going to be a severe winter and many of our population will be without shelter, fuel and food. In 1922, the first year I became a member of this house I moved a resolution regarding this question because I realized the great problem this country faced in connection with its old people. Nothing was done that year. I believe the late former member for Winnipeg North Centre, the

father-in-law of the hon. member who moved this resolution, moved a resolution to the same effect. Both resolutions were sent to the industrial relations committee which was then functioning. Recommendations were made to the high court of parliament that some action be taken.

Because of the complicated constitution of this country with federal, provincial and municipal authorities, this problem has never been treated from the commercial and humanitarian aspects. It is the first duty of this national parliament to look after the health, comfort, happiness, welfare and prosperity of its citizens. We have not done that. We have wasted millions of dollars on material things, but so far as human values go we have left these matters largely to the municipalities and home authorities.

I remember when I was in the city hall at Toronto, where most of the social legislation of this country started, a pension scheme was set up for the police and fire departments. I was a member of the police commission at that time when the late Mr. Thomas Bradshaw in 1918 further developed this scheme. The scheme was extended to the school boards and to many other agencies. The whole question of federal old age pensions has been treated largely as charity in its administration.

In Ontario, since the turn of the century grand juries, in carrying out their ancient functions by visiting the gaols of the province, have urged better care of the aged. In almost every gaol they found poor people who were there simply because they were poor or had lost their jobs or were unable to work. Many years ago a house of industry was established in our city and we tried to take these poor unfortunate people out of the gaols of the province. I wish to pay a tribute to the Conservative government of Sir James Whitney, and to other governments of the province, for what was done along this line. But it must be remembered that most of the social work done was started first by municipalities of Ontario.

I am not prepared to say whether the age limit should be sixty-five or sixty years, but I do think something should be done immediately by the government. The resolution divides itself into three parts. First, there is the lowering of the age limit to sixty years; second, there is the increasing of the amount and, third, there is the deleting of income requirements for eligibility.

The third part of the resolution does not go far enough. It should eliminate what I call the means test. I know of one case of a newspaper man, one of the best loved men who ever sat in the gallery here at Ottawa, who died and left a widow. She is in receipt of a small old age pension of $29 a month. This is paid partly by the province and partly by the dominion and is distributed by the municipality.

Some years ago an attempt was made to take care of the veterans of 1885 of the old northwest field force, of which this man had been a member. His widow was entitled to some pension in that connection, but what did they do? They applied the means test. She refused to take the measly pittance which was being offered to those who had saved Canada from being dislocated in 1885; she decided to stay with what she thought was sure, her $29 a month old age pension. With the housing situation as it is she finds that she cannot get a room or two in the city for less than $45 a month.

The present form of old age pension is nothing but charity and it is a disgrace to the Canadian people. On my first visit to the house the other day I found on the order paper a motion to spend over the head of parliament the sum of two or three billion dollars. The House of Commons is not consulted as to how that money shall be spent, and I was surprised and waited in vain for somebody to say something about it on the 11th of September. We voted billions during the war without due consideration. Yet think of the measly way in which we are treating the deserving old aged people of this country! Something must be done. This measly means test should be abolished immediately.

The city of Toronto had a large number of men in the street department whom it pensioned off at $12 a week, without any contribution from any government. The old age pension board in Toronto consists of five persons and they are very fine people. The actual number of Toronto residents receiving old age pensions as of December 31 of last year was 11,044, and the amount paid out in pensions in 1944 was $3,651,449.31. There were also pensions to the blind being paid to 252 persons as of December 31, 1944, and the amount paid in pensions for the blind was $83,778. The city is also required to provide free office space for administration purposes.

But here in Canada you are making a political football of the question. The greatest mistake made by the fathers of confederation was in providing for provincial legislatures. They were created largely for political reasons, not economic reasons, and in old age pension administration we have had nothing but charity for our people ever since with a means test.

I do hope that something will be done about old age pensions at once. One of the reasons I came to Ottawa—I never come here looking for anything because I know I never would get anything—was to help support these humanitarian projects like the old age pension, sickness insurance, soldiers' welfare, and to spread nationally the gospel of these social services which started in the city of Toronto. I want to support all these measures that are related to the health and comfort and welfare of our people. That is my only reason for saying a word on this motion. We have a Department of Health and Social Welfare, presided over by the young minister from Montreal, which is supposed to look after everybody from the cradle to the grave and provide everybody with some kind of handout from the government treasury. One of the glories of the Victorian era was that the people kept the state. Now it is the state that is to keep all the people.

I commend what I have set out on this motion to the government. I do not know where the government is to-day; very few of them are in the chamber. The government spends millions of dollars without the authority of parliament; why cannot it do something about the old age pension now instead of waiting until next Christmas and then handing out relief? Something must be done immediately. I hope that other speakers will be heard from for five or ten minutes each, urging the government to do something now. I am not prepared to say whether the pensionable age should be sixty or sixty-five. But I do say that there should be no means test and that the list of persons eligible should be extended.

Mr. F. D. SHAW (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, exhaustive debate should not be necessary to convince the membership of this house of the desirability of giving unqualified support to this resolution. I propose this afternoon to make my remarks very brief, but my brevity does not come about through failure to recognize the absolute need for an immediate overhaul of the Old Age Pension Act; rather it comes as a consequence of my realization that on many previous occasions the members of this group have placed on the record, their views with respect to old age pensions, and extensive repetition is unnecessary.

An examination of the resolution before us reveals, as the sponsor stated, three things: first, not necessarily the demand but the request for consideration of lowering the pensionable age to sixty; second, increasing the amount of the pension to enable the recipient to live in health and self-respect; and third, deleting the income requirements for eligibility.

I am convinced that if a vote were taken to-day on this resolution, ninety-five per cent of the membership of this house would support it. I say that because I well recall that about a year ago the question was extensively debated in this chamber, and I fail to recall any private member having spoken in opposition to the proposals which were then made. I do recall, however, that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) suggested that the member who at that time was urgently demanding consideration of this question should place a resolution on the order paper or at least make a motion to the effect that these changes should be brought about. The minister knew that at that time it would have been utterly impossible for any private member to introduce a measure on which a vote of the house could be taken.

What is the situation as we find it to-day? The individual Canadian, worn-out, let us say, by the long struggle imposed by economic conditions, finds himself at the age of seventy unable to provide for himself and he makes application for pension. It is a well-known fact that he is looked upon in many quarters with pity, and in certain quarters he is looked upon as an outcast. Then he is examined, and I might add, with suspicion. If he can meet the rigid and severe qualifying regulations that have been established, including proof of virtual destitution, he is grudgingly granted what might well be called charity or a dole. I have yet failed to hear an argument to convince me that it is otherwise. It is a fact that there are hundreds, possibly even thousands, who never apply for the old age pension because they fear the inquisition which follows the application for pension. The whole thing does not finish when the applicant receives the pension. From that time forward he is periodically examined and questioned and checked.

Mr. BRACKEN: And double-checked.

Mr. SHAW: Right, double checked, and investigated and even spied upon. Certainly the individual recipient's life is made miserable, and it is almost a fact that he can hardly call that life his own.

If I were to cite ten reasons for voicing objection to the old age pension provisions as we know them to-day I would include a number of the following:

In the first place I would say that those who sponsor and support the present Old Age Pension Act fail miserably to appreciate the

contributions made by so many of those pioneer citizens toward the development of this nation. Moreover, they fail to appreciate the fact that there are thousands in this country between the ages of sixty and seventy who by virtue of circumstances over which they have had no control are unable to earn a livelihood. It is a fact, and it was referred to earlier this afternoon that before the war men of forty, forty-five and fifty were regarded as being altogether too old for many of the types of employment which were available. It would almost seem that under the present system the government in effect are betting that the majority of our people will never live to be seventy. I charge that the present pension amounts which are paid never have and do not now bear any fair relationship to the cost of living.

It comes to my mind at this time that a year ago, during the debate to which I referred previously, the Minister of Finance indicated his belief that, since the cost of living in 1928 was higher than it was last year as reflected in the cost of living index, the pension which was received at that time should certainly provide more in the way of goods and therefore should be quite adequate. What he failed to indicate then was that when the scheme came into effect in the late twenties no one argued that the amounts paid were adequate to provide a decent standard of living for our aged pioneers. It is true that the figure was an arbitrary one. The arguments advanced were that it was somewhat new, that we must proceed with caution, and if conditions led us to believe that at some later date it would be necessary to increase the amounts, that would be done. I would say, too, in virtual condemnation of the present set-up, that it fails also to recognize the existence of a wife where the pensioner is over seventy and the wife is under seventy. This is what we have: a bachelor or a widower upon attaining the age of seventy years, or actually sixty-nine years and nine months, may make application for pension. If he passes all those rigid tests and meets all the rigid restrictions, he may be granted the maximum pension, which in certain cases is $30 per month. But if a married man becomes seventy years of age and is granted the pension, the authorities completely ignore the fact that he may have a wife under seventy years of age, because in the act there is no provision for making payments on behalf of the wife. A married man in his seventies with a wife in her seventies may get the maximum of $60 a month. Now I wonder by what method of calculation or reasoning it can make sense to anyone that we should ignore the existence of the wife if that wife is under seventy years of age.

I say that through our present pension system we fail to recognize the vast productive capacity of this country, and, as a previous speaker stated, that all these people are asking for is a fair share of Canada's production.

I would say, too, that the present scheme fails in another respect. It fails to recognize that if we, as members of the government have stated on recent occasions, are under a moral obligation to provide for the needs of the destitute in other nations, we are also under a moral obligation to provide for the aged pensioners of our own country, the needy of the nation.

This present scheme also fails to recognize, as do those who support it, the complete viciousness of the present means test. I have already said that scores of people have not applied for the pension, even though they need it in the worst way, because they fear that means test and its implications. Only within recent days I have had letters from three persons around the age of seventy-five who have stated, in effect, "We have not applied prior to this time because we did not want them meddling in our personal affairs, asking us why this son or this daughter does not provide for us. We have struggled on, hopeful of paying our way, but now we have come to the end of the road and it is necessary for us to make application."

The present pension system and those who support it fail to realize the effects which might develop as a result of our enabling many of these persons over sixty years of age to remove themselves from the employment stream. This was referred to earlier; I will not take time to elaborate upon it.

Another vicious aspect of the present provisions upon which I would lay particular emphasis is this. The scheme fails to recognize the existence of political misuse, because it is a well-known fact that eligibility and pension amounts are determined in considerable measure by administrative discretion. I would say that that is one of the strongest points of condemnation of the system as it is operating to-day.

In this country we boast, and justifiably so, of our great accomplishments. We boast of the real and potential wealth of this nation, and we boast about its being a Christian civilization. But I wonder if we are not sometimes just a bit ashamed to realize that hand in hand with our boasting we have on the

statute books of our nation such a shameful piece of legislation as the present Old Age Pensions Act.

Certain objections have been raised with respect to the making of what might be called radical changes in the present provisions. It will probably be asserted that consideration is being given to a compulsory contributory scheme of old age pensions. I do not propose to take time to express my views about any such proposed scheme. But let me emphasize that while that may be something for the future, we are faced with a serious problem right now. A contributory scheme will not provide for those who are now listed among our needy aged pioneers. Let us indicate our seriousness and our sincerity about the future by making certain most essential changes to bring about immediate results, and let us make those changes at once.

Costs will be thrown in our faces, but it will be a weak and futile avenue of attempted escape. During this war we have astonished ourselves by what we have done as a people. Surely we are not going to say that certain changes in our present Old Age Pensions Act, to do nothing but grant many of our people simple justice, will now be impossible, especially in the light of our great accomplishments in the last few years.

With respect to financing, I should like to make reference to the words of the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis), not with the idea of engaging in any controversy over what he has said. I have already indicated that we are supporting the resolution, but I could not help thinking, as he referred to the method of financing, that in order to carry out the proposal he suggested for the distribution of our production it would be necessary to tax from our people every cent which they did not spend.

To-day the government of Canada does not tax from the people, though it comes very close to it, perhaps, every cent they have not spent, but the government borrows and plunges us into debt. We say that there is another method, and we shall have an opportunity at a later time to deal with it in this house. I will not therefore elaborate upon it at the moment. I say, however, that anyone speaking in opposition to this resolution to-day must be prepared to answer two or three questions if he hopes to be at all convincing: Why cannot and should not the eligibility age be reduced to sixty immediately? Why cannot and should not the pension be increased in order to grant the security to which these people certainly are entitled? And a third question would be this: Why cannot and should not that vicious means test be removed? I am of the opinion that no amount of political manœuvering and time-killing debate will solve our problem. The issue is clear, concise and definite. I urge that the government give this house an opportunity to declare itself on this issue this afternoon.

Mr. D. A. CROLL (Spadina): In rising to speak on this question I realize that there has been some difference in the house as to whether the war is over or not. I think we are all agreed, though, that we are now passing through the transition period, at least in its first stages; and the productive machinery, the governmental machinery of the country and the outlook and trend are definitely from war to peace.

I agree with other hon. members in the house that the ultimate goal for all Canadians is social and economic security; but the path there, Mr. Speaker, is not strewn with roses, because to-day we have not only a multitude of new problems but also some old problems, and I am speaking of one old problem. I know something of this problem because I administered old age pensions in the province of Ontario as a member of the government, and under present changing conditions not only must we give consideration to the problem but we must do something about revising the Old Age Pensions Act.

It is only fair to say that the government have been aware of the problems. In 1943, by order in council, the amount was raised from $240 to $300, and in 1944 it was raised from $365 to $425 to pensioners.

Mr. KNOWLES: The total amount allowed.

Mr. CROLL: Yes. But a more prominent place to-day must be given to old age pensions because it is becoming an acute problem. There are a great number of objections to the old age pensions act now on the statute books. The first one is the means test. Because it is unparliamentary I cannot say what I think about that test; but believe me when I say to the house that many worthy people in Ontario have never applied because it meant an investigation of the son; it meant an investigation of the daughter and the son-in-law; it meant an investigation of the man's life, and his pride did not permit him to admit, and he would not admit publicly, that he had lost the economic battle of life. He had further to face the humiliation of turning over to the government his small house as a charge against the money that the government gave him, which in effect brought the government in the final analysis a mere pittance, because after the man passed away the government always made a settlement with the

heirs or executors, took whatever they gave and often forgot about it. But the government had to go through the motions. That is unworthy of a country like Canada and unworthy of this government.

So far as the age is concerned, I shall have something to say about that in a few minutes. So far as the amount is concerned, we must not lose sight of the fact that it has been raised from $20 to $25, and that is progress. But that is not the vital point. There are provinces in this dominion that pay an old age pension of $18.63 and there are provinces that pay as high as $29.41; but the province that can afford the $29 usually pays the $18 and the province that has the greater needs cannot afford it. Consequently, it must be a dominion responsibility.

We have this act and we must keep pace with the times. We are living in an increasing tempo of everyday life. We are living at an accelerated and very fast pace, and we in Canada have astounded the world with our scientific development. We are one of the three great powers in the world possessing some very important scientific secrets. In this country not only have we stream-lined production in factories, on the farms, in our forests and fisheries, but we are speeding up that production from day to day and the momentum will continue rather than relax.

Every one of us in the house, excluding the lady member, must remember the horse and buggy and mechanical days, but we must not forget that to-day we sit on the very fringe of the rocket and the atomic power age. The old age pension legislation fits well into the age of yesterday and, as the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis) said, the procedure in this house also belongs to that age. The scientists have done a great job, particularly in the last six years, but as yet they have not found a way to make of the body a tireless machine; so the human body wears out. To-day the need is for youth, both in body and in mind, the youth that brings with it not only vitality but strength. In industry at the present time fifty is a questionable age; a man fifty years old has difficulty in getting into most industries. In industry to-day sixty is a difficult age and seventy is an impossible age. That is the problem we have to face. At the present time there are some two hundred thousand pensioners who are not able to cope with the tempo of life or who are incapacitated and cannot maintain the Canadian standard of living. Peculiarly at this time we have an opportunity to do something about this problem, because by the hundreds of thousands young men are returning to the Canada which belongs to them, to pick up the threads and weave the pattern of a life of happiness and security. During the war the oldsters were plying the tools which belonged to the young men. As has been said in this house already, these old people made a valuable contribution to the war effort. They left their homes; they did everything that was asked of them, and now the time has come for the tools to change hands, for the young men to take up the task. Yesterday I read an article in the Windsor *Star,* dated October 2 and headed "Older Men Stepping Out":

> Many of the older men in some of the larger organizations in Canada are retiring now that the war is over. This makes vacancies by which others step up and there is a general reorganization.
>
> So many men eligible for retirement within the last three or four years have remained on the job to fill in while the younger men were at war. Now, these younger chaps are coming back and delayed promotions are being given.
>
> Most of the older men are glad to step out. They have been working hard and are tired. In their last active years they did more than when they were in the prime of their careers. They rose to the emergency and carried on well.

My submission is that we should permit the young men to work and create while the old men rest and enjoy life. We have heard a great deal about money. I expected some of the questions that were asked, but I think we ought to look at it from the point of view of whether or not this is a good investment, whether or not this is purchasing power. These old people spend their money; they are lucky to make it last the month, when they receive only $25 or even $30. In this house we placed upon the statute books a law that has the absolute approval of everyone, that has caught the imagination of this country and that is the envy of our neighbours to the south. I am referring to the family allowances legislation, under which we invest in the youth of this country. At the same time we pay compensation to people who meet with accidents, at any age; but for the inevitable accident of life, old age, we make a pitiful allowance. People who look upon that as charity are mistaken. People who look upon it as a reward are mistaken. People who look upon it as a burden are mistaken. It is a long overdue dividend to the pioneers and builders of this country.

I think the time has come when not only the Old Age Pensions Act but other legislation must be revised in order to keep step with the times. It is true that in private industry some arrangements are made for pensions. Public enterprise also makes some such arrangement, although public enterprise has gone much farther in this direction. But a

great many people are in neither of these classes at the present time. They have toiled through the sunshine of their lives, and now in the twilight I think it is the duty of their representatives to see that the clouds do not entirely obscure the sun.

My hon. friend who introduced the motion made reference to the government blue book, which contains a great deal of information. He read paragraph 1 on page 37, and I should like to complete the record. At that page the government places on record its realization of the deficiencies and makes a public confession, which is not a common thing for governments to do. They say they recognize the problem, and there it is; my hon. friends agree to that. But the government go farther and say, "This is what we think ought to be done:

> In developing its proposals with reference to old age pensions, the federal government has given careful attention to the experience of other countries (in particular the plans and proposals now in operation or under consideration in Great Britain, the United States, Australia and New Zealand)—

That ought to make everybody happy.

> —as well as to the economic and social conditions of Canada. In the light of this survey, it appeared that the following principles should be incorporated in the dominion government's proposals.
>
> (a) The scheme should be nationwide in scope and capable of immediate implementation.
>
> (b) Benefits should be paid at flat rates and should not in individual cases have to be related to individual amounts or rates of prior contribution.
>
> (c) Provision should be made for more generous scales of payment and a lower age of eligibility than heretofore.
>
> (d) To the extent that means-testing procedures may have to be maintained, they should be left as the administrative responsibility of the provinces, who are best equipped to deal with this problem.

Naturally I do not agree with the last point, although if it were left to the provinces I can assure the house that the means test would have gone out the window. It would have gone out the window when I had the department, and I think I can speak for those now in charge. That is progress. It is all very well to say it is only a step in the right direction; but when one reads farther and realizes that the government has as its plan a national old age pension to all people at the age of seventy and, in addition, a pension to those in need between the ages of sixty-five and sixty-nine, it seems to me it is not only a step in the right direction but a hop, skip and jump in that direction. True, it may not go as far as we should like, but we have to face up to it.

[Mr. Croll.]

The crux of the situation lies in the dominion-provincial conference. If we are to deal with these related problems, then we must have the complete, absolute and over-all right to collect income tax, to collect succession duties and to collect corporation taxes. And so long as the provinces will not untie our hands, we cannot write cheques for social services to the extent we would wish.

It is our business to create public opinion in that respect. I think the steps taken by the government at the present time are forward looking and realistic. However, I was completely impressed by what was said by the hon. member who has sponsored the motion. These were his words as I recorded them: "The government does not see its objective, and the government has not planned."

May I point out to him that at this particular time to act in a piecemeal fashion would accomplish only a limited objective. Not only must the government look at old age pensions, but it must look at health insurance and unemployment insurance. A resolution is now offered asking that this insurance be increased by fifty per cent. I have no doubt a number of us will have something to say when that matter is before the house.

Only a few days ago we discussed the question of further allowances to veteran settlers, a matter which will come before the veterans affairs committee. The government must look at these problems in the broadest sense—and not only the government, but each one of us. Those are the things we want. I do not believe we want to have them piecemeal. I believe that by our rising in our places, speaking about these problems and expressing our opinions the government will learn where we stand. Undoubtedly we must have a somewhat broader vision in these matters. If we have responsibility, then we also must have some power.

We must have the right to tax before we have the right to spend. Undoubtedly this is vital to the whole question at the present time, and I agree with it in principle. On the other hand, we must make certain that we view the problem in its widest scope, and as it is related to other social services. Then we must deal with it on that basis.

Mr. NORMAN J. M. LOCKHART (Lincoln): Mr. Speaker, may I offer my word of congratulation to the hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Croll) who has so ably presented views which, I believe, were based on actual experiences he has had, in more ways than one. I must say I was in accord with him when in a sense he criticized the

present administration for not having developed and improved the Old Age Pensions Act before this time. I am quite sure the hon. member will acquit himself honourably in this chamber. Those who have had earlier associations with him will agree that he will add much to the discussions in the days to come.

I can readily understand that the introduction of this resolution is only the beginning of much that will be said in the house respecting legislation for the care of persons who have reached the point where they are unable to support themselves. As the days and weeks pass it will be expected that the government will introduce something along the lines suggested in the resolution. In fact, already some notice has been given of future action. The hon. member who moved the resolution has developed in to-day's debate a discussion which may be of guidance to the government in its task.

The Old Age Pensions Act and associated legislation is a dominion-born statute. It was passed, I believe in 1927, in cooperation with the provincial governments and with some minor modifications it has remained on the statute books almost in its original state.

The fact that this statute during those years has been permitted to remain more or less in a static condition is one which might well be criticized. Because of their administrative arrangements with the federal government, and to ensure their provincial autonomy, the provincial governments have exercised certain powers. In turn they have been assisted by the municipalities and by local boards which have been set up in the municipalities. To all intents and purposes the clerks of municipalities have been the media through whom the applications have been developed. Originally the Old Age Pensions Act operated on a fifty-fifty basis. That has been modified to the extent that it is now placed at seventy-five for the dominion and twenty-five for the provinces.

Quite recently the federal government has discovered that it can spend well over $200 million per year to look after the younger citizens of the country, and it has found a way to do that without consulting the provinces to any great extent. The money is paid from the federal treasury to persons who are not expected directly to benefit. If this can be done in one instance, then it is quite probable that ways and means could be found to do it in respect of old age pensions, and in other instances. Ways and means are being found to do these things.

The conference between the federal and provincial authorities is to continue, and flowing from it one would expect further legislation. It is to be hoped that the legislation affecting old age pensions will be changed materially, so that at least the charity feature of the present act will be eliminated.

I do not pretend to have had the vast experience the hon. member for Spadina has had. On the other hand I recall being in his office some years ago at a time when some of us carried municipal responsibilities. I have always remembered his generous attitude and his endeavour to try to meet the problems so as not to humiliate unduly the people who form the most deserving group of citizens in our country. The responsibility now rests upon the federal government. I ask the federal government to tell this house what they are going to pay these persons of either sixty or sixty-five years of age, and what fuller measure of security they are going to give these worth-while residents and citizens of this country. I expect that the new minister, under whose supervision any revision would take place, will tell this house why there has been no revision of this matter up to the present time. I am quite satisfied that he will admit that for many years there have been representations of the strongest kind to the federal government asking for changes in the legislation.

I want to point out to the minister or whoever is going to be responsible for the change that there is one thing that must be looked into. I have tried at times to assist in establishing the age of persons who have resided in this country for many years. Section 18 of the act reads:

> Any pension authority shall have the right for the purpose of ascertaining the age of any pensioner to obtain without charge,
>
> (b) subject to such conditions as may be specified in the regulations made under this act, from the dominion bureau of statistics, any information on the subject of the age of such pensioner which may be contained in the returns of any census taken more than thirty years before the date of the application for such information.

I know that this matter has been brought to the attention of the federal authorities many times, or at least I am so informed. This information is given only to the municipal authorities. I know of many people who came to this country in 1912, 1913 and following years, from the motherland and other countries. Often they find that the record of their birth has been destroyed, or perhaps it was not established in the first place. These people have lived in this country for thirty years or more, but are unable to establish their exact age. Under the present act, the dominion

bureau of statistics is unable to give anything beyond 1911. As a humble representative of one section of this country I know of several instances in which British subjects, by birth or naturalization, who have proven themselves good citizens, were unable to prove their age. If by a modification of the act we can assist them to prove their age and thus get their just rights, it is our duty to do it and we should do it immediately.

I pass on to another phase of the matter that I should like to bring to the attention of the government. To a large extent the federal treasury will have to find the money, and I suppose they will tell us what they propose to do and how much it is going to cost. It seems to me that a broad policy should be laid down. Reference has been made by the hon. member for Spadina and others to the means test. In my opinion this means test is abominable. As the hon. member said, if he had had anything to do with it years ago he would have thrown it out the window. I assume we shall be told what is to be done about doing away with the humiliating experience that these old citizens of the country are subjected to.

Members in every part of the house know of people in the humblest walks of life who by working hard have saved sufficient to buy a little four-roomed cottage. Many such people are faced with the humiliating experience of being deprived of passing that on to a crippled son when they leave this earthly abode. I have had experiences of that kind. If we do not wipe out the means test, we should modify the act so that those who apply for old age pensions will be able to retain a reasonable part of what they have struggled a lifetime to get, and still be given their just rights by way of a pension. I know the government have heard this story for many years, but nothing has been done. We go along in a state of lethargy and do not seem to realize that these people have not been getting their just rights.

An hon. MEMBER: They waited for an election.

Mr. LOCKHART: As someone back here very aptly says, they waited until an election came along. Someone has been asleep at the switch, and it is about time he woke up. This has been placed on the doorstep of the government, and I am simply pointing out some of the things I have experienced. I want them to give full cognizance to what I am saying.

I should like to say a word about the earning capacity of pensioners. A pensioner is allowed to earn $125 a year. He is also given $3 a month as a so-called cost of living bonus; this small pittance is added to his pension, while others in Canada were receiving double and treble that amount in recognition of the increased cost of living. Again I say that the very essence of our citizenship, those who have pioneered and built up this country, were obliged to take less than their just rights.

Again, an old age pensioner is allowed to earn over and above his pittance of a pension only $125 a year. No matter what action might finally be taken by this house on old age pensions after the subject has been duly considered by, I hope, every member, I would ask the government to increase the amount which an old age pensioner is permitted to earn, in addition to the small old age pension he receives, because many of these people still have a lot of activity left in them and still have a great love for this country and would like an opportunity to do what work they can. I should like to see the amount they can earn materially increased, and if the government does not propose to do that, I am going to rise in my place in this house and demand it. I know the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell) the other night said that it was not much use for any of us to rise and say what we wanted because everything was cut and dried and we got nowhere anyway. But I say, Mr. Speaker, that at least we can make our views known to the government and let them and the country know that we are alive to the situation which exists.

Another point I wish to bring to the attention of the government is the deductions which are made from the old age pension by reason of a military pension being received. A father and mother in receipt of an old age pension may have been depending on a soldier son who went overseas and was incapacitated or perhaps lost his life on the battlefield or died as a result of service. If the hon. member for Spadina were present at the moment he could cite many such cases. I have one in mind. The government knows all about it because I believe the provincial government of Ontario has brought it to their attention. If not, I shall be glad to furnish the details. This old couple on the death of their son were getting about $25 or $30 a month. They were also paid a mere pittance in the form of old age pension. There were doctors' bills to pay and many other unfortunate circumstances. I have the details here on my desk. To state it briefly, the old age pension they received was adjusted because the act provided that that had to be done. If the minister wants the facts I will give them to him. I shall not take the time of the house to relate them now. It is time that the government woke up to the fact that

the people of this country want them to do what is right and fair to the best of our citizens who are now well up in years.

I also wish to bring up the question of proving citizenship in order to get the old age pension.

An hon. MEMBER: That is not in order.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): It is very much in order.

Mr. LOCKHART: Certainly it is because citizenship has to be proved in order to get the old age pension. There are British subjects in this country who have been unable to prove their citizenship. There is no question at all that they have lived in this dominion, some of them for forty or fifty years, and in the case of one that I know of, for sixty years. But certain records have been lost and these people are unable to establish where they were born or what their original citizenship was. They are among the pioneers, the very best citizens of our country. They have been good citizens for thirty, forty and fifty years. There should be some provision in the act whereby these people could obtain whatever pension is paid and at whatever age it is paid, instead of being denied the pension as they are now because of their inability to prove that they are British subjects. The act is definite on that point; they must prove their citizenship. If I am wrong the minister will correct me, but I believe I am right. That is one thing which certainly needs rectifying.

There is another thing that needs rectifying, and to illustrate my point I will cite a case which came to my attention about two months ago. A woman of eighty years of age, keen and active, had been receiving the old age pension, formerly $20, now raised to $28 by reason of the increased cost of living, or supplementary aid or whatever it is called. She went to visit a sick daughter in the city of Detroit. The daughter was lying at the point of death. The act says that the pensioner must not stay outside Canada for more than thirty days. The daughter lay at the point of death, not for thirty days, but for four long months, during which the mother sat at her bedside, administered the medicine and perhaps had considerable to do in bringing about her daughter's final recovery. Because this pensioner had stayed outside Canada more than thirty days her old age pension was cut off, and she has to go through the whole business of applying again. Surely some latitude should be allowed to the provincial governments, which are charged with the administration of the act. But the act itself says that the pension must be cut off if the pensioner stays outside Canada for more than thirty days. There may be many extenuating circumstances which ought to be taken into consideration.

I know of another case, where a father visited his son in Philadelphia, and while there took ill and was in hospital for two and a half months. His pension was cut off.

I ask the minister to consider these cases. Old age pensions will be much discussed at the dominion-provincial conference, and I appeal to the minister now to make sure that these injustices to the best of our citizenship are definitely cured and these inconsistencies rectified. They are injustices done to what I always have felt is the very cream of our citizenship, those who have helped to build up this country and to whom we owe so much. I ask the minister to make sure that when this subject of old age pensions is considered, steps will be taken to ensure that injustices and inconsistencies of the sort I have mentioned are definitely cured.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. STANLEY KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I join with those who are calling for the vote but I know how little chance there is of the question being put.

Mr. GRAYDON: Don't talk out the motion.

Mr. KNOWLES: Don't worry. I seconded the motion and I shall not be talking it out.

Mr. GRAYDON: You are going to if you do not sit down.

Mr. KNOWLES: Mr. Speaker, as the seconder of the motion it certainly was my intention to speak to it. My interest in old age pensions is well known, and the material on my desk is abundant evidence that I had a good deal to say. However, it has been intimated to me that the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Claxton) would like to make a statement before the debate closes to-day. I have offered to yield to him for that purpose, although he may think that what I am going to say in a sentence or two will indicate a rather high price for the privilege I am prepared to accord him. I yield to the minister because I feel that the old people of Canada would like to have some definite statement from the government as to what they may expect in terms of the immediate implementing of the federal government's proposals for better old age pension legislation.

The other night when I was speaking in a previous debate the minister did not altogether like the reference I made to 1948 when

I asked if, perchance, that was to be the year of the next election. I remind him now that when he answered my question in the midst of my speech he did not specifically state when in his opinion the new scale of $30 a month for all over seventy would come into effect. I hope that in the few minutes which are left this afternoon he will answer that question directly. That is why I am prepared to let him speak in my place.

As I have already said, the old people of Canada know very well where I stand on this question. They want to know where the government stands. For that purpose I am glad to yield to the minister, and I hope that he will not "muff" the opportunity I am giving him at this time.

Hon. BROOKE CLAXTON (Minister of National Health and Welfare): I deeply appreciate the courtesy extended by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) in giving me an opportunity of taking up some of the points which have been discussed this afternoon. I should also thank some hon. members, I think a considerable number, who did want to speak on this subject but who have not had an opportunity. I should have liked to discuss the resolution as thoroughly as I could and put before the house a considerable body of facts and figures which bear on this question and which, I think, we ought to have before reaching a conclusion on it. But time does not permit that to be done on this occasion. There will be other opportunities during the session when we can go more fully into this.

First of all, I should like to congratulate the hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Croll) on his maiden speech and welcome him to the house. He has shown, over a long period of years, an interest in social questions, and I am sure that the speech he made this afternoon will be but one of many in which he will contribute greatly to our knowledge, interest, and enthusiastic support of social security and health measures in Canada.

I wish it had been possible for me to say the few words I am going to say without any political note; but the attitude of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lockhart) and his suggestion that continuously he and the members of his party have been pressing for something to be done in connection with old age pensions which had been constantly and obstinately resisted by other parties in this house, leads me to recall to the house that when the question of old age pensions was first suggested here in 1926 it was resisted by a list of speakers which certainly sounded like the hierarchy of the Conservative party. They included Sir Henry Drayton, the late Mr. R. S. White, Hon. C. H. Cahan, Right Hon. Arthur Meighen, Right Hon. R. B. Bennett and Hon. R. J. Manion. I do not think one will find many speeches since then from that quarter in this field.

Mr. IRVINE: May I correct the minister? I think that if he looks up the debates of 1924 he will find that I then raised the question of old age pensions, and I happened to be on the committee which was appointed by this house in connection with the subject.

Mr. CLAXTON: I read only yesterday the hon. members contributions to the subject. I was referring not to his corner of the house but to hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): In this connection, I have referred to this matter for five sessions, and as recently as last April, and the minister has sat here on several occasions when I have discussed this very matter.

Mr. GRAYDON: He just wants to give us a lecture in ancient history.

Mr. CLAXTON: There may be some exceptions over that long period of time, but I think by and large what I have said is true. I would not have mentioned it had it not been for the attitude of the hon. member for Lincoln.

With regard to the special cases he mentioned, I think it is a fact that every one is a matter of provincial administration of laws and regulations which have been agreed to as between the dominion and the provinces. If he has any special cases I wish he would bring them to our attention and we will follow them up. I thought that on two or three points he was completely inaccurate in his interpretation of the law.

It seems to me that a good many of the speakers to-day have been rushing in a crowd to burst through an open door. The discussion has taken place, if I may say so, in a temper which is wholly satisfactory and entirely constructive, but it has to a considerable degree taken place as though the dominion government had never made its proposals to the dominion-provincial conference. Those proposals must be available to hon. members; they have been distributed; and yet it would seem as though those parts which deal with old age pensions have not received very much attention.

I believe hon. members of every party are in agreement that the Old Age Pensions Act as at present in force is not satisfactory. That

is fundamental. In order to do something about it the federal government took the only course possible, namely, to put before the provinces proposals that the present act should be changed. Those proposals will be found at page 37 and following of the dominion government's proposals to the dominion-provincial conference. There will be found a review of the legislation as it exists, some references to legislation in other countries, and then the dominion government's proposals, first, for a national old age pension at age seventy of $30 a month without a means test; and second, for old age assistance to people between sixty-five and sixty-nine years of $30 a month with a means test, to be provincially administered and to be contributed to on an equal basis by the dominion and provincial governments. These two proposals are elaborated there; and the hon. member for Spadina quoted from the proposals the reasons and objects of the federal government in putting them forward.

These proposals have been put before the provinces. They were put before them at the conference which began on August 6, and formed part of a comprehensive body of proposals to deal with post-war reconstruction and the social security of Canada. They were not put forward in isolation; they were the result of years of study and they were comprehensive. Furthermore, they were part of a plan which we are convinced will work, and which is the only plan so far put before the people of Canada of such a nature or of any nature to cover the whole field of employment, reconversion and social security, as well as finance.

When the proposals were put before the provinces they received what I think anyone who was present would regard as a sympathetic reception. Certainly the provinces gave every assurance that the proposals would receive serious consideration, and we in this house can only take it to be the case that they are receiving serious consideration to-day. With that as the situation confronting us at this moment, it seems to me it would be quite inappropriate for this government to make some totally different proposal with regard to anything of a major nature here. The place where we can do it is before the conference and the time to do it is at the conference.

That is not just a technical objection. It is a very serious objection because of this. The plan suggested by several speakers in the debate on the address, and suggested in the speech to-day by the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis), was for old age pensions to be paid to all citizens on attaining the age of sixty years, at $50 a month without a means test. The estimate which the Dominion Bureau of Statistics has given me would indicate that in the year 1948, $50 a month to every person of sixty years of age and over would cost the federal government $850 million for that year alone. When I tell the house that the total amount raised by personal income tax for the year 1944-1945 is estimated to be 672 million hon. members will see something of the magnitude of the proposal put forward by the hon. member.

In other words, the cost of this proposal would be more than the total personal income tax paid by the Canadian people during the last year. That has a definite bearing on our relations with the provinces. We have with them an agreement under which we have agreed to retire from tax fields by an amount sufficient to enable them to raise certain sums in income taxation. Were we to impose taxes or keep in force taxes of the nature required by my hon. friend's proposals, we could not carry out our undertaking with the provinces.

This proposal is being put forward, too, at a time when I think the great body of the Canadian people would like to see a reduction in income taxation.

Mr. BURTON: Not at the expense of the old folks.

Mr. CLAXTON: That reduction in taxation can be made, and we believe it can be made at the same time as the social security legislation of Canada is put on a footing second to none in the whole civilized world. We believe that can be done and will be done if these proposals are put into effect. But we cannot do that if at the same time we put on our people a burden of taxation which crushes all initiative and which prevents all enterprise from carrying on successfully at a profit. Whether enterprise is carried on publicly or privately, it can make or lose money. It does not make much difference whether it is done publicly or privately from that point of view. But there is the other element. Hon. members and the people of Canada are looking to a great amount of trade after the war as one of the important factors by which we can maintain the very high standard of living we have achieved. We shall not have that trade unless we are in a position to meet prices, and that cannot be done if we have taxation on a scale such as would be required here.

What we have done in our proposals is not to take old age pensions just by themselves and say we will spend $850 million and give old age pensions at the age of sixty years to a lot of people who will not need them anyway. What we have done is to look over the whole economy of Canada and study the

situation of the people of Canada in relation to their needs, and we have tried to put together a balanced programme of social security, having regard not only to old age, not only to the provision of assistance for our children, but also to health, unemployment and preventive medicine.

These proposals, which hon. members will find in the green book, have been worked out so as to present a balance, and we believe that the provision of $200 million for old age pensions, payable without proof of need, to everyone at seventy years of age, at the rate of $30 a month, is well within possibilities. We believe that the provision of health insurance, which may cost $150 million to the federal government, is well within possibilities. And these measures, taken with family allowances, which may cost $200 million net, will present to the Canadian people a body of social legislation which, taken with that already in force in the provinces, or under consideration in the provinces, will put Canada in the forefront of the world to-day in the field of social security legislation.

One word in conclusion. A good deal has been said about the old age provisions in other countries. I say to my hon. friends that if the old age pension put before the provinces in the dominion proposals is carried into effect we shall have within Canada the most generous old age pension system anywhere in the world, and I calculate that by dividing the amount of the cost by the number of possible recipients. I say similarly, if my hon. friends will total up the anticipated costs of the social security legislation put forward in these proposals, and add to them the costs of the social security legislation already in force in the provinces and in the dominion, they will see that Canada will be leading the world in its per capita contribution to the welfare of the Canadian people if the present plans are accepted by the provinces and by this house.

As I say, this represents a comprehensive plan. It would not do at this moment to pick out this and change that, and it would not be keeping faith with the provinces. We have put before them in all seriousness and sincerity these proposals; we are willing to carry them out just as soon as they can be agreed to, and we hope they will be carried out. We believe, too, that the surest way of securing what my hon. friends would want would be that they should assist us in presenting these proposals to the people of Canada and to the provinces, so that they will secure the support which we believe they deserve.

Mr. KNOWLES: Will the minister answer the question as to the earliest possible date on which this plan would come into effect?

[Mr Claxton.]

Mr. CLAXTON: I certainly will. The fact is that there has been a misapprehension, gathered from the table on page 39 of the proposals, where the estimated cost of the federal old age proposals is given, based on the 1948 figures. As I told the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre the other night, the reason why the 1948 figures were selected was that that was thought to be the first year when we could safely estimate that there would be a full conversion from war to peace, and most of the figures in the proposals were related in one way or another to 1948. That is the only reason why 1948 was put there. If the provinces agree to the proposals we will introduce old age pensions just as soon as the legislation can be brought in to do it effectively.

Mr. KNOWLES: But when will that be?

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Thursday, October 4, 1945.

The house met at three o'clock.

BACON

REQUEST FROM BRITISH MINISTRY FOR INCREASED SHIPMENTS

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, before motions are called I should like to make a statement to the house with regard to a development in connection with food requirements which I think should be made known not only to the house but to the country.

Yesterday, October 3, about noon, I had a phone call from Sir Ben Smith, British Minister of Food. The telephone call was to acquaint me with the fact that the food position in Great Britain at the present time is more difficult than at any time since the beginning of the war, and making an appeal to us to help in any way that we possibly can in connection with supplying one particular kind of food, namely bacon.

He stated in that telephone conversation that unless something could be done during the next two months it would be necessary in Great Britain to reduce the ration from three ounces to two ounces per week. It will be recalled by hon. members that the ration throughout the greater part of the war stood at four ounces, and during a considerable part of it the amount was higher than that. But toward the end of the war it became necessary to reduce the ration to three ounces. It is now

suggested that unless within the next two months we can do something to assist, it will be necessary to reduce that ration to two ounces. The cause of this, of course, lies in the fact that Great Britain has been doing everything possible to assist in building up the supplies of food on the continent which are necessary to maintain conditions there.

When that appeal was made I directed the meat board to make a study of our position in Canada, and to communicate further with them in connection with the matter. Through the further communications we have thought it wise to suggest to the British government that an attempt will be made in Canada to increase our shipments of bacon to Great Britain over the next two months.

Our present commitments or allocations require 11,000 tons in October and 11,000 in November. The suggestion is that if we could increase that amount by 3,000 tons in October and 3,000 in November they could continue their three-ounce ration during those two months, and that probably after that they would be able to take care of the situation. We had suggested to them that we would probably find no difficulty in continuing the 11,000 tons for October, and in increasing to 18,000 tons for November. They came back, however, with the suggestion that it would be most difficult for them to carry on throughout November unless we could increase our shipments in October.

So, Mr. Speaker, what I wish to say to the house, and to the people of Canada generally, is that we believe that if we all cooperate we can make these shipments possible. We anticipate no difficulty from the producers, because we are just now entering upon the period of greatest shipments or greatest marketings of farm products, particularly hogs. We believe that while the hog deliveries will be slightly lower than they were a year ago, sufficient hogs will be coming into the market to make these shipments possible. In the next place it will be necessary for us to operate our packing plants to capacity during that period of time; and in the third place it will be necessary to have available the shipping facilities which will take to the point where it is required the fullest amount we can possibly supply to the market. We do not anticipate any difficulty in connection with shipping facilities or with refrigeration. There can be very little difficulty in the matter of getting the facilities necessary in that direction. So we have undertaken to do everything possible to see to it that this bacon is advanced to the British within the next two months in an increased amount of 6,000 tons over and above what we had previously been expecting to ship.

I am sure that in making this known to the house and to the country I do not need to make any further appeal than the appeal that has been made by the Minister of Food in Great Britain. I believe it is not only in the interests of humanity that we should send forward the product, but it is in our own interests as a country which is going to have products to sell that we should be able to meet this, which may be the last, appeal made to us to do something a little in advance of what we thought we would be able to do in order to bring to a most successful conclusion our activities in connection with the supplying of food to the European continent during and after war. I believe that every effort will be made to see to it that this product is sent forward.

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the house has listened with interest to this advice from Great Britain as to their requirements for protein food. I am sure also that the house will approve the decision made by the government to try to increase the amount that will go forward. I do not want to raise any contentious issue at this time, but I would point out that this gets us back to our failure to increase production. We increased supplies last spring at the very time when our production was down 45,000,000 pounds a month. I think that is where our chief failure lies. This section of the house will support the minister in his effort to try to have the Canadian people supply this additional amount to the old country.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): All I should like to say is that this section of the house, as the leader of the opposition has put it, will do everything possible to support the minister in the promises he has made.

Mr. SOLON E. LOW (Peace River): This section too, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GARDINER: I do not want to start a discussion on the matter, but I would like to say that in accepting the kind remarks from the three leaders of the different oppositions I do not wish it understood that I am agreeing with the remarks made by the leader of the official opposition in so far as they refer to production.

Mr. BRACKEN: I did not expect you would.

BRITISH CHILDREN

EXPRESSION OF THANKS ON BEHALF OF GOVERNMENT OF UNITED KINGDOM

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I think the house will be interested in hearing the contents of a very gracious telegram which was received on September 30 from the Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs. It is as follows:

From the Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs

To the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Canada

London, September 29, 1945.

No. 204. Now that almost all the children evacuated to Canada under the children's overseas reception board scheme have reurned to the United Kingdom, I wish, on behalf of His Majesty's government in the United Kingdom, to express our grateful thanks to His Majesty's government in Canada and to all those foster parents, officials, school teachers and private citizens throughout Canada who have cared for these children so generously and sympathetically during the past five years.

It will never be forgotten that in the time of our great need you welcomed our children into your homes, and not only fed and clothed and educated them, but gave them that patient care and thoughtful guidance which only parents or the best of friends can give.

We realize that the responsibility for these guests from overseas must have pressed heavily on the foster parents at times, especially as the strain of war increased and they had to contend with their own anxieties and problems. Their patience, and that of the officials and social agencies, has never failed, and to that has been added kindness and generosity of countless Canadians who have given freely of their skill, their time and their money to make the children's stay both memorable and happy.

For all this inestimable kindness and generosity, I thank you all most sincerely on behalf of the United Kingdom government and of the parents. Some of our boys and girls have elected to make their homes with you, and we are proud to think that a number have served in the Canadian forces. All are bringing back happy memories of their five years in Canada, and links which have been forged as a result of your hospitality between so many homes in our two countries are based upon real affection as well as of gratitude.

Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs.

To that gracious telegram the following reply was sent:

From the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs, Ottawa

To the Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs, London

No. 227 Ottawa, October 2, 1945.

Your telegram No. 204 of September 29. On behalf of the government of Canada I express to you our cordial appreciation of your message of thanks for the reception accorded in Canada to the children evacuated from the United Kingdom under the children's overseas reception board scheme. Your message is being made public here and I am sure that it will be much appreciated by all those in this country who were associated with the care of the children during the last five years. The imminent dangers which led to the evacuation have passed into memory, we hope never to return. The successful execution of the scheme leaves behind it new and close ties between many families in our two countries and warm friendships which will endure. We are glad that some of those who came to Canada under the scheme will remain with us.

Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs.

WHEAT

STATEMENT ON MARKETING—REMOVAL OF 14-BUSHEL LIMITATION FOR PRESENT CROP YEAR

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, about two weeks ago I made a statement to the house on wheat prices. At that time I should have liked to be able to deal further with the marketing of wheat, but finality had not been reached at that time. To-day I should like to give the house a statement on the very important matter of wheat marketing. It is a little longer than I should have liked it to be, but I want to get the facts in connection with this matter on the record.

Since the crop year 1941-42, the government's wheat programme has included a restriction on the total quantity of wheat to be marketed within any one crop year. In view of the present wheat position, the origin and purpose of the restriction on wheat marketings might be carefully explained.

The following circumstances led to the adoption of a policy of restricting the volume of wheat to be marketed within any one crop year and the volume of wheat to be marketed by any single producer during the same period:

1. In the early years of the war, overseas markets for Canadian wheat were limited and consisted mainly of the requirements for the United Kingdom. Even shipments of wheat to the United Kingdom remained at a fairly low level owing to the submarine menace and the shortage of shipping in those days. There was, therefore, no opportunity to market all the surplus wheat which resulted from the large crops harvested in 1939 and 1940.

2. On July 31, 1940, the carry-over of Canadian wheat was 300 million bushels, and the 1940 wheat crop was estimated at 514 million bushels for the prairie provinces, making total supplies of over 800 million bushels for the crop year 1940-41, with a prospective export market of about 230 million bushels. The

1940-41 programme provided for seasonal delivery quotas but no over-all restriction on the marketing of wheat. Consequently, the government took the necessary steps to see that producers had an opportunity of marketing all of the wheat which they desired to market in the crop year 1940-41. During the crop year, producers delivered 456 million bushels of wheat and at the end of the crop year; very little remained on farms. Marketing of the entire 1940 wheat crop was only possible because arrangements were made to provide temporary storage facilities both at the lakehead and at country elevator points.

When the grain policy for the succeeding crop year, 1941-42, was under discussion, it appeared that the carry-over of wheat at July 31, 1941 would be in the neighbourhood of 500 million bushels, practically all in the licensed storage facilities of this country which in pre-war days had a capacity of some 450 million bushels. This meant that country elevators would be congested at the start of the new crop year and the physical ability to take delivery of wheat was severely restricted.

3. Under these circumstances the suggestion was advanced in western Canada from responsible quarters that the government should permit the marketing of that amount of wheat which could be sold at home or abroad during the crop year 1941, and the stockpile as at July 31, 1941, should be carried as a war-time reserve. This suggestion was accepted by the government, and the 1941-42 grain programme included a restriction of marketings to 230 million bushels—an estimate of the volume of wheat which could be disposed of in domestic and export markets during the crop year 1941-42.

4. Having arrived at an absolutely safe position in respect to quantities of wheat required in the prosecution of the war, it was becoming increasingly evident that war-time demand was gravitating to live stock and live stock products. This demand came not only from the United Kingdom and from our growing armed forces, but from the domestic market which had been expanding steadily. The government, therefore, decided that positive steps should be taken to increase the production of live stock and live stock products, necessitating an increase in feed grain production. To that end the Wheat Acreage Reduction Act of 1941 provided financial benefits for the diversion of wheat acreage to other grains and summer-fallow, which proved to be effective.

The same basic wheat situation and livestock situation continued in Canada in the succeeding years, and the limitation on wheat marketings has remained an important feature of the dominion government's wheat policy in each crop year since 1941-42.

The necessity of this provision is indicated by the following table, which shows the carry-over of Canadian wheat, annual production in the prairie provinces, and total available supplies for the four crop years from 1941-42 to 1944-45:

	July 31, Stocks	New crop	Total supplies
		(Million bushels)	
1941-42.....	480	296	776
1942-43.....	424	528	952
1943-44.....	595	268	863
1944-45.....	356	411	767

During this period, carryover figures ranged from 355 million bushels in 1944-45 to 595 million bushels on July 31, 1943. Total supplies of wheat in Canada ranged from 952 million bushels in 1942-43 to 776 million bushels in 1941-42. These figures indicate the extent to which war-time reserves of wheat were continuously carried in Canada and the enormous quantities available in relation to immediate needs. It is obvious that without over-all restriction of marketings a situation might have arisen, and in fact did arise in 1942-43, where it was impossible to take delivery of all wheat offered by producers. The limitation on marketings provided the basis upon which all producers would share alike in any quantity of wheat which could be marketed within any one crop year. Otherwise, marketing opportunity would have been available in the first instance to producers at delivery points where grain storage happened to be more adequate.

Throughout the years under review, and even down to the present crop year, the government has never advocated expansion in wheat acreage, but on the contrary has advocated the maintenance and expansion where possible of the production of live stock and live stock products. This does not mean that the government did not recognize the necessity of maintaining a large volume of wheat for importing countries when the war in Europe ended. The figures which I have quoted indicate the extent to which this objective was kept in mind throughout the years. On D-day about 300 million bushels of wheat were available in Canada with the 1944 harvest sixty days away. On V-E day about 320 million bushels of wheat were on hand, with substantial quantities still to be delivered by producers prior to July 31, 1945, and the 1945 crop not far away. We had these supplies after providing the United States with over 160 million bushels of wheat in 1943-44 to supplement their feed grain supplies.

Early in 1943 the market situation improved largely because of the large imports required by the United States. But at this point a new factor entered the grain picture. This was the difficulty of securing sufficient transportation to move the quantities of wheat and feed grains required in the domestic market and in the export market. Since that time, transportation has been the controlling factor in the volume of wheat and other grains which could be made available for export. In 1943-44, in the fifth year of the war, the railways were called upon practically to double the volume of transportation available for the movement of grain, and even with these increased transportation facilities it was very difficult to keep up with available demand at all times. Since the crop year 1943-44 we have always had to bear in mind that the transportation factor had to be considered as well as the current and prospective demand. Not only were there large quantities of wheat to move, but by this time we were producing large surpluses of feed grains which had to be distributed in deficit areas in Canada and in the United States, and transportation became a vital consideration in the government's grain policy.

When policy was under discussion for the crop year 1945-46 we felt that the transportation situation was such that we would have a carryover of wheat on July 31, 1945, of about 325 million bushels, the equivalent of about a full year's export under the then existing conditions. We thought that a small crop of, say, 300 million bushels would give us total wheat supplies of over 600 million bushels in addition to 150 to 200 million bushels of marketed feed grains, or total supplies which would press upon the capacity of our railroads and port facilities having regard to other forms of war-time traffic which they were carrying. We also realized that if the 1945 crop were a large crop we would have to face extremely difficult conditions in respect to the movement of marketed grain. This fact, accompanied by the intensification of the demand for feed grains and live stock and live stock products, provided ample grounds for retaining the over-all marketing restriction in 1945-46. We also had another important consideration in mind. We knew we had on hand a very large volume of wheat which could be used to meet overseas requirements in case the war ended; all the wheat which Canada, as one of the wheat exporting countries of the world, could be excepted to carry to meet early post-war requirements.

In one respect our calculation of our wheat position early in 1945 was not borne out by subsequent events. V-E day resulted in the raising of exports in the crop year 1944-45 by about 65 million bushels, and the reduction in our July 31 stocks from an anticipated 325 million to 258 million bushels, with, of course, some of the post-war European demand already met. The 1945 prairie wheat crop has turned out to be a crop of moderate size—some 300 million bushels. Whereas we expected wheat supplies of perhaps 650 million bushels for the crop year 1945-46, our total supplies will aggregate about 550 million bushels, with an additional 170 million bushels of feed grains to be marketed and transported during the present crop year. The supply of some 150 million bushels less wheat than we expected early in 1945 will, none the less, tax the capacity of our railroads during the first half of the present crop year, and particularly our ability to move grain through available Canadian and United States ports.

During the present crop year we expect to export about 325 million bushels of wheat, leaving between 75 to 100 million bushels of wheat on hand July 31, 1946. Since V-E day over one-half of the wheat going into Europe has been Canadian wheat, and that percentage will be fully maintained during the present crop year.

The average yield per acre in western Canada this year is not large. Most of the surplus from the 1945 crop will be marketed within the 14-bushel limitation. There are some areas, however, and many producers who will have wheat in excess of the 14-bushel delivery limitation. If the restriction on the limitation on marketings is lifted for the balance of the present crop year, it will probably mean an additional 15 million bushels of wheat available for importing countries during the present crop year. In view of the efforts which this country is making to provide food for Europe, the government feels that if a little more wheat can be provided by lifting marketing restrictions for the present crop year, this action should be taken. It has therefore been decided to remove the 14-bushel limitation for the present crop year.

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): I wish to make just an observation with respect to the statement of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. His review of the marketings of wheat during the war years has been very interesting, but the point he was leading up to, I gather, is that the restrictions formerly imposed with respect to marketing have been removed.

Mr. MacKINNON: For this crop year.

Mr. BRACKEN: For this crop year. In view of the need of food overseas and in view of the situation now existing in Canada, I think the government's decision in this respect is to be commended.

RAILWAY TRANSPORTATION

STATEMENT WITH RESPECT TO CONTINUANCE OF REDUCED FARE RESTRICTIONS

Hon. LIONEL CHEVRIER (Minister of Transport): I have received representations from various groups, associations and individuals in connection with the cancellation of reduced rates on railways over the week-end for dominion and provincial holidays, and also for parties of ten or more. I have considered these representations and I should like to make a statement to the house.

For some years it has been found necessary in order to assure the maximum use of railway facilities for the prosecution of the war to suspend or cancel certain reduced fares for holiday and excursion travel which in normal times have been afforded by the Canadian railways to the travelling public.

There are now in force the following orders:

Order in council P.C. 2557 of March 30, 1943, extended to November 15, 1945, which prohibits the sale of reduced fares for dominion or provincial holidays, weekends and parties of ten or more;

Orders of the Transport Controller:

T.C. 01P of June 24, 1942, cancelling special tariffs of reduced rates or fares covering agricultural exhibitions, celebrations, coach excursions, horse races, organized excursion parties and other special fares;

T.C. 02P of July 30, 1942, cancelling bargain fares, eastern to western Canada, prairies to pacific coast, and certain conventions;

T.C. 07P of June 25, 1943, suspending home visitors' fares and summer tourist fares.

The Canadian railways report that the movement of the armed forces is now taxing their facilities to capacity, and that in September the capacity of their equipment was exceeded. I expect that the return of service personnel from Europe to Canada will continue over the next few months in sufficient numbers to require the maximum use of all available railway trains, accommodation and operating crews. The repatriation and demobilization of the armed services place a great strain on the operation of the Canadian railways which during the war years have shouldered the increased burden of transportation demands with vigor and efficiency. Great credit is due the railways for their important contribution to the war effort and final victory.

In addition to this expected movement, a large number of British prisoners of war and internees from the Pacific will travel across Canada, and this will take a lot of railway equipment, but it can be done advantageously by the use of sleeping car equipment returning from the Pacific coast.

During the period of demobilization it behooves the travelling public to refrain as much as possible from unnecessary railway travel on pleasure or for visits to their relaties until after the service movement is finished which will be about the end of next April. During the month of December, I expect that the railways will again be called upon to handle inbound troop movements through the port of Halifax, necessitating longer hauls for equipment. December is ordinarily an unusually heavy month for the railways on account of Christmas holiday travel, and the additional movement of service personnel may tax the railways beyond the capacity of their equipment.

It is with regret that I have to announce that there will be no removal of the restrictions now in effect on reduced fares for railway travel until after January 1, 1946, when the whole question will again be reviewed. I hope to be able to announce the lifting of the restrictions on reduced fares by the middle of January, but of course this will depend upon the traffic conditions prevailing at that time.

CIVIL SERVICE

REVERSION ON NOVEMBER 1 TO PRE-WAR HOURS OF WORK

Hon. PAUL MARTIN (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, on the second of July last one-half of the extra hour which the members of the civil service had been working during the war was restored to them. It has now been decided that, effective on November 1, the civil service will return to its pre-war hours of work.

The net result of the change will be that the extra hour which the civil service worked during the war will now be returned to them.

In view of transportation difficulties it will be necessary to retain staggered hours of arrival and departure where these are at present in effect, for the time being at any rate.

The government, and I am sure the house generally, wishes to express its wholehearted appreciation to the members of the public service for their work during the war. Many have come to Ottawa from all parts of Canada

for several years of strenuous service in the war effort. Many have been loaned by industry; many have left their household duties, or their well-earned leisure hours of retirement, to take their place in civil service ranks.

The permanent civil service has accomplished a splendid piece of work during the war. To all these the government and the house expresses its sincere appreciation and gratitude.

OLD AGE PENSIONS

AGE AND INCOME REQUIREMENTS—STATEMENT OF MEMBER FOR BROADVIEW

On the order for motions:

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw attention to a statement reported in the Toronto *Globe and Mail* of this morning with regard to the debate on old age pensions. The minister said that the figure of $50 a month advocated by the hon. member for Vancouver East would involve in 1948 an expenditure of $850 million. I am quoted as supporting the resolution. I did not. I gave my views as they appear in *Hansard*. I have been a supporter of the principle of old age pensions since first I came to this house. As regards the age, I said that I would not know whether the minimum should be sixty or sixty-five, and in my opinion a survey should be made. Yesterday I opposed very strongly the application of a means test for the low-paid citizens, and also contended that the list of persons eligible in this class should be extended. I repeat that I have been a supporter of old age pensions since 1921, and I commend to the attention of the government what I have said on this matter.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

STRIKE AT FORD MOTOR PLANT, WINDSOR—MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT UNDER STANDING ORDER 31

Mr. CLARENCE GILLIS (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time for the purpose of asking leave to move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), the adjournment of the house, under standing order 31, for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the strike at the Ford plant at Windsor, Ontario, affecting some ten thousand employees, and the danger of this strike, if not settled immediately, spreading to other automobile plants and affecting a total of some thirty thousand employees and ultimately involving workers in other industrial plants throughout the country. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that if you doubt the urgency of the matter you will use your discretionary power to allow the house to decide.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to hear first from the hon. member on what grounds he claims that there is urgency.

Mr. GILLIS: Mr. Speaker, on the matter of urgency, this industrial dispute in Windsor is the first of our post-war difficulties in the field of labour relations. The attitude of the government in this regard may determine future labour relations in the very difficult period in the transition from war to peace. The urgency, sir, is on the following grounds. First, the strike has the city of Windsor tied up with ten thousand employees of the Ford Motor company involved. There are some thirty thousand workers in similar plants, under the same union, who have taken a strike vote and are standing by. They decided by a ninety per cent vote at least that if and when it was demonstrated to them that action on their part was necessary they would join the Ford strike, with immediate strike action. I am afraid that if some action is not taken by the government immediately we may find ourselves, perhaps this time next week, with all the automotive industry tied up, and, in addition to that, other plants across this country which are unionized, perhaps utilizing their affiliation, through the congress of labour and other bodies, to take similar action in support of the Ford workers. I have this afternoon some definite proposals to make which would perhaps expedite the settlement of the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not see any urgency just now. There is no riot, there is no trouble of any kind—

Mr. COLDWELL: Are we going to wait for riots?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: —and I believe that the hon. member had and still has the opportunity of putting this particular question to the minister concerned, with respect to the strike, or of putting the question on the order paper. Therefore, not finding any urgency in the motion of the hon. member, I have to rule it out.

Mr. GILLIS: I have no intention, Mr. Speaker, of disagreeing with your ruling. That is your prerogative and I know of no way in which it can be challenged. At the same time, the action you suggest—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. GILLIS: The matter of putting the question on the order paper—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

An hon. MEMBER: It is not debatable.

Mr. GILLIS: The matter of putting a question on the order paper or putting a question to the minister would offer no solution.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. With all respect to my hon. friend, this is not debatable.

Mr. GRAYDON: The hon. member might be given this leniency.

Mr. COLDWELL: It is a government ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member knows that rulings of the Speaker are not debatable. I think I have been generous to him in suggesting some means by which he may have an answer to the problem in which he is interested.

Mr. COLDWELL: I very regretfully feel that I must challenge your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MACKENZIE: On a point of order, may I direct my hon. friend's attention to previous rulings of Speakers in this house, notably that given by my hon. friend the member for Yukon (Mr. Black) when he was Speaker. He gave this ruling on February 19, 1932. I will quote the appropriate sections:

Mr. Ralston appealed from the Speaker's refusal to permit an appeal from his decision—

—on a similar motion to adjourn the house on a matter of urgent public importance. You will find this at page 748 of the third edition of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms.

And the question being put by Mr. Speaker: Shall the ruling of the chair be sustained; it was decided in the affirmative.

Debates, House of Commons, 1932, Vol. I, pages 360-1-2-3-4-5.

When the Speaker's decision is sustained by the house it is a binding rule in the house until it is altered.

Mr. COLDWELL: Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit to you that this house is at all times in control of its own procedure, and that a Speaker's ruling, made under one set of circumstances, must not be considered as indefinitely binding the house for ever; otherwise we shall never be able to do business as private members in this house. I respectfully suggest that we have a right to challenge this ruling, and I am appealing to the house for support of the contention that we are making.

Mr. GLEN: May I be permitted to say, Mr. Speaker, that this matter has been already decided, by the last parliament, on two occasions if my memory serves me correctly.

Mr. COLDWELL: This is a new parliament.

Mr. GLEN: Nevertheless a new parliament is bound by the same rules as the last parliament.

Mr. COLDWELL: Not the same rulings.

Mr. GLEN: Standing order 31, under which this motion was made, states that the member desiring to make such a motion—

—then hands a written statement of the matter proposed to be discussed to the Speaker,—

Mr. COLDWELL: That was done.

Mr. GLEN: —

—who, if he thinks it in order and of urgent public importance, reads it out and asks whether the member has the leave of the house.

I remember one occasion on which the Speaker's ruling was challenged when I was in the chair, and I then pointed out, as has been pointed out by the acting leader of the house, that an appeal had been made by Mr. Ralston against the Speaker's decision. The decision was confirmed on two subsequent occasions, and the house then confirmed it with the standing orders as we now have them. The Speaker has exclusive right to determine whether the motion is in order or not. The point was confirmed in one case by a recorded vote, and I submit to the house that in this case, the standing order being as it is, the Speaker has no option but to rule according to his own judgment, and the house must therefore accept it without appeal.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I on a question of privilege, following the remarks of my hon. friend the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Glen), make this observation. I think he might also have properly added that the Speaker has an alternative which he did not mention, and that is to submit to the House of Commons the point as to urgency. I know that this is perhaps a little irregular, a little out of order, but it does seem to me that the question of urgency has been sufficiently established and it might at least have been referred to the house. I make that suggestion to Your Honour with great diffidence.

Mr. GLEN: If I may be permitted, I would point out to the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon) that on March 27, 1935, a motion was made for the adjournment of the house when Mr. Bowman was Speaker. The motion dealt with the request of mayors and representatives of certain cities and towns in the Dominion of Canada to be heard at the bar of the house, "in order to lay before parliament the critical conditions prevailing"—exactly in accord with the motion that has

been made to-day, critical conditions prevailing in a certain locality. In that case the Speaker ruled the motion out of order as not being a matter of urgency.

Mr. GRAYDON: How are we to know whether the cases are parallel or not?

Mr. MacINNIS: Mr. Speaker, there are three ways in which a question of this kind can be dealt with. I agree that Your Honour has the prerogative of deciding whether the matter is one of urgent public importance, but if Your Honour is under any doubt as to the urgency of the matter, then you may ask members to rise. If you will notice, No. 4 of standing order 31 reads:

> If less than twenty, but not less than five, members rise in their places, the question whether the member has leave to move the adjournment of the house shall be put forthwith, without debate, and determined, if necessary, by a division.

But if, when Your Honour asks the members to rise, twenty or more rise in their places, then Your Honour must call upon the hon. member making the motion to proceed with his discussion.

Mr. GLEN: The hon. member is not reading correctly the meaning of the standing order. In order to have the matter properly before the house may I read section 3 of standing order 31, which is as follows:

> He then hands a written statement of the matter proposed to be discussed to Mr. Speaker, who, if he thinks it in order, and of urgent public importance, reads it out and asks whether the member has the leave of the house.

In that case Mr. Speaker is of opinion that it is urgent, and he asks the house if the hon. member has leave to introduce it. The standing order continues:

> If objection is taken, Mr. Speaker requests those members who support the motion to rise in their places.

This request is made only if objection is taken, and then, as the hon. member says, and as the standing order provides:

> If less than twenty, but not less than five, members rise in their places, the question whether the member . . .

Mr. MacINNIS: Would the minister read the last part of subsection 3, which he did not read?

Mr. GLEN: The last part of subsection 3?

Mr. MACKENZIE: It does not apply.

Mr. GLEN: I have already read it, but I shall read it again.

Subsection 3 reads:

> He then hands a written statement of the matter proposed to be discussed to Mr. Speaker, who, if he thinks it in order, and of urgent public importance, reads it out and asks whether the member has the leave of the house. If objection is taken . . .

By a member of the house.

> . . . Mr. Speaker requests those members who support the motion to rise in their places and, if more than twenty members rise accordingly, Mr. Speaker calls upon the member who has asked for leave.

The hon. member has omitted to notice that if the Speaker has decided that it is urgent, he puts it to the house. If objection is taken by any member of the house, it then becomes the duty of the Speaker to call a vote of those for or against.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is what should have been done in this case.

Mr. POULIOT: May I be permitted—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. POULIOT: I have a right to speak on a point of order. The rules are not drafted in a way to be understood clearly if we take only one standing order. There are some standing orders which complete others, and to understand standing order 31 we must revert to standing order 12. There is nothing in the book which says that at this stage there can be no appeal from the ruling of the Speaker. There is a rule in the book which says that some motions are not debatable, but, sir, let us now take them together in order to be fair to all. My intention is not to speak *ex cathedra,* but just to appeal to the fairness of the Chair.

This is an unusual case, because a motion to adjourn the house to discuss a matter of urgency changes the agenda or the programme of the whole of the sitting in which it is made. The order of the day must be set aside until the debate on that matter of urgent importance is finished.

Paragraph 1 of standing order 31 reads as follows:

> Leave to make a motion for the adjournment of the house (when made for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance) must be asked after the ordinary daily routine of business (standing order No. 15) has been concluded and before notices of motions or orders of the day are entered upon.

The motion was made at the right time, therefore there is no argument about this. The second paragraph reads:

> The member desiring to make such a motion rises in his place, asks leave to move the adjournment of the house for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, and states the matter.

That was done; the only discussion that there might be is about the matter of urgency. Is it urgent or not? All the formalities have been complied with; the only question for the Chair to decide is whether it is an urgent

matter of public importance—two things, "urgency" and "importance". Paragraph 3 reads:

He then hands a written statement of the matter proposed to be discussed to Mr. Speaker, . . .

I do not know whether that was done, but I presume it was.

Mr. KNOWLES: It was done at two o'clock.

Mr. POULIOT: I continue with the paragraph:

. . . who, if he thinks it in order, and of urgent public importance, reads it out and asks whether the member has the leave of the house.

That was—

An hon. MEMBER: That was not done.

Mr. POULIOT: Here we come to the crucial point of the matter:

If objection is taken . . .

There was no objection taken; the only objection came from the Chair. Usually it is submitted as a matter of course. I continue:

If objection is taken, Mr. Speaker requests those members who support the motion to rise in their places and, if more than twenty members rise accordingly, Mr. Speaker calls upon the member who has asked for leave.

That was not done, and it is precisely because that was not done that some hon. members appealed from the ruling.

Mr. REID: I wonder if I could ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. POULIOT: Excuse me, please. I have the floor. It is not to be unpleasant, but I am making my argument.

Now let us go back to standing order 12, a most important rule, which has to do with the privileges and rights of hon. members, and which assures the privileges and rights of members of parliament. The first sentence of paragraph 1 of standing order 12 reads as follows:

Mr. Speaker shall preserve order and decorum, and shall decide questions of order, subject to an appeal to the house without debate.

The point is that there is no debate on the ruling of Mr. Speaker, but the house has the right to appeal from it; and if the majority vote for the continuation of the debate on the motion, it is carried on; if not, it stops there. That is the point. I submit, sir, that the rules cannot be taken separately; they must be taken jointly. There is an appeal from your ruling, and I am sure that in all fairness you will act accordingly.

Mr. GLEN: May I be allowed to ask the house to consider standing order 12, which the hon. member has quoted?

Mr. POULIOT: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member has spoken three times on the point of order. He has the right to speak only once.

Mr. MACKENZIE: You had no right to speak at all.

Mr. GLEN: In a debate—

Mr. IRVINE: What is your ruling, Mr. Speaker, on the point of order with regard to the discussion which has taken place?

Mr. GLEN: There is nothing before the Chair.

Mr. COLDWELL: There is an appeal from the ruling.

Mr. GLEN: A ruling has been made.

Mr. COLDWELL: How many times may an hon. member speak? I rise to a point of order. How many times may an hon. member rise to discuss this question?

Mr. CHEVRIER: How often have you broken that rule?

Mr. GLEN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member takes exception to my speaking now. I submit there is nothing before the Chair. There is a discussion going on in the house with regard to the matter of procedure. The hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) has quoted standing order 12, which reads—

Mr. COLDWELL: Mr. Speaker, may we have your ruling? How many times may an hon. member rise to discuss this matter? We should like to have that ruling, so that we may know in future how to guide ourselves.

Mr. SPEAKER: A point of order was raised by the hon. member, and I understand that another hon. member has a right to answer it.

Mr. GLEN: The hon. member for Temiscouata has referred to standing order 12, which states:

Mr. Speaker shall preserve order and decorum and shall decide questions of order, subject to an appeal to the house without debate.

Then he applies the contents of standing order 12 to standing order 31. But urgency is not a point of order. Urgency is a matter of substantive consideration; it is not a point of order. An appeal may be taken on a point of order, but standing order 31 does not give that right of appeal, because the essence of that standing order is urgency. It is not a point of order; it is a matter for the consideration and decision of Mr. Speaker alone.

Mr. KNOWLES: On the point of order, and I believe there is one before the Chair,

may I say that I was seeking to get your eye, Mr. Speaker, at the time you saw the hon. member for Temiscouata, so as to make in my way the argument he presented for your consideration. I should like to add to it now, by way of answer to the objection just made by the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Glen), an objection which I suggest was not well taken.

The hon. member for Temiscouata called attention to the words in standing order 12 which state that Mr. Speaker shall decide questions of order, subject to an appeal to the house without debate. The Minister of Mines and Resources asserts that that does not apply to standing order 31, because in his opinion the decision Your Honour made on the hon. member's request was not on a point of order. But he himself—the minister—quoted paragraph 3 of standing order 31 a number of times, which has in it these words: "who"—referring to Mr. Speaker—"if he thinks it in order"—and so on. I submit that it was your opinion that the request of the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis), seconded by myself, was not in order. That is the crux of the matter now under discussion, namely that the request was out of order.

I know that the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie), who is leading the house, has already quoted decisions made by Speakers in previous parliaments, and has pointed out the fact that those decisions were upheld by votes of the house. But I find nowhere in the book of rules any order to the effect that Speakers' decisions, even if upheld by votes of the house, become rules of the house. It seems to me that the only thing that is binding, or that carries from one parliament to another, is the set of standing orders themselves.

On many occasions I have endeavoured to quote citations contained in Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, and have been told that those really do not hold. It has been pointed out to me that only the precise standing orders count. If the citations contained in this book do not count, or do not hold, then surely the decisions of previous parliaments are not binding upon this parliament. I submit it is our right to decide that standing order 12, which gives the house the right of appeal from a Speaker's ruling on a point of order, definitely includes standing order 31, because it says:

> . . . Mr. Speaker, who, if he thinks it in order and of urgent public importance, reads it out and asks whether the member has the leave of the house.

Your Honour has ruled against the motion on the ground that in your opinion it is not a matter of urgent importance, and, taking the words of the standing order, you have ruled that in your opinion it is out of order. I submit the hon. member for Temiscouata is perfectly correct in his contention that the house has a right to appeal from your ruling, and that the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) is in order in so doing.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. When this motion was put before the house, as Speaker I had to decide whether or not there was any urgency. Having heard the hon. member, and having heard the motion, I was not quite sure. There was a doubt in my mind, and I gave him an opportunity to show or to prove to me that there was an urgency. My interpretation was that there was no urgency, and as such the motion was out of order.

Mr. KNOWLES: That is the point.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now, standing order 12, which was mentioned by two or three hon. members in discussing my ruling, says:

> Mr. Speaker shall preserve order and decorum and shall decide questions of order, subject to an appeal to the house without debate.

All I say is that in my ruling I did not decide a question of order. My interpretation was as to whether or not there was any urgency. As the question, therefore, is not raised on a question of order I understand there is no appeal.

Mr. COLDWELL: No debate.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): I am in accord with the ruling Your Honour has made in respect of the application by the hon. member for Cape Breton South to move the adjournment of the house. In your opinion, which is final, it is not a matter of urgency. The Minister of Mines and Resources has clearly explained the application of the rule which applies. As I see it. the hon. member for Cape Breton South has given Your Honour and the house sufficient reason why it is not a matter of urgency. He said that if he had an opportunity to talk he could suggest some solution for the difficulty at Windsor. The place for him to go with his information is to the Minister of Labour, not to this house. The Minister of Labour is the proper person to whom to refer it.

Mr. COLDWELL: No, it is here; what is the House of Commons for?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think hon. members will agree that I have been most generous to all parts of the house, even to the extent

of asking the hon. member to prove to me that there was any urgency. I believe I was generous in giving him that opportunity. I have given my ruling, and we should proceed now with the business of the house.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Next order.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

SELECTIVE SERVICE

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

1. How many persons are, or were, employed by the or in connection with the work of selective service, (a) as of September 27, 1945; (b) as of January 1, 1945?

2. What was the total amount paid them by salary and expenses as of each of the said dates?

Mr. MITCHELL:

1. The number of persons who are, or were, employed by the or in connection with the work of selective service, (a) as of September 27, 1945, 8,315, plus 929 casuals; (b) as of January 1, 1945, 8,092, plus 412 casuals.

The figures above embrace the staff engaged on unemployment insurance and selective service work. The work connected with the administration of national selective service and of unemployment insurance is so closely related that it is impossible to determine how much of the change is due to national selective service and how much to the normal activities of the Unemployment Insurance Commission.

2. The total paid them by salary and expenses,

(a) for the month of August, 1945:	
Salaries	$1,064,794 52
Expenses	46,460 87
	$1,111,255 39
(b) for the month of January, 1945:	
Salaries	$ 992,901 79
Expenses	42,287 32
	$1,035,189 11

The figures above include those covering the staff engaged in unemployment insurance and selective service work. It will be noted that a change has been made in the terms of this question and the answers above reply to question No. 2 as if it had read:

2. What was the total amount paid to such officials or employees for salary and expenses, (a) for the month of August, 1945; (b) for the month of January, 1945.

WARTIME PRICES AND TRADE BOARD—PROSECUTIONS

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

1. How many prosecutions by provinces have been instituted by or under the instructions of the wartime prices and trade board?

2. How many convictions have been secured?

3. How many enforcement and/or investigating officers, by provinces, are employed by or are on loan to the said board in connection with the investigation or enforcement of its regulations?

Mr. MAYHEW:

1.	Nova Scotia	495	
	New Brunswick	314	
	Prince Edward Island	62	
	Quebec	5,061	(1)
	Ontario	3,105	(2)
	Manitoba	787	(3)
	Saskatchewan	735	
	Alberta	624	
	British Columbia	894	
		12,077	

(1) Excluding Hull district.

(2) Including Hull district—excluding Fort William and Kenora districts.

(3) Including Fort William and Kenora districts.

2.	11,411.	
3.		Total
	Prince Edward Island	6
	Nova Scotia	40
	New Brunswick	35
	Quebec	316
	Ontario	376
	Maintoba	53
	Saskatchewan	91
	Alberta	47
	British Columbia	73
		1,037

NATIONAL DEFENCE—DISTRICT AND COMMAND HEADQUARTERS—AUDIT

Mr. BLAIR:

1. Did audits at district and command headquarters of the Department of National Defence disclose inadequacy in the control of recording cash receipts, cheques and money orders?

2. If so, what was the nature of this inadequacy?

3. What remedial action has been taken?

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. Yes.

2. The audits revealed that, in some instances, records had not been maintained, and, in other instances, certain personnel had not been bonded, in accordance with prior instructions issued by the department. No defalcations were found.

3. Remedial action was taken by informing the District Officers Commanding of the observations. They, in turn, instructed all heads of branches and divisions to conform to the departmental instructions in future.

STEVENSON AIRFIELD, WINNIPEG

Mr. KNOWLES:

1. Have any plans been made for extending the runways and enlarging Stevenson field, at Winnipeg?

2. Has any date been set for the implementing of said plans?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. Tentative layout plans have been made for enlarging Stevenson field at Winnipeg and constructing longer runways.

2. No.

SHIPMENT OF FEED GRAIN FROM WEST TO EAST

Mr. McCUAIG:

How much money has been spent by the federal government in connection with shipping feed grain from the western to the eastern provinces, from 1940 to date?

Mr. GARDINER: $64,116,824.34.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

Mr. LOW:

1. What are the names and civil occupations of each of the members of the board of governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation?

2. What is the name and occupation of the executive officer of this organization?

3. What are, (a) the names; (b) occupations or duties; (c) location of employment, of all other persons in Canada employed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation whose salary is over $100 per week?

4. What are the, (a) names; (b) terms of employment; (c) rules governing the preparation and presentation of the script of all regular news commentators retained by the corporation in Canada?

Mr. McCANN:

1. Name—Civil occupation

Howard B. Chase (chairman), executive, brotherhood of locomotive engineers.

Rene Morin, general manager, general trust of Canada.

Dean Adrien Pouliot, dean of science, Laval university.

Mrs. T. W. Sutherland, newspaper owner.

F. J. Crawford, stockbroker.

W. J. Parker, president, Manitoba pool elevators.

B. K. Sandwell, editor— *Saturday Night.*

A. W. Trueman, president, university of Manitoba.

2. Augustin Frigon, general manager.

The general manager of the corporation is chief executive officer and, subject to the direction of the board of governors, he is responsible for the carrying out of the provisions of the Canadian Broadcasting Act, 1936, and of the regulations and by-laws made thereunder. Subject to the approval of the board of governors, he manages the activities and finances of the corporation.

3. Name—Occupations or duties—Location of employment.

J. M. Beaudet, director of French network, Montreal.

E. L. Bushnell, director general of programmes, Toronto.

I. Dilworth, Pacific regional representative, Vancouver.

C. W. Jennings, general supervisor of programmes, Toronto.

R. P. Landry, director of personnel and administrative services, Ottawa.

D. Manson, assistant general manager, Ottawa.

G. W. Olive, chief engineer, Montreal.

J. A. Ouimet, assistant chief engineer, Montreal.

W. E. Powell, assistant commercial manager, Toronto.

J. R. Radford, supervisor of station relations, Toronto.

E. A. Weir, commercial manager, Toronto.

4. Commentators are engaged on a per occasion basis and are not regular employees of the staff of the corporation.

*WHEAT FLOOR PRICES—BASIS CHURCHILL

Mr. BOWERMAN:

1. Has the government received a request from the Prince Albert, Saskatchewan, board of trade, that the $1 floor price on wheat be payable, basis Churchill as well as Fort William, Vancouver and Prince Rupert?

2. If so, has the government reached a decision?

3. What is that decision?

Mr. MacKINNON: I have received a request such as is referred to here from the Prince Albert board of trade. After consulting with the wheat board on the matter I intend to discuss it with my colleagues in the government. It is a technical matter about which I cannot give an offhand opinion, but I would hope to have an answer shortly for the hon. member. I would point out that Prince Rupert is not a price-basing point. I wonder if the hon. member would allow the question to drop on my undertaking to give him a reply just as soon as I get it?

Mr. COLDWELL: Was there not a request from Prince Rupert?

Mr. MacKINNON: No. I asked the hon. member what I did because I have no unanswered questions on the order paper.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

BEAUTIFICATION OF OTTAWA—JACQUES GREBER

Mr. BOUCHER:

1. For what period of time was Jacques Greber employed to advise in the beautification of the capital?
2. What amount was paid to him by way of, (a) salary, fee or honorarium; (b) living allowance; (c) travelling expenses?
3. Was he responsible for the location of the national war memorial and the planning of the plaza area?
4. What is the nature of the contract between Mr. Greber and the government for future work, including details of the length of time for which he has been employed and the rate of remuneration to be paid to him?

Mr. MAYHEW: Return tabled.

CANADIAN ARMY—HEADQUARTERS—GERMAN EQUIPMENT "ECLIPSE"

Mr. COLDWELL:

1. What were the numbers of officers and other ranks at national defence headquarters as of January 1, 1945, and what are the numbers at the present time?
2. What were the numbers of officers and other ranks at Canadian military defence headquarters as of January 1, 1945, and what are the numbers at the present time?
3. What were the numbers of officers and other ranks at 1st Canadian army headquarters as of January 1, 1945, and what are the numbers at the present time?
4. Are 1st and 2nd Canadian corps headquarters completely disbanded? If not, why has this not been done?
5. Was there an operation designed to supervise the handling and disposition of all German equipment known as Eclipse?
6. If so, what were the numbers of officers and other ranks engaged on this operation on June 1, 1945, and what are the numbers at the present time?

LECTURES TO CANADIAN ARMY PERSONNEL OVERSEAS

Mr. COLDWELL:

1. Was a series of lectures scheduled to be given to Canadian army personnel overseas by Canadian civilians within the past several months of this year?
2. If so, was this series cancelled, and what was the reason for this action?

ARMED FORCES PERSONNEL—LEGAL COUNSEL

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Does the government, or the Canadian bar association or local bar associations throughout Canada provide counsel in the law courts for soldiers in trouble?
2. Have any complaints been received regarding cases in which soldiers are involved, being conducted without the soldier having counsel?
3. What has been done since the last session when this matter was discussed in the house, and what action, if any, has been taken?

UNITED NATIONS

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture) moved that the house go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to bring in a measure for carrying into effect the agreement for a food and agriculture organization of the united nations to be signed and come into force when twenty nations have notified their acceptance of the constitution set out in the said agreement; and to provide that all expenditures in carrying out the agreement shall be defrayed out of moneys provided by parliament.

He said: His Honour the Deputy of the Governor General, having been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the consideration of the house.

I would like to place myself in the hands of the house with regard to this resolution. In order to explain why, may I say that at the meeting held at Hot Springs, I think in 1943, a decision was made to set up a conference on food and matters pertaining to food. The first meeting of that conference is to be held in Quebec beginning on October 16. It is urgent that between now and October 16 we should become parties to that arrangement by the passing of a measure based on this resolution.

This legislation is made necessary as a result of the fact that more than twenty nations have agreed to become part of that conference—twenty was the figure set at Hot Springs. Twenty-eight countries have asked for the privilege of operating under this arrangement. We hope to bring down the legislation next week. The only reason it was not brought down earlier is that we have been dealing with other matters that had been arranged for at the beginning of the session. I would like to ask the permission of the house to allow this resolution to go into committee and to pass its second reading to that stage to-day, and then whatever discussion we wish to have on the matter could take place on the second reading of the bill, which I would hope to have brought down next Tuesday. It is necessary to pass this resolution, because there is money involved.

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): We were led to believe by the leader of the house that the discussion on this matter would take place next Tuesday. Speaking for this party, I may say that we would be entirely agreeable to whatever procedure is necessary to get the measure for-

ward, subject to our being permitted to discuss the matter later. We are not prepared to proceed with any discussion to-day.

Mr. MACKENZIE: That was the understanding I had with the leader of the opposition.

Mr. POULIOT: If hon. members who have observations to make can make them now—

Mr. MACKENZIE: There must be unanimous consent; this is not debatable.

Mr. SPEAKER: This motion is not debatable.

Mr. GARDINER: If there is any objection, of course it will not proceed any further. I understand the leader of the opposition to say that he consents to our going on, so long as the discussion can be held on Tuesday. We were simply getting into such a position that we could have before the house the legislation for second reading next Tuesday.

Mr. COLDWELL: Do I understand the Minister of Agriculture to say that there is to be no statement made to-day? If there is to be a statement, we would wish to discuss it.

Mr. GARDINER: I am prepared to say that there will be no statement. I simply want the house to agree to moving up the resolution the necessary stages so that we shall be in position to have the bill for second reading next Tuesday.

Mr. SPEAKER: The "next sitting of the house" means the next day on which the government will be ready to proceed.

Mr. GARDINER: I want to have second reading of the resolution to-day.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. GARDINER moved that the house go into committee on the resolution.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

Mr. POULIOT: I have just one word to say, what I wanted to say before. I have no objection to discussion in committee taking place at any time, nor have I objection to a debate taking place in the house at any time, because that is the business of the committee or the house to decide. But here we have a most difficult matter to consider. We are willing to do something in that regard, but the fact is that this resolution states a future policy. Any member may make a suggestion to be taken into consideration when the bill is being drafted, and the bill can be improved in the light of any suggestions made by hon. members. But when a bill is drafted by the experts of any department—I am not speaking particularly of the Department of Agriculture, because I suffered from this practice when Mr. Bennett was in power, and I tried to do something through the then Secretary of State, Mr. Cahan—we must swallow it whole; there is no possibility of change. That is why I am making this suggestion, not particularly about this measure, which has already been decided upon, but so that in future the discussion take place on the resolution itself. The country may then benefit from the experience of hon. members on all sides of the house and the suggestions they may make.

Mr. CHURCH: This committee should be informed as to just what is being done in connection with this agreement for a food and agriculture organization. Who is to be in charge of it? What do each of the twenty nations contribute, and how is it administered as to China? What food is to be given? A report has been made by the American Red Cross bearing on this matter. I called the attention of the Prime Minister to it in the debate on external affairs in August of 1944, and he said that he would look into it.

My next point is that parliament should be informed of what Canada and the other countries are going to do under this agreement. We shall have to vote the money. Where are the supplies going? From what I have heard, some supplies destined to China did not reach China at all. What about transportation from North America across the seas? Who is in charge of that? School teachers are all right teaching school and in many other ways; in fact, some of our best leaders have been drawn from that class. But we should have in charge of this business someone who has a practical knowledge of food products, live stock, transportation, expert administration, and so forth. I ask the minister who is in charge, because the Prime Minister is not here. I want to see the resolution go through, but I ask that a proper survey be made along the lines I have indicated and that the public be informed, because the public will have to pay. I am in favour of this step to send food and supplies to suffering peoples, but in this matter we should act as business men. We are voting hundreds of millions of dollars; where is the money coming from? It is coming out of current revenue. Parliament should be informed of just what is to be done. In some matters you cannot get any information from the press, and at times we might as well be meeting in secret for all the public hear of this chamber. We are to blame if we pass the resolution without getting this

information. It is the duty of the opposition to look into this agreement, to examine, explore, explain and criticize if necessary, and see whether it is in the public interest. I might point out also that the resolution is debatable.

Mr. GARDINER: Mr. Chairman, may I call attention to what I think the arrangement is, and if there is any dissatisfaction with that arrangement I shoud like to hear from the members. My understanding is that there was a discussion between the leader of the house and the leaders of the opposition groups with regard to when we should discuss this matter, and that it was agreed that we would discuss it next Tuesday. The only question I raised this afternoon was whether the debate should take place on the second reading of the resolution or on the second reading of the bill. It takes a day to introduce the resolution and have it ready for another sitting; then another day to pass it, even if we do not discuss it at all, and then a further day to bring down the bill. Because of the nearness of the conference, if we followed the usual procedure we would have to go into the conference without the legislation, or at all events we would have no opportunity to discuss it here. Therefore I suggested that we decide now whether we should discuss the matter on the second reading of the resolution or on the second reading of the bill, and I understood that the discussion would take place on the second reading of the bill. When we come to the second reading of the bill I shall be prepared to give all the information asked for by the hon. member for Broadview. I have it here before me, and I shall be glad to place it before the house at that time, when every member will be free to discuss the subject matter of the resolution or the bill as freely and as widely as possible. I therefore suggest that the discussion take place on Tuesday, because I do not think the members are prepared to have it take place now.

Mr. COLDWELL: I should like to make just one correction. The minister said he understood that a certain course had been agreed upon by the leaders of the opposition groups. This is the first I have heard of any such agreement. I did see in *Hansard* that the acting leader of the government had asked that the resolution be advanced one stage, and I think that is the intelligent thing to do. I am not opposing it at all. I think it is the right thing to do under the circumstances.

Mr. MACKENZIE: My hon. friend is correct. Quite unintentionally I overlooked him.

Mr. COLDWELL: Don't do it again.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Certainly not.

Mr. BRACKEN: I do not think there is any major difference of opinion in the house with respect to the procedure that is being taken. I was advised by the leader of the house that the government wished to get this matter advanced, and that there would be full opportunity for discussion next Tuesday I approve this procedure in order to expedite the passage of the measure. I think the minister has made out a case for expediting it. I understand that there will be no limitation but that the fullest opportunity will be given to discuss the measure next Tuesday. On that understanding we approve of passing the measure through these preliminary stages now without further discussion.

Resolution reported.

Mr. Gardiner moved that the resolution be read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. BRACKEN: Might I say one word? In view of the fact that there may be some in the house who may not agree with either the principle or the details of the measure now before us, may we take it for granted that in taking these steps now we are not committing ourselves either to the principle or to the details?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Certainly.

Motion agreed to; resolution read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Gardiner thereupon moved for leave to introduce bill No. 14, for carrying into effect the agreement for a food and agriculture organization of the united nations between Canada and certain other nations and authorities.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION

MEASURE TO AUTHORIZE CARRYING OUT OF PROVISIONS OF INTERIM AGREEMENT

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction and Supply, for the Prime Minister) moved that the house go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to bring in a measure to empower the governor in council to do such things as are necessary or expedient for carrying out the provisions of the interim agreement on international civil aviation, signed at Chicago on the seventh day of December, 1944, or any recommendations of the interim assembly or interim council of the organization, or any committees thereof, made pursuant to such provisions and to provide further that all expenditures in connection therewith be defrayed out of moneys provided by parliament.

He said: His Honour the Deputy Governor General, having been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the consideration of the house.

Mr. CHURCH: Has the interim agreement on civil aviation been tabled? I have never seen it.

Mr. HOWE: I will make inquiries. I do not think it has, but I will see that it is tabled immediately.

Mr. CHURCH: Would it not be better to wait until the Prime Minister returns? It is a very important matter.

Mr. HOWE: I think it is important that the agreement be advanced. The Prime Minister may not be back for some time, and the provisional organization is meeting in Montreal in the next few days.

Motion agreed to.

PENSIONS AND REESTABLISHMENT

APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER AMENDMENT OR SUPPLEMENTING OF EXISTING LEGISLATION

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs) moved:

That a select committee be appointed, 1. To consider all legislation passed since the commencement of the war with the German reich relating to the pensions, treatment, and reestablishment of former members of His Majesty's armed forces and of other persons who have otherwise engaged in pursuits closely related to war;

2. To prepare and bring in one or more bills to clarify, amend or supplement the above legislation;

With power to send for persons, papers, and records; to print its proceedings, and to report from time to time to the house;

That the provisions of section 1, standing order 65, be waived in respect to this committee.

And that the said committee shall consist of the following members: Messrs. Abbott, Adamson, Ashby, Baker, Belzile, Benidickson, Bentley, Blair, Blanchette, Bridges, Brooks, Bruce, Claxton, Cleaver, Cockeram, Croll, Cruickshank, Dion (Lake St. John-Roberval), Dorion, Drope, Emmerson, Fulton, Gauthier (Portneuf), Gibson (Hamilton West), Gillis, Green, Hallé, Harkness, Harris (Grey-Bruce), Herridge, Isnor, Jutras, Kidd, Langlois, Lapointe, Lennard, Marshall, Mackenzie, Macdonald (Halifax), MacNaught, McKay, Merritt, Mitchell, Moore, Mutch, Pearkes, Power, Probe, Quelch, Ross (Souris), Sinclair (Vancouver North), Skey, Tremblay, Tucker, Viau, White (Hastings-Peterborough), Whitman, Winkler, Winters, Wright.

He said: When I gave notice last evening of this resolution I informed the house that it was not my intention to debate it at this stage. As hon. gentlemen will observe from the order paper, a committee is suggested for the approval of the house of sixty members, ex-service men of both wars, I think a very able committee, who have a tremendous task of work ahead of them on behalf of this parliament. Hon. members who were here in the last parliament will recall how sincerely and strenuously former committees of this house laboured in our committee rooms, without any trace or tinge of partisanship, and how they in the finest spirit of cooperation produced during the last five and a half years what I consider to be one of the best structures of legislation of its kind in any country of the world.

It has been a tradition of this parliament for the last twenty-five years that committees dealing with veterans' affairs be non-political and non-partisan, and those who were here before remember the work of the various committees—the pensions committee of 1941, the committee on the Veterans Land Act, the committees dealing with canteen funds, returned soldiers' insurance and various other phases of the legislation which is now before us.

Every opportunity will be presented for complete debate when the various reports reach this house and the government introduces its measures for first, second and third reading.

If hon. members will look at standing order 69 they will note that it is quite proper to have amending legislation considered by a committee of this house who will report back to the house, and for the government then to introduce its legislation.

The work of the committee will be, in the first place, to consider all the legislation since 1939, all the orders in council passed since 1939, all regulations which have been passed under statutes other than the War Measures Act, as well as under the War Measures Act since 1939—I think some of them were referred to the other day by the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker)—and also to consider the administration of the legislation which we now have partly on the statute books and which we intend, after this committee's work is concluded, to have entirely on the statute books of Canada as a permanent guarantee of security for those who have been overseas, who have fought in the old war and in this one.

Mr. McLURE: Will it be a full-time job?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I am afraid it will be a very big job. I think we owe it to those who have served us in both wars to have this legislation in permanent form on the statute books of Canada. I bespeak at the present moment the cooperation

of this house in the immediate setting up of the committee. I hope we shall begin our work next Tuesday. We must get down to it as soon as we can, because it is going to take, I am afraid, most of the time of those who are members of that committee.

I am sure that in the committee now to be established we shall receive the same cooperation which we enjoyed in the committees of other years, and that the work will be a monument to the humanity and the industry of this house.

Mr. CHURCH: Would it not be possible to have these various bills and statutes and orders collected into some sort of code? As things are, it is most difficult for a lawyer to refer to them. I commend to the minister and the committee the suggestion that all this material be contained, if possible, in one bound volume.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I went very carefully into that matter with the legal authorities, as it was my own desire also that that should be done. But the best we can do is that, when the various measures are reported back by the committee, and the government introduces legislation accordingly in this house and the house passes substantially in final form and shape the bills submitted to it, either as submitted or amended, there shall be a consolidation of all these statutes in the form recommended by the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church).

Mr. CLARENCE GILLIS (Cape Breton South): With respect to the terms of reference of this committee, I have in mind a problem which I raised in the house a few days ago, namely, that of many of our returning service personnel who are coming back to this country undergoing detention, men who were given dishonourable discharge, with loss of gratuity, and that kind of thing. Will this committee be in a position to probe that particular matter and bring some recommendation to the house?

Mr. MACKENZIE: My intention, subject to the discretion of the committee, would be that all matters affecting the welfare of ex-service men and women can be considered by this committee.

Mr. A. J. BROOKS (Royal): As the minister has suggested, I do not think we should take much time to debate this resolution. There are one or two points I wish to bring to his attention and to the attention of the house.

First, I congratulate the minister on setting up this committee. It was obvious, I think, that such a committee would be necessary in this parliament, and at this time, now that the war is over.

We have had many veterans' committees since 1916. I think that was when the first committee was set up by parliament to look after pensions. That committee of course began from scratch, and since then many acts have been put on the statute books of the country and many regulations passed having to do with soldiers' affairs. We have had many distinguished men on these committees and looking after soldiers' pensions and other matters since the first great war. Among them I might mention such men as Mr. W. F. Nickle, N. W. Rowell, Mr. Hume Cronyn, Sir Herbert Marler, the Hon. Cyrus MacMillan and the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power), who was chairman of the committee in 1938. These men all did excellent work, but the fact that we now have to set up another committee shows that this type of work is never finished.

We are fortunate, Mr. Speaker, in having in this house a great many returned men. I believe there are eighty-two.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Eighty-four.

Mr. BROOKS: Eighty-four returned men from the two wars, the last war and this one. Those of us who listened to the speeches made by these men from all parts of the house realize that they are going to add very greatly to the ability of this committee, as they have done to the debates and other proceedings of the House of Commons.

One point I wish to make is this, and I hope the minister will consider it. These returned men are all greatly interested in veterans' affairs, and they are all well qualified to discuss the work of the veterans committee. I feel that every returned man in this House of Commons should be given an opportunity to sit on the committee. The minister has spoken of former committees, and I think I am correct in saying that every former veterans committee appointed in this house contained all the returned men in the house. I believe that is correct. A precedent was established. The minister has also said that the proceedings of these committees have been non-political. I have had the honour of sitting on two committees myself, and I can vouch for the fact that the minister is correct when he says that the proceedings have been entirely non-political. I also understood, Mr. Speaker, that when the steering committee was considering the question of setting up a veterans committee in this house the minister expressed his intention of

placing all the returned men in the House of Commons on the veterans committee. I would ask the minister now just what changed his mind.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I did not know at the time that there were so many. A committee of eighty-four would be unwieldy.

Mr. BROOKS: The minister says he did not know at the time that there were so many. I wonder—and I do not say this offensively—if it was the fact that he did not know there were so many opposition returned men. I think that is the point, Mr. Speaker. I would point out to the house that of the returned men in the house there are thirty-two on the Conservative side, thirty-five on the Liberal side—

Mr. MACKENZIE: Thirty-seven.

Mr. BROOKS: Ten in the C.C.F., three in the Social Credit and two among the independents.

Mr. MACKENZIE: You missed out two.

Mr. BROOKS: I stand corrected. I understood they were reserve army men and had not served overseas. I may be incorrect in that. The minister may say that such a committee would be too large. My experience has been that only about fifty per cent of the members of a committee can attend its meetings regularly. They have other duties, and not more than fifty per cent is the average. I feel that a committee sitting day in and day out fifty per cent, or forty members, would not be an unwieldy committee or one that could not carry on and do good work.

I do not wish to discuss the many matters that will come before the committee. The minister has truly stated that there are many things for us to consider. I think the most important which this house and the country have to deal with at the present time is the matters of veterans' affairs. As regards those who have been wounded, it is platitudinous to say that they must receive the very best attention which the country can give; and as regards the dependents of the men who died overseas, it is also I am sure the desire of the house and the country that we should pass legislation which will give them their due rights and the best that the country can give.

There is one matter that I should like to say a few words about, and that is the question of hospitalization. There are thousands of wounded men coming back at the present time. I had the honour, the opportunity and the pleasure a year ago of visiting many of our Canadian hospitals overseas, and I wish to take this occasion to pay tribute to the army medical corps for the splendid work it did in connection with those hospitals. I do not think there could have been anything finer. But the point I wish to make is this. As these men come back from these splendid military hospitals, let us see that the hospitals in Canada during the coming years are just as efficient and just as good.

Not long ago I read a criticism by an American colonel of the veterans hospitals in the United States after the last war. He stated, as I have stated now, that the military hospitals were the very finest, but he criticized the veterans hospitals, stating that they were in no way up to the standard that had been maintained by the military institutions. That condition may not have prevailed in this country, although on many occasions I have heard severe criticism of our veterans hospitals. But I will say again that we must give to those wounded men coming back the very finest hospitals the country can provide. We must see that they have the most competent doctors it is possible for us to place in those hospitals, and the best nurses; and other attendants must be efficient. These hospitals will be not only hospitals to these men, but, for many years to come, homes as well, and we must make them not only hospitals but homes.

The minister says the committee will be sitting for some time. I have no doubt it will be sitting for the rest of this session; I doubt if it will be able to complete its work in that time. Many things will happen before the committee makes its report, and there are thousands of young men coming back who will be looking for jobs which must be provided for them. That is something which this committee cannot look after. These young men who are going to college will benefit little, and it will do the country little good, if after three or four years in college they find that there are no suitable jobs or suitable work for them when they graduate. I would ask the minister now: Does he anticipate that amendments will be made to the Civil Service Act? Will that come within the terms of reference of this committee?

Mr. MACKENZIE: The committee will be entitled to make recommendations in regard to civil service preference as affecting veterans.

Mr. BROOKS: So far as that is concerned, it will come within the terms of reference?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Oh yes; the reference is very wide.

Mr. BROOKS: I ask this question because I think that while under the civil service commission the returned men of the last war

obtained fair treatment, there were a good many abuses. I notice, and I think it is general knowledge, that a good many of the men who took the civil service jobs took them in the low brackets, and in many cases it was not possible for them to get up to the higher brackets. I believe the Canadian legion has recommended that some system be evolved whereby these men can receive special training and help in order to fit them to advance in the civil service. That is a very good suggestion, and one which possibly might be attended to now before this committee sits, because with all the thousands of men coming back and with the reorganization and reconstruction of the civil service it may be necessary to place many of our returned men at once.

I now come to the matter of appointments which do not come under the civil service. There are many thousands of them in the gift of the dominion, provincial and municipal governments. It has been the practice too often in the past for political expediency and patronage to enter into these appointments from the very highest to the very lowest. Now that the war is over and these gallant young men are coming back, I hope that no questions of politics or patronage will enter into the appointments affecting them. That principle should start from the very highest and apply to all, down to the very lowest government appointments. May I give an example of what I have in mind? Just before the last election there was in the gift of the government the appointment of four senators and one judge from New Brunswick. To those five vacancies not one returned man was appointed. I repeat, returned men should have received consideration. I have no personal objection to the men who were appointed, except from the returned soldier's point of view. They were excellent men, and they may have had some good reason—I am sure some of them had—for not having been soldiers in the last war. However, the point is that there were returned men who were just as well qualified. If I cared to I could mention an hon. member from New Brunswick who sits in this house to-day, who served with distinction in the last war and who had three sons in the war just concluded. This man lost a son and had another one wounded. It was the expectation of the people of New Brunswick, irrespective of politics, that consideration would be given to this returned man when appointments to the senate were made. There is a great principle involved there, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that the government will take these matters into consideration.

I should now like to say a word on the question of housing. I ask the minister whether housing will come within the terms of reference of this committee?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Certainly, if requested by any of its members.

Mr. BROOKS: That also is a matter which can hardly wait for two or three months. I do not wish to labour the point this afternoon; it has been discussed many times. But we all know that veterans' housing is in a chaotic condition in Canada. There are thousands of young men coming back who are not able to buy houses for themselves and their wives. Many of these young men married overseas, and some of them have married since they returned. This matter must receive the immediate attention of the government, and not wait for reference and regulations so far as the committee is concerned.

A few weeks ago I took occasion, with some other hon. members, to visit some of those so-called veterans' houses near the city of Ottawa. I think they are totally inadequate for the purpose for which they are being built. They are too small, and too expensive, as my deskmate the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Black) says. I was told that they would cost between five and six thousand dollars. They are little one-storey houses containing two bedrooms. This government passed the Family Allowances Act, for what purpose? As I understood it, it was to encourage the increase of the population of Canada. Are we going to ask our soldiers who come back to this country to live in a house where there are only two bedrooms? One must be taken by the man and his wife. How many children can you put in one bedroom and expect them to be raised in the manner in which children should be brought up?

I must not take up any more of the time of the house this afternoon, but I congratulate the minister on having secured the services of General Burns as head of his rehabilitation branch. I think that is correct?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Yes.

Mr. BROOKS: General Burns is one of the most outstanding soldiers that we have in Canada to-day. I am satisfied that if conditions and rules and regulations permit, he will do a fine job. I would again ask the minister to reconsider enlarging this committee so that it will take in every returned man in this House of Commons. I feel that if he does not do that, the committee will lose the benefit of the advice of some very able men. I wish to assure the minister that

so far as the returned men from this part of the house are concerned, I can assure him that he will have the fullest cooperation in this committee, as he has had in committees of the past. If I am not too presumptuous, Mr. Speaker, and knowing the returned men of the other groups in this house, I feel that I can say the same thing for them.

Mr. STANLEY KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, there are a few words that I should like to say on this motion. I shall touch on just two matters. First, I should like to ask a question or make an appeal in connection with the terms of reference. The other matter about which I should like to say something is the composition of the committee.

The terms of the reference read in part:

To consider all legislation passed since the commencement of the war with the German reich. . . .

In referring to the motion the minister gave the date, "1939". I should like to know—perhaps he can give me the assurance in the midst of my remarks—whether that will give the committee power to review the Pension Act and the War Veterans' Allowance Act?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Yes.

Mr. KNOWLES: Which were passed prior to 1939?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Yes, because all have been amended since 1939, and those amendments must come before the committee.

Mr. KNOWLES: Therefore it will be possible—

Mr. MACKENZIE: That is the definite intention.

Mr. KNOWLES: —to review the entire picture.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Absolutely.

Mr. KNOWLES: I am concerned about that because in my capacity as a member, like all hon. members of the house, I have had many sad cases of old soldiers of the last war brought to my attention. I know that our thoughts at the moment are more particularly with the younger men who are coming home from the war just concluded; but on all sides of the house there is a keen desire that we do not forget the old soldiers of a quarter of a century ago. When many of these men try to get consideration for the plight in which they find themselves they find that their last recourse is to the War Veterans' Allowance Act; but there are certain restrictions in that act, notably the designation of what was an actual theatre of war, which bar them from benefits under that act. Many of these cases have been brought to the attention of the minister and his department over and over again. I have seen many of the letters that he has written in which he has said that these matters have been noted and would be considered when amendments to the act were under consideration. I hope that the case of the men of the last war will receive ample consideration from this committee, and that one of the things that the committee will have power to recommend is certain very necessary revisions to the Pension Act and especially to the War Veterans' Allowance Act.

In connection with the need for amending the War Veterans' Allowance Act, I would hope also that the arrangements which have been made with respect to the widows of veterans of the last war will come under review. May I ask that question of the minister now? Will they come under review as well?

Mr. MACKENZIE: I stated clearly, but perhaps not very lucidly, that every single piece of legislation affecting those soldiers passed since 1939 will come under review.

Mr. KNOWLES: It is fine to get these things on the record, because that was not a piece of legislation.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I have said it three times already this afternoon.

Mr. KNOWLES: That was not a piece of legislation; it was an order in council.

Mr. MACKENZIE: That makes no difference. I said explicitly that all orders in council would be tabled and would be the subject of discussion, and also all regulations which were not by way of orders in council. That was stated clearly by me this afternoon.

Mr. KNOWLES: Well, it is clearer still now; we are glad to know it, and I thank the minister for the definite assurance he has given us.

The other point I should like to speak about is in support of the appeal the hon. member for Royal (Mr. Brooks) has just made to the minister. I, too, am sorry that the minister did not see fit to stand by his original suggestion that all veterans who are members of the house would be made members of this committee.

I know the members of the committee, if it is set up as the motion now stipulates, will do their work on a non-partisan basis. They will do it as veterans, out of concern for their comrades of the two wars. There is no doubt in my mind as to that. But I submit that

they start out with a handicap because of the committee's being set up in the manner the minister has proposed.

The figures have already been given—I do not know whether they have reached *Hansard* —as to the number of veterans in the various groups in the house. I understand there are thirty-seven in the Liberal party, thirty-two in the Progressive Conservative party, ten in the C.C.F. group, three in the Social Credit group and two among the independents.

But the composition of the committee is to be thirty-three from the Liberal party, sixteen from the Progressive Conservative party, six C.C.F.'ers, three Social Crediters, and two from the eight independents in the house.

That division was proposed in a letter which I. as C.C.F. whip, received from the chief government whip, the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Weir). The letter, referring to the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie), states:

> He has asked for a committee of sixty members. On the basis of the arrangement made by the steering committee this would provide for six members from the C.C.F. party membership.

I presume that similar letters went to the whips of the other parties. I quote that paragraph from the letter of the chief government whip only to indicate that the basis taken for the composition of this committee is that which the so-called steering or striking committee had arrived at with respect to another matter, namely that of standing committees.

I submit that has nothing to do with this matter. In fact, as a member of the striking committee I was told in that committee that any decision we made there with respect to the standing committees did not have any bearing upon the composition of other special committees to be set up by the house. However, it is quite clear from the letter I have just read, and also from the names in the motion now before us—and the party designations of the hon. members mentioned are easy to identify—that the basis chosen in this instance is the one arrived at by the striking committee—not, may I say, by unanimous decision—for the standing committees.

That basis, if I may place it before the house, is that the Liberals shall have fifty-five per cent of the membership of all committees, the Progressive Conservative party twenty-five per cent, the C.C.F. 10·8 per cent, the Social Credit group 5·1 per cent and the independents 3·1 per cent.

Against that list of percentages, which total 100 per cent, let me remind the house that the number of members in the various groups in the house entitle those groups to the following percentages on all committees: Liberals, 52·7 per cent; Progressive Conservatives, 27·3 per cent; C.C.F. 11·4 per cent; Social Credit, 5·3 per cent; Independents, 3·3 per cent.

I shall not discuss the matter of standing committees at this time. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, you might rule me out of order if I were to continue that part of the discussion any further. I have brought this information to the house only because this is the first time the matter of committees has been discussed. We are being asked to set up a committee on the basis of a division which was communicated to the whips of the various parties—

Mr. MACKENZIE: I rise to a point of order. I suggest that the hon. member is entirely out of order when he refers to the proceedings of the striking committee, a committee which has not yet reported to the house.

Mr. KNOWLES: I expected that point to be raised. However, as whip of this party I received a letter asking me to submit on behalf of the party—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. The point raised by the Minister of Veterans Affairs is well taken, when he refers to any reference being made to the striking committee before the report of that committee has been brought in. Such reference is not according to the rules of the house, and to that extent the hon. member is out of order.

Mr. KNOWLES: I have been doing my best to avoid any infringement of the rules. However, I submit that if we are not permitted to refer to that committee, then the motion for the setting up of the standing committees should have been made before the one now under discussion. As I have indicated from the letter, part of which I have quoted—

Mr. MACKENZIE: That is not our fault.

Mr. KNOWLES: And not mine, either.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Perhaps not.

Mr. GRAYDON: What kind of buck-passing arrangement have we here?

Mr. KNOWLES: I take it that the other whips received a letter similar to the one I received. It indicates that the basis is to be that arrived at by a committee, the report of which has not yet been made.

I do not wish to develop this point further, except to say that if the minister was not prepared, as he suggested in the first instance, to recommend that all veterans of the house

be placed on the committee, then the least he should have done would be to appoint members from the various parties who were veterans in proportion to the strength of those parties in this house.

I say again I have complete confidence that no matter what handicaps face them the veterans who serve on the committee will do a good job on a non-partisan basis, and will fight for the rights of their comrades of both wars. I do say, however, it is regrettable that they should go into a committee which has the handicap of its having been set up on a political basis, with a larger percentage given to one party than that to which such party would be numerically entitled.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Where does my hon. friend get that rule?

Mr. KNOWLES: I am basing my claim on plain, ordinary, logic, simple arithmetic and simple justice.

Mr. MACKENZIE: There is no such rule in this House of Commons.

Mr. KNOWLES: That is what I thought once before this afternoon. If the minister did not want this kind of discussion, and if he did not want the question raised as to the political complexion of a committee as important as this one, he should have done one of two things. Either he should have stood by his original suggestion, and put all the veterans of the house on the committee or, if he had to reduce the size of the committee, then it should have been set up in proportion to the size of the political groups in the house. Perhaps an even better division for a smaller committee would have been to set it up in proportion to the number of veterans in each group in the house. Such a division might not give this group any greater strength. That is not the point. The point I wish to make is that this should not be done on a political basis at all. It so happens that on a percentage basis there are more veterans in the Progressive Conservative group than in any other group in the house. Far be it from me to defend the interests of the Tory party; I am not. This is a matter of principle. I think the veterans should be represented in full on this committee. I notice my hon. friends to the right do not quite know how to take me in saying this, but there it is.

When answering the hon. member for Royal (Mr. Brooks) the minister said that the reason all veterans in the house were not made members of the committee was that there were more than he had thought there were. I believe the total is eighty-four and the proposal before us is for a committee of sixty members. I agree that large committees are sometimes unworkable, that you can get better work done by a committee of twenty or fifteen members and sometimes a committee of two or even one is a good idea, if it is the right man. But since the proposal before us is for a committee of sixty, I suggest that the difference between sixty and eighty-four does not justify the argument that the latter number would be too many.

I have no doubt that in recent days I have got under the minister's skin a bit with my persistence in connection with the discussions we have had about committees, much of which could not be repeated in the house.

Mr. MACKENZIE: On either side.

Mr. KNOWLES: I shall not say anything more about that. But despite any hard feeling there may have been, despite the fighting that has occurred about these committees, despite the fact that before we get through this afternoon the discussion may take on a political complexion, I hope the minister will consider the suggestion so well advanced by the hon. member for Royal, which I am trying to support, and change the composition of this committee so that it will include all the veterans in this house.

Mr. VICTOR QUELCH (Acadia): Mr. Speaker, I am going to be brief in my remarks because I expect to be a member of this committee and I shall have an opportunity of saying what I want to say after we have heard the evidence of the various organizations. I think it is necessary that this committee be set up at the earliest date possible. I wish to congratulate the minister upon having made the scope of this committee so wide open. I understand that it is to deal with all orders in council and all matters having to do with pensions and rehabilitation. In other words, it is to be as wide open as possible.

There has been a great deal of good legislation passed in the last few years, but I think the minister will agree that since so many orders in council have been passed there is much confusion to-day about just what the law is. I think he will agree also that a number of adjustments are necessary in order to make some of the acts work effectively. After we have heard the representations of the various soldier organizations I think we shall be in a far better position to judge as to what needs doing than we are at the present time.

I believe all will agree that the committees of the past have done good work. It has often been stated that the soldiers' committees were the least partisan of any of the com-

mittees set up by the house, and I think most people will agree with that. I was sorry to hear the parliamentary assistant to the minister become a little political in his remarks the other night. I hope he will not continue with that stand when we are in committee because, if he does, he knows very well it will make it harder to carry on the business of the committee effectively.

The success of the job of soldier rehabilitation will depend to a large extent upon the success of the programme of the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe). If his programme falls down, then our job will be that much harder. We hope the Minister of Reconstruction carries forward an aggressive programme. As I said before, this committee has a big job to carry out and the sooner it gets at it, the better. Therefore, I shall say no more at this time.

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Temiscouata): Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the minister upon the choice of an assistant, who has been a member of this house for a number of years and has shown a knowledge of what he is speaking about. His selection is worthy of praise. The hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker) is a veteran; he has broad views on many matters and he is zealous in helping the veterans. The minister did exceptionally well in selecting the hon. member for Rosthern as his right arm in the department.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) has spoken about the size of the committee. I wonder if the committee will be of any use. In saying that I do not mean to offend those who will be members of the committee, I say it because of the actions of a board which is composed of outsiders, one being a member of the Quebec legislative council, which is supposed to look after the veterans. It is impossible to get satisfaction for the veterans except by writing personally to the minister. I contend that veterans have suffered injustice.

I am thinking of any young man who was eighteen years of age when he was drafted for overseas service. The war is over; he has come back and he wants to try to get some help. A gratuity of $7.50 a month is supposed to be paid for each month of service in Canada, and $15 a month for each month of service overseas. The gentlemen in charge of the Quebec office were so parochial that they did not even send the necessary forms to the Rivière du Loup office of unemployment insurance and selective service to take care of soldiers coming back from overseas who might be applying for gratuities. These forms were in Quebec but the bureaucrats were so stupid that each time a veteran went to the Rivière du Loup office they had to write to Quebec because that was not a branch office of the Department of Veterans Affairs. One form would be sent for that one man, and then they would have to write for another form for another man. This occasioned considerable delay. I pointed out the absurdity of the matter and it was corrected.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Was that veterans affairs or defence?

Mr. POULIOT: It was veterans affairs. Defence has nothing to do with it once a man is discharged.

Mr. MACKENZIE: But when he applies for gratuity?

Mr. POULIOT: Perhaps I am not using the right expression, for I must confess that I have not read the statute. All I know is what has been said in the house. When a veteran went to the Rivière du Loup office to get what he was entitled to as a veteran he found there were no forms there. Because of the bureaucracy at Quebec it was necessary for the Rivière du Loup office to write for a form every time a man came to that office. I know the minister is full of good will and, if I speak as I do to-day, it is because I want definite instructions given to all bureaucrats to cut this red tape in order that these boys may have a chance to get what they are entitled to as soon as they arrive home. That is the first thing, and I had it corrected.

Here is the second thing. Yesterday the Princess Louise Dragoon Guards were received in Ottawa with the beating of drums and a fine procession. They deserved that, but the boys are not as well received as they deserve to be. At times their parents suffer annoyance and tribulation because of the stupidity of the military police. Take the case of the young man whose case was publicized in the press of yesterday. This was a fine boy from my county who was wounded at the time of the invasion of France. He won the Military Medal, but he told me that the only remembrance he had of France was the blood of his friends who had died at his side. This young man came home with a piece of shrapnel in his kidney. He came to my office, and I read something that had been published in the local paper about him. It was well done, and the parents were pleased. Afterwards this young man had decided to go to Quebec city to be looked after in the military hospital. What happened afterwards? The military

police, at two o'clock in the morning, came and awakened his father and mother and searched their home for that young man while he was in the hospital being treated for a wound he had suffered during the invasion of Normandy, where because of his bravery he won the Military Medal. That is not the way to receive the veterans, and I hope that the committee will investigate that case and find out who was responsible for such a stupid order.

We have the most abominable bureaucracy at military headquarters in Quebec city, and if I am told I am not in order in speaking of this matter at this stage when a motion is before the house for the appointment of a committee on veterans affairs, I say that I have a right to speak. I say that the military police had no reason whatsoever to create such a disturbance. It is considered a shame throughout the whole district. Here was a man who had won the Military Medal for his bravery on the battlefield. He risked his life for his country. He comes home, and his father and mother are proud of him. They have other sons in the army too. This week, the night I left home I met this young fellow. He is quite tall but he was pale because of his stay in the hospital. I met him at the railway station and said, "You are not in the hospital?" "No," he said, "I have asked for two days' leave to inform the military police that they will get an uppercut from me if they go to my home again to waken my father and mother." There is a man with guts. He is a fine lad. The minister is not here in his place at the moment, but I say to the house that the ultra-photogenic Brigadier Frou-frou in charge of military district No. 5 should go down on his knees and apologize to the parents of this boy. That is how I look at it. There is no order in the Department of National Defence, and I shall take that matter up in due course. I say now that I do not want the veterans in my county and of my province to suffer from the stupidity of the brass hats in Quebec city. I know them and I had to denounce them in the house.

Why do we have these difficulties over the veterans and why are so many of the boys called deserters? I do not know whether the name of this particular boy is included in the number of those reported as deserters in the sessional paper which was tabled to-day. How many are there? To my personal knowledge many injustices have been done in my constituency. Things have been done which should never have been done. I know the minister is fair; he is big and strong, and I hope that he will use his strength and his power and his influence in the cabinet to protect those lads who come back to Canada and are told in the press that they are heroes; but when it comes to giving them real help, that is hard for them to get. We have plenty of legislation regarding veterans, so much that everyone gets lost in it.

Instead of having a committee of outsiders, whoever they may be, colonels or otherwise, appointed to settle the affairs of the veterans, their affairs should be settled by this very committee on veterans affairs that is to be set up if this motion passes. In my view this is a case where parliament itself should be the supreme court of justice in Canada, where the boys and young men who have completed their service in the armed forces should have a place to go to secure redress of all wrongs. Parliament itself should be that court, and that is what I would like the committee on veterans affairs to be—not just a place to listen to the representatives of the legion or any other military organization. I saw them at work when I was head of the civil service committee, and they came with briefs that were very long and that meant very little. If this parliament wants to keep the respect of the Canadian people at large it must be true to the traditions of the past, not of the recent past, but of the old past, and look at every individual case where injustice has been done or affronts or insults have been heaped upon a man who is worthy of respect.

I am not a veteran, but I have fought enough for veterans and soldiers to have my say on the matter. It is because of my utmost respect for parliament as a great institution of the past that I make this suggestion, and I hope that the members who compose that committee, whether they are veterans of the first war or of the last war, will not snub the little fellow who may have been in any branch of the armed forces and who comes before them to secure justice and to get rehabilitated. What is rehabilitation? It is the right to start life anew after a number of years of service and sacrifice. Some of those boys have lost their chance; they have no opportunity. I just met a lady in the corridor who was very active in Liberal circles. She has a young son who has been four years overseas, and he has been offered a job at $90 a month. That is not enough on which to raise a family.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. POULIOT: The boys who come back from overseas cannot all expect to get jobs from the government. There must be co-operation between the government and industry

to rehabilitate all the men who have been in the armed forces, not only those who have served overseas but also those who have done their duty here in Canada, according to the law and the instructions they have received. It would be a great mistake to pay no attention to the boys who have acted in conformity with the law and obeyed all the instructions they have received, who have done their full duty. It is not their fault that they were not sent overseas. Some of them have gone far away; they have travelled across this country. Right at the very time that we had complaints that the trains were overcrowded, we had units in Canada sent travelling across the country from coast to coast and then sent travelling back again from coast to coast. That was going on all the time. It was a racket, to send them all over. I shall not say more about that now because the then minister of national defence has been discarded, but it is true just the same.

I hope that the members of the committee who are veterans of the first war will not snub the young boys, but will help them, and that they will assist the minister by supplying him with scissors to cut red tape, starting at the citadel in Quebec, the big post office building on the hill, where the headquarters of District No. 5 are located, and seeing to it that all these people shall be fired from the army.

I will tell the house another reason why the war is not finished: it is because so many of these people never earned a living in their lives before they got into the army during the war; they want to continue there for a long time; they are swivel-chair heroes. I denounce them, and there is one of them whose picture I will depict in the near future. He is here in Ottawa. He is a pet of a former minister of national defence. If they do what I suggest I shall have the utmost confidence in the wisdom of all the members of the committee which is to be appointed, to send the swivel-chair heroes back home; to confound them with real soldiers would be an insult.

Mr. H. W. HERRIDGE (Kootenay West): I do not intend to take the time of the house to discuss things which I think should properly come before the committee or before the house at a more fitting time. But I wish to make reference to the fact that some objection has been raised to the relative strength of parties on the committee. I can understand the reason for this objection being raised, but I must say that, after twenty-five or twenty-six years of experience on committees dealing with veterans' affairs, I have found in working with members of all political parties that when we enter the field of veterans' affairs we work on a basis of non-partisanship. Regardless of the political faiths of the members of this committee, I am quite sure that every member will think first of the veterans of this country and not of the party to which that member may belong; and I am quite confident and quite happy to leave the investigation entirely in the hands of the committee as now composed.

Mr. D. KING HAZEN (St. John-Albert): This resolution provides that a select committee be appointed to consider all legislation passed since the commencement of the war, relating among other things to the treatment of returned men. When the treatment of returned men is being considered by this committee I hope that it will do all in its power to see that soldiers who have returned from the war suffering from nervous diseases are not placed in provincial insane asylums. I hope that it will see that suitable military hospitals are provided for these men and that they are not put into provincial hospitals which are occupied by the insane and which are sometimes very much overcrowded. I know it is said by some people that these men can get better treatment in provincial hospitals. I question if that is true of many of our provinces. I know that if I were the parent of a man who had returned from overseas suffering from a nervous condition I would not want to see him put into one of those institutions. Returned men should have their own hospitals.

There is another matter to which this committee might give some attention. I am not satisfied that veterans who are patients in our military hospitals invariably get the best of treatment and advice. I have in mind the case of an infantry soldier who was in hospital in Italy. He was brought back to this country suffering from some disease and was placed in one of our military hospitals. He has been there for months, and his condition has not improved, in fact, if anything it is getting worse. I wrote the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie) about this matter. He assured me that he would look into it, and I appreciate that he is doing so. But I have seen this veteran on one or two occasions, and I have thought, when I have talked with him and considered his condition and tried to find out something about it, that if I were his father I would be far from satisfied with the treatment that boy was receiving, that I would want to have specialists called in to advise as to the best treatment. I may be mistaken, but I do not think in these military hospitals we have such specialists, and I do not know if provision is made

whereby they can be obtained for particular cases. There should be provision that they can be called in, and I would urge the committee to see to it that in military hospitals there be provided or made accessible specialists in cases where particular treatment is needed or in what I may term obstinate cases where the condition of a returned man is not any too well understood by the staff of the hospital.

Those are the only two suggestions which I wish to bring to the attention of the committee at this time, and I hope they will be considered by it.

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Cariboo): I have no intention of debating this question. I am very glad a committee is being appointed. I know that its job will be a very difficult one and that it will tackle many and varied problems, and that in the hands of the veterans of this house the problems of the veterans will be taken care of.

I rise rather to ask a question than to discuss the motion. I believe the question was already asked by the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis), but I was not sure that I understood the minister's answer. There are some young men who are in difficulties. I have discussed one particular case with the minister, so that he will understand exactly the type of case which I have in mind. What I wish to make sure of is, will cases of men who have been court-martialed and are now in Canadian gaols be discussed in this committee?

Mr. MACKENZIE: There are no reasons why they cannot be discussed; but in regard to taking action, I think the only action we could take would be by way of recommendation to the Department of National Defence, which itself would take action, probably by other means.

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): May I point out in that connection that the important matter in my opinion is not just that these people have been sentenced to confinement. If I understand the matter aright, they have been dishonourably discharged, which deprives them of gratuities and all the other benefits to which veterans are entitled. That may come about because of a misdemeanour which is just a matter of momentary impulse and the whole of the man's past services may have been forgotten. I think that is what the committee should keep in mind.

Mr. MACKENZIE: My hon. friend is right; but in many statutes already passed by the last parliament benefits are not available to those who have not been honourably discharged. That matter of course could be reviewed by the committee.

Motion agreed to.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

STRIKE AT FORD MOTOR PLANT, WINDSOR

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. F. BROWN (Essex West): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour, who I regret is not in his seat at the moment. Perhaps he can answer later in the day or to-morrow. Can the Minister of Labour inform the house as to developments in the proceedings with respect to the strike at the Ford Motor Company plant at Windsor, and other threatened strikes?

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): May I follow that up by putting another question to the Minister of Labour. In view of the gravity of the strike situation at Windsor, will the government or the minister consider the immediate appointment of a controller to take charge of the Ford plant and resume production there, pending the negotiation of an agreement between the parties? I ask the question because of the urgency of the situation.

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): It has taken a long time to reach the orders of the day, and the Minister of Labour is at the moment outside attending an important meeting. May I be permitted to bring these two questions to his attention and he will reply at the earliest moment.

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT IN VIEW OF PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S MESSAGE TO CONGRESS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Will the acting leader of the house be in a position to make a statement within a few days regarding the St. Lawrence waterway, in view of the message of President Truman to congress yesterday recommending an early start?

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): That will be for the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SUGGESTED COMMITTEE ON REVISION OF RULES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. RODNEY ADAMSON (York West): In view of what happened in this house this afternoon, I would address a question to the

acting leader of the house. Will he consider setting up a committee to review and revise the rules of the house?

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): In view of the events of this afternoon the question is timely. I had notice of a similar question from the member for Wellington South (Mr. Gladstone). It is on my desk. Evidently both hon. gentlemen were thinking in the same direction.

In regard to a special committee of the house on standing rules and orders, hon. gentlemen who were here a year ago will recall that in February, 1944, we did establish such a committee and that committee made a unanimous report to this house. Unfortunately the house did not seem to think along the lines of the committee and the report was not adopted by the house. In a matter like this it rests with the house itself whether it wishes to have another committee set up or to discuss further the report of the committee of a year ago. The latter procedure would involve a resolution by a minister of the crown to set aside a special time for consideration of the report of the committee of 1944. I think the former procedure would be preferable. I shall take the first opportunity to confer with the leader of His Majesty's Loyal Opposition and the leaders of the other groups as to what the wishes of their groups are in regard to this matter, and if there is a general feeling in the house in regard to it I will take it up with my colleagues.

ARGENTINA

INQUIRY AS TO EFFECT UPON CANADIAN INTERESTS OF CURRENT POLITICAL DEVELOPMENTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): May I direct a question to the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the aggressive diplomatic position which now appears to be taken by the United States of America toward the government of Argentina, I would ask the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs to inform the house fully of the current political developments in that country, indicating to what extent Canadian interests are affected thereby. I would also ask the minister what steps if any are being taken by Canada in connection with recent developments in the Argentine.

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs): First of all I wish to thank the hon. member for his kind thoughtfulness in sending notice of this question not only to myself but to the under-secretary of state for external affairs. It makes it very much more expeditious to get answers when that is done. I am sure my hon. friend would not expect one, on brief notice, to make an extended statement on the internal situation in Argentina. The question would call for a statement on current political developments in the Argentine and one could not on brief notice attempt to make an at all comprehensive statement on political developments in that country. I may say that the Canadian ambassador in Buenos Aires is in close touch with developments there. He has presented his credentials and keeps in close touch with what is going on, and in the normal course of his duties he would take such local action as might prove to be necessary if any Canadian interests were being affected. The government is following as closely as possible, from the reports it receives and also in consultation with other governments, the course of events in Argentina, but there is nothing further I would feel it might be proper to say at this time.

ATOMIC ENERGY

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION FOR CONTROL—DISCUSSIONS BETWEEN CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): May I direct another question to the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs. Yesterday President Truman told congress that he would initiate discussions with Canada and Great Britain looking towards international cooperation in the control of atomic energy, and called on the world to outlaw the atomic bomb. In the meantime he intimated that the secret of the new bomb would be preserved within the group of Great Britain, Canada and the United States. Have there been any discussions of a formal or informal nature between the governments of Canada and the United States of America with regard to the points covered by President Truman in his message to congress? If so, does the government of Canada hold views similar to those which he so expressed at that time?

A further question is this: Is Canada proposing to institute a body similar to the United States atomic energy commission, which appears to be clothed with wide and special powers to direct and control atomic energy experimentations? May I also ask, in view of the importance of the subject, when it is anticipated that the discussions, which President Truman mentioned, among this group of powers will be initiated, and who will represent Canada in those discussions?

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs): With respect to the last portion of my hon. friend's question, no previous notice had been received and I am not in a position to make any statement at this moment. As to the earlier portions of his remarks and questions, the full context of President Truman's message to congress of yesterday has not yet been received in Ottawa, and I am not prepared to comment upon it until we have an opportunity to examine it closely. I can say now that there have been discussions with officers of the government of the United States over a considerable period dealing with the development and employment of atomic energy. The Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) has been a member of a combined policy committee, which was established in August, 1943, the other members of which were Mr. H. L. Stimson, then United States Secretary of War, Doctor Vannevar Bush and Doctor James B. Conant for the United States, and the late Field Marshal Sir John Dill and Colonel J. J. Llewellin for the United Kingdom. It was a committee of the highest level dealing with the research work and experimentation that were being carried on.

The present representatives of the United Kingdom on this committee are the Earl of Halifax and Field Marshal Sir Henry Wilson. Consideration is being given to the most effective organization to be adopted in Canada for the further study of Canadian policy and activities in this field, and I hope that in this connection a further announcement may be made before long.

UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

DECISIONS OF PREPARATORY COMMITTEE AS TO CHOICE OF HEADQUARTERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): May I ask the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs whether the government has been advised of the decisions taken by the united nations preparatory committee regarding choice of a headquarters for the united nations organization? I ask that question because newspaper reports indicate that the headquarters of that organization is to be situated in the United States. In that connection I make one observation to the minister, namely, that I am not at all satisfied that what I regard as very strong claims for Canada have been pressed as enthusiastically as in my opinion circumstances would warrant.

[Mr. Graydon.]

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs): With respect to my hon. friend's question I would not like to say offhand what are the contents of the communications we have received in respect of those preliminary discussions. I should like to take his question as a notice for further inquiry with respect to which I shall make a statement as soon as possible.

AIR FORCE

PRESS REPORT OF STATEMENT AS TO POST-WAR POLICY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. H. GOLDING (Huron-Perth): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of National Defence for Air Services. Does the statement of Air Marshal Breadner as reported in the *Globe and Mail* of this morning reflect the government's policy in connection with our post-war air force?

Hon. COLIN GIBSON (Minister of National Defence for Air): The hon. member was kind enough to send me notice of this question, and I have had an opportunity of looking over the item referred to. I must take this opportunity of congratulating the *Globe and Mail* on their speedy reporting. The article refers to the speeches made by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Abbott), General Crerar, Admiral Jones and Air Marshal Breadner at the McGill university founders' day dinner. I am now informed that that dinner is taking place to-night, and no speeches have yet been made.

MEAT

EXPORTS TO THE UNITED STATES DURING LAST SIX MONTHS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. F. E. LENNARD (Wentworth): Since Canadian canned meats are being advertised for sale by New York city retailers, and being sold free of points, will the government advise the house, at the earliest opportunity, what meats, fresh and canned, have been exported to the United States within the past six months?

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I shall be glad to accept that as a notice and get the information.

CANADIAN ARMY

DISMISSAL OF EDITOR OF "MAPLE LEAF"—REQUEST THAT EDITORIALS BE PLACED ON HANSARD

On the orders of the day.

Mr. C. C. I. MERRITT (Vancouver-Burrard): I should like to draw the attention of the house to an undertaking given by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Abbott) on September 24, that he would obtain and place on *Hansard* copies of the *Maple Leaf* editorials which were the subject of questions on that day. Later, on October 2, two days ago, in response to a request of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) the Minister of National Defence tabled copies of those editorials. The following day, yesterday, those editorials did not appear on *Hansard*. Consequently I rise to-day to ask that in the absence of the Minister of National Defence, his colleague, the Minister of National Defence for Air Services (Mr. Gibson) might perhaps read those editorials into *Hansard* in pursuance of the undertaking given by his colleague, or, in the alternative, might move, with the unanimous consent of the house, that the editorials be attached as an appendix to to-day's *Hansard*.

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): I shall be very glad indeed to direct the attention of the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Abbott) to the hon. member's remarks. My impression is, however—I am not sure that I am correct in this—that the articles in question would need to be read into *Hansard* before they could be produced. I do not think that tabling of them would authorize their appearing in *Hansard*. However, I shall be glad to see that the Minister of National Defence becomes acquainted with the observations which the hon. member has made.

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): The point is not that the Minister of National Defence be advised, but that these editorials be placed on *Hansard* pursuant to the undertaking given by the minister. There must be some procedure by which they can get on *Hansard*, and that is what I asked.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I thought the hon. member's question was that they be tabled.

Mr. BRACKEN: No.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I am not referring to the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. Merritt).

Mr. BRACKEN: No. I am very clear on this. The hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green) said that he wanted them put in *Hansard*, and there was a very clear undertaking that that would be done.

Mr. CHEVRIER: When the leader of the opposition asked the question the other day I thought he asked that they be tabled; that is my recollection.

Mr. BRACKEN: That is not my recollection, but whether it was or not, the undertaking was clearly given by the Minister of National Defence, in answer to a question by the hon. member for Vancouver South, that they would be put on *Hansard* in the same manner as some other material with respect to the same matter was put on *Hansard* by the minister. That has not been done; the house expects it to be done. I suggest to the government that they should see it is done by whatever means necessary.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Yes.

Mr. GRAYDON: Before the matter is disposed of—

Mr. MERRITT: Would the hon. member allow me to have the floor, since I brought up the matter? So that the matter may be perfectly clear and in order that there may be no doubt about it at all, I wish to read the reference which appears on page 381 of *Hansard:*

> Mr. Green: Mr. Speaker, I was not intending to carry on the discussion. All I wanted to do was to ask the minister to make sure that he had given his undertaking that he would obtain copies of these editorials and place them on *Hansard*. That is all I ask.
>
> Mr. Abbott: I have already given that undertaking, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if it comes to any question of referring the matter to the Minister of National Defence, or any question as to the procedure whereby that solemn undertaking given by the minister may be fulfilled, then I suggest that it is quite within our power to do so by unanimous consent, which, I am sure, the minister would be the first to ask for were he in his place. I suggest that by unanimous consent of the house they be taken as read and placed on *Hansard* now.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: With respect to the statement of the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard as to the procedure which can be adopted at this time, may I say that the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard rose to ask a question. He asked the question. The Minister of National Defence is not in

his place at the moment. It seems to me that there has been sufficient discussion of the matter, and the leader of the government has stated that he will bring the matter to the attention of the Minister of National Defence. I do not think we can gain much by proceeding with the argument.

Mr. GRAYDON: On a question of privilege arising out of what was said by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Chevrier) a moment ago. He made clear what his recollection was of the question which was put by the leader of the opposition when he asked to have those editorials put on *Hansard*. Perhaps I might turn to page 662 of *Hansard* of October 2 and read just a sentence or two of what the leader of the opposition said, because I think it is pertinent to the discussion. It is as follows:

> Will the minister be good enough to inform the house if he has received the documents in question, and, if so, when we may expect that they will be tabled, so that they may appear in *Hansard*?

That is perhaps the reason why the Minister of Transport arrived at the understanding he did.

POSTAL SERVICE

PARCELS TO GREAT BRITAIN—WEIGHT LIMITATIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question which could be communicated to the Postmaster General (Mr. Bertrand), who is not in his seat at the moment. I believe this is a matter of urgency, because people are being requested to pack early their Christmas parcels for Great Britain. Will the same facilities be given to persons in Canada wishing to send parcels to Great Britain as according to newspaper advertisements, are now being extended to people sending to the continent of Europe? At this time the limitation is five pounds to Great Britain and eleven pounds to the continent. Could the same facility be given with respect to parcels for Great Britain?

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): I shall bring this matter to the attention of the Postmaster General during the dinner recess, so that he may reply to my hon. friend.

Mr. COLDWELL: And may we have a reply from the Minister of Labour at eight o'clock?

Mr. MACKENZIE: I shall try to get in touch with him.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

HALIFAX V-E DAY RIOTS

REMISSION OF SENTENCES OF NAVAL PERSONNEL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Minister of Justice a question arising from a press report in the last few days to the effect that there have been certain remissions or reductions in sentences passed on naval personnel following the V-E day riots at Halifax. Has he any statement to make in that regard?

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Minister of Justice): From his familiarity with practice in the department, my hon. friend will know that in respect of short sentences—that is to say, sentences of six months and less—it is not the usual practice of the Department of Justice to advise the exercise of clemency.

But in view of the very favourable reports received from local, judicial and executive authorities, as well as from the armed services, the offences committed in the course of V-E day celebrations have been considered on a special basis, with more than usual leniency. As a result, thus far there have been twelve releases from prison, out of a total of sixteen gaol sentences.

The record shows that of the twelve released from prison out of the total of sixteen, three were ratings of the navy; two were from the merchant marine; four were men who were serving with the army, and three were civilians In connection with the other four, with respect to whom clemency has not yet been recommended, one was serving with the navy, one with the merchant marine, and the other two were civilians. Then, seventeen had been sentenced to terms which required to be served in penitentiaries.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: More than two years.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Yes, more than two years. Ten of these were members of the armed forces, and seven were civilians. The decision as to clemency in these cases has been under consideration. Of course a special docket is made up with respect to each of these cases, and in connection with these seventeen we are still awaiting reports from the office of the attorney general of Nova Scotia. We hope to have them soon, and to be able then to arrive at some decision in each individual case.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

THREATENED PACKING PLANT STRIKE IN VANCOUVER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Cariboo): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell). Since he is not in his seat at the moment, perhaps he will answer it to-morrow, if not to-night. I have been advised by the cattle growers' association of British Columbia that a packing plant strike is pending or threatening in Vancouver and that there is a possibility the producers will try to sell before the stoppage consequent to the strike occurs. This would be disastrous to the cattle men. Therefore I should like to ask the minister if he has been advised of a possible packing plant strike in Vancouver and, if such a possibility is likely to occur, what he has done or what he proposes to do to settle the grievances before the strike takes place?

Mr. MACKENZIE: I shall be glad to direct the attention of the Minister of Labour to the hon. gentleman's question.

CANADIAN SERVICE PERSONNEL

ARRANGEMENTS FOR BRINGING WIVES AND CHILDREN TO CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. K. FRASER (Peterborough West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Abbott), or in his absence to his parliamentary assistant. What steps have been taken by his department to speed up transportation from Britain to Canada of the wives and children of the men who were or who have been in Canada's armed forces, so that these wives and children may be in Canada for Christmas.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think that question should be placed on the order paper.

WAR AND DEMOBILIZATION

PROVISION FOR APPROPRIATION OF $1,365,000,000 FOR WAR PURPOSES, DEMOBILIZATION, PROMOTION OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY, ETC.

The house resumed from Tuesday, October 2, consideration in committee of a resolution to grant to His Majesty certain sums of money for the carrying out of measures deemed necessary or advisable in consequence of the war—Mr. Ilsley—Mr. Golding in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE FOR AIR

Hon. C. W. G. GIBSON (Minister of National Defence for Air): Mr. Chairman, it is customary for ministers of defence when presenting their estimates to make a statement concerning the activities of the various forces.

In making a statement to-day concerning the Royal Canadian Air Force, I realize that this will be the last report to parliament on the wartime activities of the force.

Under the circumstances, for the benefit of the members and also for record purposes, I would like to give a short resume of the war record of the R.C.A.F., its present position and the plans for the future.

My remarks may well be divided under the headings yesterday, to-day and to-morrow.

On August 31, 1939, slightly over six years ago, the Royal Canadian Air Force had a total permanent strength of only 3,048 officers and men. In addition there were 1,013 all ranks in the auxiliary air force.

With the outbreak of war the air force forged ahead—taking on additional commitments and rapidly increasing the number of its airfields and personnel. Strength grew from the 3,048 of September to a peak of 232,585, of which 17,412 were civilians—not in uniform. From this peak the numbers decreased, until on V-E day the total was 181,489, of which 11,015 were civilians. In the intervening period the R.C.A.F. had suffered casualties totalling 21,866, of which 6,615 were fatal, 8,836 have been officially presumed dead, 1,526 are missing, 1,376 were seriously wounded or injured, and of the prisoners two are unaccounted for in Europe, three not yet officially reported upon in the far east, and the remainder were either reported missing and have since been found to be safe, or were prisoners of war either released, escaped or repatriated under the Geneva convention.

The first major step in the development of the air force was the signing of the British commonwealth air training agreement in Ottawa on December 17, 1939, by Great Britain, Australia, Canada and New Zealand. By this instrument the dominion became the operating partner of the most extensive training programme which, up to that time, had ever been developed. The Royal Canadian Air Force acted as general manager in this programme, and as a result of this heavy commitment the main role to be played by the force in the early days of the war was deter-

mined. For many months that role was to be mainly training rather than operation, and so it was only a token operational force which was despatched overseas in the early days of the war. It was not until late in 1940 that the original three squadrons were reinforced by the first graduates from the training plan—the first trickle in the flood which was to mount to the tremendous total of 131,553 graduates before the termination of the plan, and of these 72,835 were members of the R.C.A.F. Of the total figure 49,808 were pilots; 29,963 navigators of various categories; 15,673 air bombers; 18,496 wireless operator-air gunners; 14,996 straight air gunners; 1,913 flight engineers, and 704 naval air gunners.

Following the termination of the B.C.A.T.P. agreements on March 31, 1945, a special agreement was entered into with the government of the United Kingdom to provide for the continuation of training for a limited number of R.A.F. personnel at R.C.A.F. schools in Canada. The costs of training these men were borne by the United Kingdom. After V-J day this, too, was concluded and the last graduating class was "winged" on September 7. During the short life of this supplementary plan 1,211 airmen graduated, of which 465 were pilots and 746 navigators and navigators B. All but fifty-seven were members of the Royal Air Force.

The three squadrons of the R.C.A.F. which had been sent to the United Kingdom in 1940 were unable to absorb the ever-growing stream of R.C.A.F. personnel who graduated from the plan, and as a result the vast majority of the early Canadian graduates were posted to R.A.F. units. Throughout the war there were always many more Canadians serving overseas with R.A.F. units than with R.C.A.F. units.

With the large numbers of R.C.A.F. personnel arriving in the United Kingdom the expansion of Canada's operational organization became highly desirable. Differences in pay entitlements, service conditions, trade divisions and other important factors in the life and careers of R.C.A.F. airmen, as compared with personnel of the R.A.F., complicated administration both for the R.C.A.F. and for the R.A.F. Accordingly additional R.C.A.F. units were formed to absorb a percentage of Canadian aircrew, and long before hostilities ceased, forty-eight R.C.A.F. squadrons were fully operational overseas. Under the original plan these were to be R.A.F. units in everything other than name and nationality of aircrew. All groundcrew were to be found by the R.A.F. until such time as sufficient personnel could be released from the B.C.A.T.P. schools and posted overseas. The ultimate aim was of course to have R.C.A.F. squadrons, manned fully by Canadians—both aircrew and groundcrew—by the process which came to be known as Canadianization. Though this goal was never fully reached, at the cessation of hostilities in Europe, the percentage of Canadian groundcrew in our overseas squadrons was uniformly high.

[Mr. C. W. G. Gibson.]

The magnificent record of these Canadian squadrons is now a matter of history, as is the record of the other thousands of R.C.A.F. personnel who did all their operations with the R.A.F.

The most famous of Canada's air formations was of course the No. 6 Bomber group of Bomber command; and the famous Vancouver Pathfinder squadron of the same command. During the last year of the group's operations, under the command of Air Vice-Marshal C. M. McEwen, C.B., M.C., D.F.C., records were broken again and again and the Canadian squadrons established a reputation second to none in Bomber command. During the war the Canadian heavy bomber squadrons carried out 48,927 sorties in 262,982 operational flying hours, and dropped 125,575 tons of bombs on Europe.

They established a record surpassed by no other formation. They produced men in every way worthy to take their places in the hall of fame, alongside the heroes of the first world war.

In this last war, just as in the first world war, Canadians also excelled as fighter pilots. R.C.A.F. fighter squadrons flew 144,851 sorties in 212,148 operational flying hours, and destroyed 1,241 aircraft, probably destroyed 142 and damaged a further 607. The unit scoring the largest number of successes was the famous city of Edmonton squadron, the aircrew of which knocked down 169 Germans, and destroyed 82 flying bombs.

From October 1, 1944, to the termination of hostilities in Europe our fighters flew 26,163 sorties and lost 144 aircraft. But during that period they destroyed 236 enemy aircraft and made 1,600 cuts in vital nazi rail communications. They also destroyed 958 vehicles, 516 railway cars and 92 locomotives and damaged an additional 632 locomotives. In addition they either destroyed or damaged two medium-sized ships, one cruiser, six E-boats, 97 barges and 40 tanks.

Our coastal command squadrons, also, established a magnificent record. Their role was not spectacular, but day after day—night after night—virtually twenty-four hours a day—our men, to use their own expression, "stooged" over the ocean—in all kinds of weather, keeping the sea lanes of the world open for united nations shipping. From this side of the Atlantic our squadrons based in eastern Canada and Newfoundland provided protection for shipping on the northwest Atlantic. Their patrols took them to mid-ocean and frequently required them to be diverted to Iceland, the Shetlands and even to the British isles. During these operations our aircrews flew 25,500 sorties in 175,000 operational flying hours and made 69 attacks on U-boats. It was on this work that the late Flight Lieutenant David E. Hornell won undying fame—and the Victoria Cross.

The R.C.A.F. transport units, formed late in the war, also established records. One Canadian squadron, based in Burma, flew more operational hours, more sorties and carried more freight than any other similar unit in the R.A.F.—and that record still stands.

From the outbreak of war to the 15th of September last, members of the R.C.A.F. were awarded 7,107 decorations including one Victoria Cross, 66 Distinguished Service Orders, 3,481 Distinguished Flying Crosses and 484 Distinguished Flying Medals. I have here a complete list of dceorations and commendations awarded to members of the R.C.A.F. and Canadians in the R.A.F. for services in the war, which I will table at the conclusion of my remarks.

Canadians in the R.A.F. received a total of 356 awards including one Victoria Cross to the late Squadron Leader Bazalgatte, 16 D.S.O.'s, 196 D.F.C.'s and 24 D.F.M.'s.

I shall also table the names of all those personnel decorated subsequent to the list tabled on April 4, 1945.

Following the cessation of hostilities in Europe the R.C.A.F. was called upon to take part in the occupation of Germany. Our quota consists of a force of about 10,000 made up of two heavy bomber squadrons; four fighter squadrons with wing headquarters; three medium range transport squadrons, equipped with Dakota aircraft and, until December 31, 1945, one Liberator long range transport squadron. These transport squadrons are controlled by a wing headquarters based in England. At the present time the transport squadrons, two of which were previously based in India and Burma, are occupied in regular transport duties, including repatriation of liberated prisoners of war and other personnel from the East. The Liberator and two of the Dakota squadrons, based in the United Kingdom are assisting in this work between Karachi and the United Kingdom. Also included in the occupational force are those personnel who are employed on the control commission and for the disarmament of Germany, on both of which tasks certain positions have been allotted to the R.C.A.F.

After the defeat of Germany our attention turned to the Pacific, and a force was mobilized for service in that area. To make up this force eight heavy bomber squadrons from No. 6 group flew across the Atlantic to the east coast of Canada and began training for the new theatre of operations. It had been intended to equip these units with Lincoln aircraft—an improvement on the Lancaster, which had served our squadrons so well in the latter days of the European war—but the early capitulation of Japan, put an end to these preparations, and six of these squadrons have now been disbanded.

The two units still being retained are continuing a programme of training designed to keep them in a state of efficiency. They will form part of the post-war organization of the R.C.A.F. and will provide the necessary defence for our shores in addition to the air sea rescue activities which are part and parcel of all coastal operations.

General demobilization is now proceeding with all possible speed and has of course been materially increased since V-J day. All surplus personnel of the R.C.A.F. are being released on a first in—first out basis, with overseas service counting double.

In addition, where the exigencies of the service permit, personnel may be released on application in the following cases:—

(a) Prospective employers may make application for the release of key personnel to provide for the expeditious and effective reconversion of industry from war-time to peace-time production and the maintenance of maximum employment. In those cases where the industrial selection and release board recommends release, appropriate action is taken by the R.C.A.F. wherever possible.

(b) Personnel in Canada who produce satisfactory evidence that they are entitled to be reinstated in their former employment, in accordance with the terms of the Reinstatement in Civil Employment Act, and who intend to return to such former employment.

(c) Personnel in Canada who provide satisfactory evidence that they will undertake or resume farming operations where there is need of their services. This includes personnel now on farm leave without pay.

(d) Personnel in Canada who intend to proceed with university or other similar educational studies, provided satisfactory evidence is produced that they have been accepted for training at a university or similar institution.

(e) Personnel transferring to other armed forces.

(f) Personnel whose release is authorized on compassionate grounds.

(g) Personnel who have attained their forty-second birthday.

(h) Personnel who apply for release to resume school teaching.

The following personnel are being released regardless of their priority points:

(a) Married personnel of the women's division and the nursing service.

(b) Over-age officers.

(c) Personnel medically unfit for operational flying.

Personnel serving overseas are being repatriated in accordance with their point score which is based on both total length of service and length of service overseas. They are all being released on arrival in Canada with the exception of those in certain administrative ground trades where existing shortages necessitate their continued employment in Canada.

From V-E day to 1st October, 37,907 R.C.A.F. and W.D. personnel were repatriated to Canada from overseas. Of these 6,455 were repatriated from September 1 to October 1, inclusive.

Between V-E day and the official announcement of V-J day 17,556 service personnel had been retired or discharged and the number of civilians employed had been reduced by 1,108. From V-J day to September 30, 37,396 left the service, and during September alone 30,627 passed through the release centres into civilian life, or over 1,000 per day.

At the present time the strength of the R.C.A.F. stands at 124,052 made up of 27,910 overseas and 96,142 in Canada, of which 9,109 are civilians. Of those in Canada 28,071 are awaiting release.

It has been realized that rapid demobilization would be most dangerous unless certain steps were taken to prepare air force men and women for their new role, and to make the transition from service to civilian life as painless as possible. It is hardly necessary to remind the house of the extensive system of personnel counselling, which has been in operation in the R.C.A.F. for many months. Every person being retired or discharged from the Royal Canadian Air Force is interviewed by a personnel counsellor and his or her aptitude for particular civilian occupations is gauged. This is no haphazard matter, but a scientific assessment of the qualities and technical skills of those interviewed so that they may be advised as to the type of employment to which they are best suited.

In addition to the personnel counsellors we have the education officers, who conduct courses in all units, and thus implement the advice of the counsellors. Interested personnel may improve their education or their technical skill and fit themselves for better and more interesting work on demobilization. With these two aids it is safe to predict that a very large percentage of demobilized personnel of the R.C.A.F. have improved their qualifications during their service careers.

Concurrent with the demobilization of personnel of the R.C.A.F. has gone the closing of schools, units and stations. During the peak of the commonwealth air training plan we had 100 schools and 182 other units established across Canada.

Following the termination of the B.C.A.T.P. agreement, schools utilized under the plan have been progressively closed. Of the major training schools, there were still twenty-nine open at V-E day.

Immediately following the cessation of hostilities in Europe steps were taken to reduce the number, and at V-J day the twenty-nine schools had been reduced to seventeen.

The collapse of Japan brought further drastic reductions so that at the moment only four major schools remain open, pending the establishment of an interim force.

Cuts in the operational units have been no less drastic. On V-E day there were twenty-six operational squadrons in Canada made up of twelve bomber reconnaissance, three fighter, three composite, three transport, two communications, two ferry and one operational training. On the 30th of September only nine remained made up of two long range bomber reconnaissance, three transport, one ferry, one communication and two photo squadrons. One of these transport squadrons will be disbanded next month.

Operational stations have also been closed, so that now only five of the original twenty-four remain.

With the closing of stations and disbanding of units much equipment becomes surplus to immediate needs. The amount of equipment to be retained as a reserve is based on an estimate of five years requirements. The stock position at all equipment depots is checked by the procurement branch so that surpluses are ascertained and disposed of. Storage of this reserve equipment is provided at reserve equipment maintenance units established across the country.

In disposing of properties the stations are first placed at the disposal of the other services. If not required for the operations of these departments, the property concerned is declared surplus to requirements and, (a) in the case of leased property, returned to the owners, or (b) if purchased property, turned over to Crown Assets Allocation Committee for reference to other government departments including the Department of Transport, and if not required, turned over to War Assets Corporation for disposal.

Surplus equipment is treated in a similar way.

I should like to make it quite clear that there is nothing sinister in our methods of disposing of surplus equipment or supplies. There appear to be some people who have the impression that anything we no longer require we destroy, and I should like if possible to disabuse their minds of this matter.

In a highly technical force like the air force it is inevitable that scientific skill will constantly produce new and improved equipment. As new developments appear old models become obsolete, and in war time we cannot afford to send our boys into the air with anything but the most modern equipment available.

As a result much equipment becomes surplus to requirements—sometimes because it is obsolete, sometimes because it is worn out or damaged, and sometimes both, but in every case careful consideration is given as to the disposal of this equipment, and disposal of it is made through War Assets Corporation.

While we are still engaged in the process of demobilization it is realized that with the end of the war plans must be prepared for our post-war forces.

No definite decision has yet been made as to the strength and composition of the post-war air force, as until the nature and extent of any commitments that we may have under international or regional agreements have been determined it is obviously impossible to reach any final decision.

In the meantime plans are being prepared to provide Canada with a balanced force which would be capable of rapid expansion should the necessity arise.

The proposed post-war organization will be made up of three parts:

(a) Regular
(b) Auxiliary
(c) Reserve

The regular force should comprise all branches of air force activities including bomber, fighter and transport squadrons, together with the necessary ancillary units, and for this purpose a strength of from 15,000 to 20,000 personnel is planned.

The auxiliary force will be made up of squadrons based at strategic points throughout the dominion and corresponds to the militia units of the army. These squadrons will provide opportunities for our young men to qualify for their wings or to secure training in their groundcrew trades.

The reserve will be made up of qualified air and ground personnel who in an emergency may be recalled for further service. Meanwhile, like the members of the auxiliary force, they will continue their normal peace-time occupations.

In planning for this post-war organization, arrangements are being made to perpetuate squadrons which took such an important part in the downfall of Germany. These will be localized as far as possible in the districts with which they were affiliated during their service overseas.

The production of the atomic bomb will no doubt have far reaching effects on the whole science of war, but whatever its effects may be upon the other services, I consider that it will undoubtedly increase the relative importance of air power.

The new field of atomic energy has introduced a situation which will require increased attention being paid to aeronautical research. This research will be imperative if the R.C.A.F. is to keep in line with changing conditions and —by the pooling of research findings—abreast with the developments in the specialized field of aviation.

With this in mind a division of research and development has been established within the force, which works in close cooperation with the other services and the National Research Council.

One of the most important fields of research for which Canada is especially suited is in the sphere of cold weather operations. Much experimental work was carried on in this direction during the war period, and it will be continued in the days of peace. Information gained in this way is not only valuable to the service but is of benefit to civil aviation generally.

It would perhaps be of interest to hon. members to learn of the work at present being carried on by one of the R.C.A.F. units known as the radio wave propagation unit.

Canada's proximity to the north pole and its consequent position in the auroral region carries with it not only the advantage of being the centre of global airways, but also the disadvantage of giving the dominion a condition involving certain radio black-out spots. This condition is peculiar to Canada. The danger of these black-out spots to navigation can readily be appreciated. In an endeavour to combat this condition a radio wave propagation unit to forecast workable radio frequencies is now in operation. The research is being carried out, and will be continued, to determine the effect of the auroral zone, and to adjust predictions accordingly. Ionospheric recording units, by means similar to radar, record hourly the conditions affecting radio transmissions in the ionospheric layers, that is the space stretching from 40 to 260 miles above the earth's surface. This data is correlated with that of actual operating conditions and analysed. By these means predictions of workable frequencies may be made so that contact may be maintained on all wireless circuits at all times.

As a result it will be possible to ensure the most efficient use of equipment and radio facilities. The importance of this service in the saving of personnel, ships and aircraft cannot be overemphasized.

There is one particular division of the R.C.A.F. of which I want to make special mention, and that is the Women's Division.

While no decision has as yet been reached as to the employment of women in the permanent air force, I should like to express the appreciation of the Department of the outstanding part played by the Women's Division throughout the war.

The Women's Division is the pioneer women's service organization in Canada, and has proved itself equal to every test to which it has been put. Those tests were neither few nor simple. Arduous—and in many cases heavy—work has been undertaken cheerfully, and carried out carefully and efficiently.

Though precluded from flying duties, these women, recruited "so that men might fly" have been of inestimable service to the R.C.A.F. and to Canada. The Department of National Defence for Air joins all of Canada in saying "Thank you" for a job magnificently done.

Pending the determination of the composition of the permanent air force an interim force has been authorized, covering the period to September, 1947. For this force, which will operate under active service status, volunteers are being accepted both from serving personnel and from those who have been transferred to the reserve.

This interim force in addition to providing personnel for our occupation squadrons and home establishment, will also be used as a proving ground for personnel. These two years will give our officers an opportunity to evaluate the fitness of personnel for the peacetime role of the R.C.A.F. and at the same time enable those who join to decide if they wish to make a career in the service.

While persons who do not elect to serve in this interim force will not be barred from appointment to the permanent force, those who do enroll will be in a favourable position for permanent appointment.

In presenting the cash requirements for the R.C.A.F. for the current year, it will be seen that the cessation of hostilities has enabled me to revise my previous estimates and to make material reductions below the requirements for the previous year.

As compared with the sum of over $1,090,000,000 voted for the last fiscal year, the requirement this year is slightly over $598,400,000, or a decrease of 45·4 per cent.

The major saving is made in the commitment for the maintenance of overseas squadrons, where there is a reduction of over $216,000,000.

A comparative statement of cash requirements for the last fiscal year and for this year has been prepared and is available for members of the house.

While, with the coming of peace, reduction in the strength of the R.C.A.F. becomes inevitable, the same spirit of initiative and enterprise within the service will continue to maintain the high standard of performance which is characteristic of the Royal Canadian Air Force.

ROYAL CANADIAN AIR FORCE ESTIMATES—1945-1946

Comparative Statement of Cash Requirements 1945-1946 to Cash Voted in the Fiscal Year 1944-1945

Item	Cash requirements 1945-1946	Cash voted 1944-1945	Decrease
1. Civil salaries and wages	$ 12,094,320	$ 22,478,709	$ 10,384,389
2. Pay and allowances	269,437,334	323,315,774	53,878,440
3. Travel, transportation and freight	23,912,775	27,345,330	3,432,555
4. Construction, purchase, repairs and operating expenses of properties	26,832,427	57,439,838	30,607,411
5. Personnel supplies and services	15,061,674	38,515,252	23,453,578
6. Communications, signals and wireless equipment	16,724,519	34,654,365	17,929,846
7. Ammunition and bombs	10,487,068	18,175,000	7,687,932
8. Mechanical transport and marine craft	2,451,532	7,026,713	4,575,181
9. Fuel costs for aircraft, M.T., and marine craft	24,347,379	19,892,038	Inc. 4,455,341
10. Aircraft, engines and spares, including overhauls	71,881,105	188,947,545	117,066,440
11. Miscellaneous stores and equipment	6,245,000	15,992,000	9,747,000
12. Flying training contracts	1,000,000	29,345,667	28,345,667
13. Maintenance of overseas squadrons	129,018,454	345,664,964	216,646,510
14. Sundries	4,132,067	8,981,443	4,849,376
	$613,625,654	$1,137,774,638	$524,148,984
Less estimated recoverable in respect of training for United Kingdom	15,138,538	47,774,638	32,636,100
	$598,487,116	$1,090,000,000	$491,512,884

And now, Mr. Chairman, with your permission I should like to table a list of honours and awards to members of the R.C.A.F. and a list of decorations that have been won throughout the war.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): I wonder if it would be the wish of hon. members that this be included in *Hansard,* with unanimous consent?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Yes.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): The list is as follows:

Honours and Decorations Awarded to Canadians from the Outbreak of War to 15th September, 1945

	R.C.A.F.	Canadians in R.A.F.	Total
Air Force Cross	337	18	355
Bar to Air Force Cross	1	...	1
Air Force Medal	41	1	42
Associate of the Royal Red Cross	11	...	11
British Empire Medal	187	1	188
Commander of the Order of the British Empire	25	2	27
Commendation	235	...	235
Companion of the Order of the Bath	18	4	22
Conspicuous Gallantry Medal (Flying)	12	...	12
Distinguished Conduct Medal	1	...	1
Distinguished Flying Cross	3,481	196	3,677
Bar to Distinguished Flying Cross	181	26	207
Distinguished Flying Medal	484	24	508
Bar to Distinguished Flying Medal	...	1	1
Distinguished Service Cross	...	1	1
Distinguished Service Order	66	16	82
Bar to Distinguished Service Order	6	2	8
George Cross	4	1	5
George Medal	17	1	18
Knight of the Order of the British Empire	...	1	1
Member of the Order of the British Empire	150	2	152
Mentioned in Dispatches	1,630	49	1,679
Military Cross	3	2	5
Military Medal	1	...	1
Officer of the Order of the British Empire	52	3	55
Victoria Cross	1	1	2

Honours and Decorations Awarded to Canadians from the Outbreak of War to 15th September, 1945—*Conc.*

	R.C.A.F.	Canadians in R.A.F.	Total
Belgian Croix de Guerre 1940	1	...	1
Belgian Military Cross, 1st Class	1	...	1
Czechoslovakian Medal for Valour	1	...	1
Czechoslovakian Military Cross	2	1	3
Czechoslovakian Order of the White Lion, 2nd Class	3	...	3
Czechoslovakian Order of the White Lion, 3rd Class	2	...	2
Czechoslovakian Order of the White Lion, 4th Class	4	...	4
French Croix de Guerre	60	...	60
French Croix de Guerre Etoile D'Argent	1	...	1
French Croix de Guerre avec Etoile D'Argent and F.F.I. Emblem	1	...	1
French Legion of Honour	1	...	1
Grand Officers Cross of Polonia Restituta	2	...	2
Greek Air Force Cross	1	...	1
Greek Distinguished Service Medal	1	...	1
King Haakon VII Commemoration Medal	3	...	3
Netherlands Bronze Cross	7	...	7
Netherlands Bronze Lion	1	...	1
Norway Medal for Valour	6	...	6
Polish "Virtuti Militari", 5th Class	...	1	1
Polonia Restituta, 4th Class	...	1	1
Russian Medal for Valour	1	...	1
U.S. Army Air Medal	23	...	23
U.S. Army Air Medal and Oak Leaf Cluster	19	...	19
U.S. Distinguished Flying Cross	14	...	14
U.S. Legion of Merit (Commander)	3	...	3
U.S. Legion of Merit (Legionnaire)	1	...	1
U.S. Purple Heart Medal	1	...	1
U.S. Silver Star	2	1	3
U.S. Soldier Medal	1	...	1
Totals	7,107	356	7,463

Awards to Members of the R.C.A.F. subsequent to the list tabled on 4th April, 1945

Military Cross

Number — Rank — Name — Address

C12166, F/L Avery, G. H., 114 Stanley Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

J7810, F/L Johnson, R. G., 505 Stella Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Distinguished Service Order

C1086, A/W/C Bannock, R., 12320-67th St., Edmonton, Alta.

J5056, W/C Grant, F. G., 614 Elbow Dr., Calgary, Alta.

J25802, A/S/L Hall, J. T., 516-15th Ave. West, Calgary, Alta.

J12199, A/S/L Klersy, W., 14 Harcroft Rd., Toronto, Ont.

J41167, F/O Mooney, J. F., R.R. No. 3, Essex, Ont.

C1639, S/L Mussells, C. H., 558 Lansdowne Ave., Westmount, Que.

J16164, A/F/L Smith, E. W., Metis Beach, P.Q.

C827, W/C Waddell, R.C.A., Box 1055, Peterborough, Ont.

J4688, S/L Watts, J. V., 404 Hunter St. W., Hamilton, Ont.

Bar to Distinguished Service Order

J5022, W/C Keefer, G. C., 167 Euston St., Charlottetown, P.E.I.

[Mr. C. W. G. Gibson.]

2nd Bar to Distinguished Service Order

C1399, G/C Fauquier, J. E., Ardvor, Rockcliffe Park, Ottawa, Ont.

Member of the Order of the British Empire

J88659, P/O Goldstraw, H. E., 438 Dubuc St., Winnipeg, Man.

J43624, F/O Lynde, C. E., 320-14th St. S., Lethbridge, Alta.

C3592, A/S/L Roth, A. N., 786 King St., London, Ont.

J18199, F/O Wheler, T. R., 61 Pine Crescent, Toronto, Ont.

Distinguished Flying Cross

J88226, P/O Adams, N. T., Sydney River, Cape Breton, N.S.

R158333, WO2 Allan, W. E., 309 Cook Rd., Brighouse, Vancouver, B.C.

J89069, P/O Allison, H. D. C., Princeton, B.C.

J15004, F/L Alverson, J. R., 516 Wardlaw Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

J86228, F/O Anderson, C. H., 891 Eve St., Belize, British Honduras.

J23911, A/F/L Anderson, D. R., 20 Fairview Ave., Toronto, Ont.

J88645, P/O Anderson, L. G., Lacedena, Sask.

J4428, S/L Anderson, W. G., Union Point, Man.

J92447, P/O Anderson, W. L., Southey, Sask.

J19906, F/O Andrews, F. J., 65 Golden Ave., South Porcupine, Ont.

J36118, F/O Angus, J. R., 1676 W. 12th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Distinguished Flying Cross—*Con.*

Number — Rank — Name — Address

J4554, A/W/C Annan, D. B., 27 Hazel Ave., Hamilton, Ont.
J21402, F/L Appleby, A. W. (BEM), Sand Point, Ont.
J11286, F/L Archambault, R. F., 376 Slater St., Ottawa, Ont.
J87608, F/L Armstrong, F.F., 861-5th Ave., Owen Sound, Ont.
J92448, P/O Armstrong, L. G., 32 Canterbury St., Ingersoll, Ont.
J38580, F/O Arne, I. C., 609-7th Ave., Saskatoon, Sask.
J90157, P/O Arnill, W. R., Dundalk, Ont.
J21404, F/L Arnold, C. K., Washington Hospital, Penna., U.S.A.
J27547, F/O Atkinson, J. H., 35 Stanley St., St. Thomas, Ont.
J87838, P/O Atkinson, W. C., Minnedosa, Man.
J35890, F/O Austen, N. L., 71 Floyd Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J21376, F/L Austenson, O. H., Viscount, Sask.
J8939, F/L Austin, W. R., 323 Laura Ave., Sudbury, Ont.
J93007, P/O Bagnell, R. E., 300 Watson St., West, Saint John, N.B.
J93382, P/O Baird, T. Mc., 262 Herbert St., Waterloo, Ont.
J87677, F/O Baker, W. E., 1176 Pacific St., Vancouver, B.C.
J88133, F/O Baptiste, F. J., Roblin, Man.
J89679, P/O Barbeau, J. P. E., 212 Guigues St., Ottawa, Ont.
J86279, F/O Barber, T. V., 127 Rumsey Rd., Toronto, Ont.
J89012, P/O Barber, W. P., 233 Wanless Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J5983, F/L Barker, R. B., 2011 Larch St., Vancouver, B.C.
J25042, F/O Barr, D. W., 1 Hans Rd., Knights Bridge, London, S.W. Eng.
J29213, A/F/L Barr, V. L., Bengough, Sask.
J37519, F/O Barrett, A. R. B., 310 Emerald St. N., Hamilton, Ont.
J36201, F/O Barron, G. A. H., Lewis St., Hespeler, Ont.
J23044, F/L Bartlett, F. R., 5376 Notre Dame De Grace Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
J13606, F/L Barton, P. S., 415 Masson St., Oshawa, Ont.
J23370, F/L Bascom, S. A., 225 Dunvegan Rd., Toronto, Ont.
J26116, A/F/L Bateman, W. M., E-2 Hillsboro Court, Nashville, Tenn., USA, c/o C. A. Pitts Const. Co., King St., Toronto, Ont.
J27670, F/O Baxter, F. D., 395 Simcoe St., Winnipeg, Man.
J88661, P/O Beare, R. G., 306 Bleeker Ave., Belleville, Ont.
J14471, A/S/L Beatty, J. H., 20 Cherry St., St. Catharines, Ont.
J17330, A/F/L Beauchamp, J. V. Z. N. R., 7056 Christophe-Colomb, Montreal, P.Q.
J24277, F/O Beaudet, J. R. P., Portneuf County, Portneuf, P.Q.
J37765, F/O Beauvais, J. L. R., 3502 Bordeaux, Montreal, P.Q.
J88138, F/O Beckley, D. W. J., Chesley, Ont.
J88676, A/F/O Beeby, T. J., 1006-5th St., Saskatoon, Sask.
J27527, F/O Begg, G. H. K., 336 East 46th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
J24424, F/O Bell, G. W., 169 Kingswood Rd., Toronto, Ont.
J13401, F/L Bendixsen, J., 32 Washington Sq., New York City, U.S.A.
J93505, P/O Benoit, J. P. R. C., 38 Devon Rd., Toronto, Ont.
J22891, F/L Benton, C. B., 409 Buffalo St., Fulton, N.Y., U.S.A.
J93253, P/O Benton, I. D., Perth, Ont.
J8432, F/L Best, S., 742 Dundas St., Woodstock, Ont.
J28345, F/O Biddell, F. H., 2207 Angus St., Regina, Sask.
J28036, F/O Bigelow, W. J., 66 Third Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
J29887, F/O Bishop, G. R., 414 Van Norman St., Port Arthur, Ont.
J92591, P/O Bishop, H. G., 7 North St., Glace Bay, N.S.
J86219, F/O Bittner, I. J., Forest Gate, Sask.
J3476, W/C Black, C. M., Main St., Yarmouth, N.S., Box 270
J89826, P/O Black, D. R., 4198 Marcil Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
J35794, F/O Black, W. L., Bracebridge, Ont.
J25281, F/L Blake, V. J., 216 Mandaville St., St. James, Man.
J9940, F/L Blakeney, W. T., R.C.A.F. Overseas Headquarters.
R169265, WO2 Blancher, C. F. L., 373 Brock St., Kingston, Ont.
R88244, WO Bliss, O. L., 208 Marsh St., New Glasgow, N.S.
J88289, P/O Bluethner, P. D., 19 Tullis Drive, Toronto, Ont.
J13413, F/L Boak, W. A., 2125 Osler St., Regina, Sask.
J14759, F/L Bockus, D. E., 53 Harvard Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J93619, P/O Bodie, W., 212—31st N.W., Calgary, Alta.
C10557, A/W/C Bolduc, R. L., P.O. Box 620, Dauphin, Man.
J89486, P/O Bolen, J. E., Kennilworth, Ont.
J37133, F/O Bolton, F. B., 2295 W. 40th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
J29126, F/O Bonnell, D. F., 709 Westbrook St., Portland, Maine, U.S.A.
J91070, P/O Boon, A. E., Ignace, Ont.
J11769 F/L Booth, K. G., 1803 Kitchener St., Vancouver, B.C.
J12057, F/L Borland, D. S., 957 W. 6th St., Erie, Penna., U.S.A.
J26027, F/O Bouchard, J. A. C., 408 Hinton Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
J88180, F/L Bourne, A. W., 224½ James St. W., Hamilton, Ont.
P36836, F/O Bourne, R. J. T., 237 Fulton Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J89798, P/O Bouzek, J. V., 330 Second Ave., Prince Rugert, B.C.
R169371, WO2, Bova, G., 278 Water Street, Ottawa, Ont.
J36299, F/O Bowen, L. C., 2518 Rosemount Blvd., Montreal, P.Q.
J35177, F/O Bowhay, R. W., Three Hills, Alta.
J29984, F/O Boyce, W. A., 67 Grand Ave., London, Ont.
J86510, A/F/L Boyd, L. F., 4454 Oxford Ave., N.D.G., Montreal, P.Q.
J7906, A/S/L Boyd, M. D., Clarkson, Ont.
J13615, F/L Boyle, J. J., 238 Pall Mall St., London, Ont.
J12027, F/L Bradford, C. R., 216 Beaverbrook St., Winnipeg, Man.
C18598, F/O Bradford, J. W., 137 Sherman Ave., S., Hamilton, Ont.
J19443, F/O Brady, B. L., Ponoka, Alta.
J15499, F/L Brady, C. S., 175 Glencairn Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Distinguished Flying Cross—*Con.*

Number — Rank — Name — Address

J35310, F/O Brassard, J. A., Strickland, Ont.
J92546, A/F/L Bray, J. S., 270 Logan St., St. Lambert, P.Q.
J88588, F/O Brearley, J. E., 331 Kingswood Rd., Toronto, Ont.
C1449, F/L Bricker, C. D., Jr., Grenfell, Sask.
J88043, A/F/O Briggs, W. W., 8 Gamma St., Long Branch, Ont.
J28631, F/O Brimicombe, V. E., Admiral Rock, Hants County, N.S.
J92491, P/O Brittain, W. G., 206 Winslow St., W., Saint John, N.B.
J28286, A/F/L Brittain, W. B., MacDonald College, Ste. Anne de Bellevue, P.Q.
J25816, A/F/L Britton, W. B., Eston, Sask.
J92578, P/O Brown, A. K., Midnapore, Alta.
J26128, A/F/L Brown, D. A., Sutton, P.Q.
J27188, F/O Brown, D. S., 1909 Pilette Rd., Windsor, Ont.
J9387, F/L Brown, G. S., 3509 Grey Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
J16839, F/O Brown, N., 40 Rathnelly Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J21136, F/L Brown, R. A., 10 Pryer Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J90481, F/O Brown, R. N. M., 25 Kilbarry Rd., Toronto, Ont.
J18186, A/S/L Brown, W. F., Hepworth, Ont.
J6844, F/L Brown, W. H., 40 Winston Ave., Amherst, N.S.
J26970, F/L Browne, A. W., 125 Chestnut Ave., Hamilton, Ont.
J26394, A/F/L Brownnell, G. J., Port McNicholl, Ont.
J29136, F/O Bruneau, A. A., 12 Bellevue Ave., Westmount, Montreal 6, P.Q.
C1066, F/L Brunnelle, J. P. M. A., 368 De L'Epee Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
J21120, F/L Bryan, A. J. A., 924 Aldama Sur Monterry NL, Mexico.
J17141, F/L Brydon, N. R., Waterville, Kings County, N.S.
J19782, F/O Bryson, C. W., Ormstown, P.Q.
J87399, F/L Buchan, W. J., Southey, Sask.
C13128, A/S/L Buchanan, D. L., 124 Maple St., Guelph, Ont.
J21334, F/L Buck, W. M., 79 Cowan Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J88233, F/O Budeau, D. H., 756 Broadway Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
J11866, F/L Bue, R. S., 11142 - 97th St., Edmonton, Alta.
C89491, F/O Bulbeck, A. A., 349 Balliol St., Toronto, Ont.
J27422, F/O Bullen, F. W., 587 Bayview Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J36278, F/O Bullock, H. G., 37 McCamus Ave., Kirkland Lake, Ont.
J26783, F/O Burch, J., 2366 E. 3rd Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
J23035, F/L Burden, P. E., 485 Charlotte St., Fredericton, N.B.
C265. W/C Burgess, C. W., Port Credit, Ont.
J35827, F/O Burnett, W. J. N., 1875 W. 10th, Vancouver, B.C.
J25789, A/F/L Burns, G. M., 236 Glasgow St., Kitchener, Ont.
J93617, P/O Burns, J. C., 119 Bower St., Alvaston Derby, England.
J35215, F/O Burns, N. A., 2200 Queen St. E., Toronto, Ont.
J28904, F/O Butt, L., 1819 Glenholme Ave., Niagara Falls, Ont.
J36276, F/O Butterwick, G. F., Drumheller, Alta.

[Mr. C. W. G. Gibson.]

J28308, F/O Byrnes, J. M., Tillsonburg, Ont.
J13486, F/L Callaghan, T. C., 108 Bloor St., Sudbury, Ont.
J7456, F/L Cameron, W. C., Lumsden, Sask.
J93772, P/O Campbell, A., Box 147, Keewatin, Ont.
J90742, P/O Campbell, A. E., 2240 Kingsway, Vancouver, B.C.
J15297, F/L Campbell, J. D. W., 70 Wentworth St., Dartmouth, N.S.
J85654, P/O Campbell, M. J., 39 Duke St., Glace Bay, N.S.
J87870, F/O Campbell, W. R., Box 444, Kapuskasing, Ont.
J7985, F/L Camsell, G. C., 143 Leighton Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
J90202, P/O Cardiff, J. A., Cymric, Sask.
J16922, A/F/L Carley, L. A., 908-5th Ave. North, Saskatoon, Sask.
J39956, F/O Carpenter, J. H., R.R. No. 1, Masson, P.Q.
J37846, A/F/L Carr, J., Morrisburg, Ont.
J28723, A/F/L Carson, J. N., 116 Orchard View Blvd., Toronto, Ont.
J25860, A/F/L Cartwright, J. E., 18 Condor Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J85843, F/O Cembrowski, J., Box 703, West Selkirk, Man.
J16556, A/F/L Chalcraft, W. R., 43 Fairbairn Ave., Worcester, England.
J37817, F/O Chambers, E. S., 2235 E. 24th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
J86499, F/O Chance, D. G., 47 Delaware Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
J11763, A/S/L Chapman, T. H., 246 Garden Avenue, Toronto, Ont.
J85376, F/O Chaput, J. G. A., Box 22, St. Adolphe, Man.
J87460, F/L Chartier, C. A., 27 Elgin St., Granby, P.Q.
J29855, F/O Chmilar, W. A., St. Paul, Alta.
J6953, F/L Clark, E. F. J., 257 Inglewood Dr., Toronto, Ont.
J92980, P/O Clark, J. H., Box 9, St. Germain, Man.
J93256, P/O Clark, L. W., Morrisburg, Ont.
J93656, P/O Clark, R. F., 37 Main St., South Porcupine, Ont.
J93471, P/O Clarke, R. G., 4 Lakeside Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
J90982, P/O Clifton, J. W., No. 75 Britannia Beach, B.C.
J38184, F/O Codd, P., Suite 6, Frost Block, Moose Jaw, Sask.
J17728, F/O Coles, N. J., 19 Gladstone Ave., Smiths Falls, Ont.
J26344, F/O Coley, J. E., 118 - 6th Ave. South, Kenora, Ont.
J8648, A/S/L Collier, J. E., 134 Pottergate, Norwich, Norfolk, England.
J7819, A/S/L Collins, A. S., R.R. No. 2, Peterboro, Ont.
J29582, A/F/L Collison, H. J., 18 Cherrywood Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J21125, F/L Conlin, J. B., 295 Alfred St., Kingston, Ont.
J35805, F/O Conlin, W. G., 2308 Cameron St., Regina, Sask.
J29976, F/O Connell, C. L., Warren, Man.
J20157, F/O Conway, J. W. H., East Angus, P.Q.
J12958, F/L Cook, E. T., 18 Renfrew Bldg., Calgary, Alta.
J28702, F/O Cope, J. L., Sioux Lookout, Ont.
J88623, F/O Coppinger, J. J., 12028 - 93rd St., Edmonton, Alta.
J88248 P/O Corbett, W. D., Edward, Alta.
J29080, F/O Cormier, P. J., 31 Highbury Rd., St. Edmunds, Suffolk, England.

Distinguished Flying Cross—*Con.*

Number — Rank — Name — Address

J90498, P/O Cornell, W. R., 104 Earl St., Kitchener, Ont.
J24917, F/O Cote, L. P. M. R., 22 rue Deligny, Quebec, P.Q.
J27630, A/F/L Coulter, L. E., Prairie Grove, Man.
J36828, F/O Covert, F. M., c/o W. H. Covert, Mt. Amelia, Dartmouth, N.S.
J85095 F/O Cowan, H. H., 368 Winnett Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J4106, S/L Cowans, R., 1118 Elgin Terrace, Montreal, P.Q.
J92193, P/O Cox, G. A., Nobleford, Alta.
J21810, F/O Cox, W. F., Victoria Ave., Fernie, B.C.
J36344, F/O Coyne, J. M. E., 220 Yale Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
J15666, F/L Craton, J. D. C., 77 E. Dragon Parade, Narrogate, Yorkshire, England.
J8382, F/L Creeper, J. E., R.R. No. 4, Owen Sound, Ont.
C22655, S/L Crosby, R. G., 1529-W-33rd Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
J28225, F/O Cross, J. E., Leamington, Ont.
J22104, F/L Crowe, C. N., 149 Stewart St., Peterboro, Ont.
J28265, F/O Cruikshank, L. S., 154 Oak St., Winnipeg, Man.
J5065, F/L Cull, R. H., Seba Beach, Alta.
J35535, F/O Culley, J. E., 96 Dawson St., Toronto, Ont.
J28886, F/O Cummings, R. S., Britannia Bay, Ont.
J9582, F/L Currie, L. L., Bridgewater, N.S.
J25295, F/O Currie, N. E., Starbuck, Man.
J88935, P/O Currie, R. V., Cusack St., Woodside, Halifax, N.S.
J20080, F/L Cutting, R. J., 64 Union St., Saint John, N.B.
J88263, F/O Dale, M. C. J., R.R. No. 1, Westboro, Ont.
C23562, F/L Davidson, M. W., Barnwell, Alta.
J28937, A/F/L Davidson, R. H., 122 Cambridge St., Victoria, B.C.
J19015, F/L Davies, A. C., 137 Highland Ave., St. Catharines, Ont.
C1459, A/S/L Day, R. W. R., 567 Burrard St., Vancouver, B.C.
J13844, F/L Deane, P. K., Port Simpson, B.C.
J17641, S/L Decourcy, T. J., 373 Partington Ave., Windsor, Ont.
J85739, F/O Delalla, J. P., 4979 Prince Albert St., Vancouver, B.C.
C819, W/C Delaney, P. S., Eureka, N.S.
J92283, P/O Delorie. A. H., 277 Binns St., Trail, B.C.
J36365, F/L De Mille, A. H., 108 Lascelles Blvd., Toronto, Ont.
J29072, A/F/L Derychere, L. R., 1872 Factoria Ave., Windsor, Ont.
R109929, W/O Deschaine, G. E., 11 Florian Rd., Putney London SW 15.
J15820, F/O Desroches, J. O. L., 2470 Rosemount Blvd., Montreal, P.Q.
J18859. F/O Dill, R., 122 Broad St., Saint John, N.B.
J21124, F/L Dinsdale, W. G., 461-11th St., Brandon, Man.
J25776, F/O Dix, W. F., Scarborough P.O., Ont.
J89226, F/O Doody, R. F., 387 Gloucester St., Ottawa, Ont.
J22827, F/L Donovan, J. H., 152 Spadina Rd., Toronto, Ont.

J85502, P/O Dorsey, E. W., 144 Wentworth St. South, Hamilton, Ont.
J38817, F/O Drewery, J. R., Lemonville, Ont.
J87988, P/O Dubas, J., Narol P.O., Man.
J89754, F/O Duggan, J., 89 Oak Park, Toronto, Ont.
C1712, F/L Dunn, E. S., 1327-15th Ave. W., Calgary, Alta.
J85003, F/O Dunn, J. E., Ochre River, Ont.
J89014, P/O Dunn, R., 2849 Highbury St., Vancouver, B.C.
J13843, F/L Dunphy, R. J., Ste. 1, Wardlow Apts., Winnipeg, Man.
J86579, P/O Dunster, B. F., 121 Eccles St., Ottawa, Ont.
J86070, A/F/O Durrant, F. G., 794½ Bank St., Ottawa, Ont.
J23584, F/L Dworkin, D. L., 824-5th Ave W., Calgary, Alta.
C12593, F/L Dyck, A. L., Borden, Sask.
J26114, A/F/L Ecclestone, G. A., 2279 Girouard Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
J26767, A/F/L Edmondson, W. R., 5A Hampson Court, 47 Kennedy St., Winnipeg.
J26275, F/L Edwards, F. W., 31 Larocque St., Sherbrooke, P.Q.
J28233, F/O Elkin, N. B., 845 Alder Ave., Moose Jaw, Sask.
J87963, F/O Ellis, D. R., 4806 Grosvenor Ave., Westmount, P.Q.
J18370, F/O Ellison, P. P., 820-10th St., Saskatoon, Sask.
J9436, F/L Ellson, K. I., 3115 Westmount Blvd., Montreal, P.Q.
J24499, F/L Elviss, J. A., Box 393, Macleod, Alta.
J27769, A/F/L Emmott, A. H., 47 Railway St., Downham Market, Norfolk.
R196577, W/O 2 Erickson, E. W., Watrous, Sask.
J15118, F/L Etienne, P. E., 1635 Chambly St., Montreal 4, P.Q.
J36191, F/O Evans, F. W., 310 Durie St., Toronto, Ont.
J6363, F/L Exel, F. L., 1907 S.W. Marine Dr., Vancouver, B.C.
J29669, F/O Fallon, F.C., 504 Wellington St., London, Ont.
J90896, P/O Farrell, L., Bay du Nord, Newfoundland.
J23013, F/L Farren, J. N., 248 Guilford St. Saint John, N.B.
J22867, F/L Fawcett, R. J., 75 Evelyn Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J5789, A/S/L Fentiman, A. E., 129 Iona St., Ottawa, Ont.
J92240, P/O Ferguson, S., 567 Third Ave., Niagara Falls, Ont.
J25761, F/O Fernie, J. K., 54 Fern Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J29885, A/F/L Fidler, G. T. J., New House Farm, Farnham Knarisboro York, England.
J21583, F/L Field, R. B. T., 146 Albertus Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J88425, A/F/L Fikis, W., 416 Adam St., Port Arthur, Ont.
J14030, F/L Finley, H. R., 3940 Cote Des Nieges Rd., Montreal, Que.
J14105, F/L Firth, L. K., 1905 B. Davie St., Victoria, B.C.
J89475, F/O Fisk, J. C., Vermilion, Alta.
J37155, F/O Fitzgerald, H. A., 169 Foster Ave., Belleville, Ont.
J18515, F/O Flanagan, E. W., 187 Queen St., Chatham, Ont.
J87622, F/O Flynn, H. P., Port Alice, B.C.

Distinguished Flying Cross—*Con.*

Number — Rank — Name — Address

J18418, F/O Fontaine, J. L. J., 5502-13th Ave., Rosemount, Montreal, Que.

J86735, F/O Forbes, R. A., 575 Hatch St., Woodstock, Ont.

J49321, F/O Ford, T. F., 1412 Joliet Ave., Calgary, Alta.

J25490, F/O Ford, T. H., Lacombe, Alta.

J37510, F/O Ford, W. H., 1542 Robinson St., Regina, Sask.

J15236, S/L Forman, J. M., 143 MacLaren St., Ottawa, Ont.

J17091, P/O Foster, E. A. N., 269 Laurier Ave., Toronto, Ont.

J25180, A/F/L Foster, G. E., Sub P.O. 23, Edmonton, Alta.

J10957, F/L Foster, L., First St., Grimsby Beach, Ont.

J28901, F/O Foster, W. R., Schomberg, Ont.

C26866, F/O Francis, J. P. W., R.R. No. 2, Battleford, Sask.

J88177, P/O Francis, N. A., 492 Blvd. du Havre, Valleyfield, Que.

J25781, F/O Frankling, G. R., 1320 Victoria Ave., Windsor, Ont.

J5046, F/L Frankling, S. R., 126-3rd Ave., Yorkton, Sask.

J20365, F/L Franks, H. G., 45 Lawrence Ave. E., Toronto, Ont.

J90453, A/F/O Fraser, J. W., Fraserdale Farms, Concord, Ont.

J88003, F/O Fraser, K. V., 271 Florence St., Ottawa, Ont.

J89414, P/O Fraser, M. E., Ste 115 Balmoral Blk., Jasper Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

J86667, F/O Free, G. H., 109 Niagara St., Hamilton, Ont.

J15228, S/L Freeman, D. B., 1005-13th Ave. W., Calgary, Alta.

J40213, F/O French, C. D., 723 Upper Lansdowne Ave., Westmount, Que.

J27859, F/L Friedman, L. A., 1165-3rd Ave. N.W., Moose Jaw, Sask.

J11276, F/L Friedlander, J. B., 3 Crepin Ave., Chateauguay Basin, Que.

J86102, F/O Frost, D. P., 324 Elm St., Winnipeg, Man.

J23399, F/L Fulton, W. H., Alcomdale, Alta.

J23072, F/L Futer, T. R., Port Kells, B.C.

J27906, A/F/L Gadd, K. V., 467 King St., Peterborough, Ont.

J92680, P/O Gallant, J. U. E., 145 Englefield Rd. Islington, London N.I., England.

J17445, F/L Gardiner, W. A., Box 372, Sydney Mines, N.S.

J11036, F/L Garvin, R. J., Estevan, Sask.

R153351, WO2 Gates, P. L., Aylesford, N.S.

J27002, F/L Gagnon, J. A. E., R.A.F. Stn. Llandwrog, England.

J29071, F/O Gault, J. A., 1227 Second Ave. N.W., Moose Jaw, Sask.

J24152, F/O Geddes, E. J., 2022 Quebec St., Regina, Sask.

J86910, F/O George, C. A., 306 Jamieson Ave. E., Kildonan, Winnipeg, Man.

J89229, P/O Gibson, D. R., Bevan, B.C.

J13360, F/L Gifford, C. G., 3640 Hutchison St., Apt. 3, Montreal, Que.

J28892, F/O Gilbert, G. L., 31 Hawthorne Ave., Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.

J21229, A/S/L Gilbertson, F. S., 33 Elmsthorpe Ave., Toronto, Ont.

J46845, F/O Giles, H. T., 1328-8th Ave., Calgary, Alta.

[Mr. C. W. G. Gibson.]

J87998, F/O Gilpin, E. C., Viking Alta.

J38706, F/O Gladding, F., 288 Brunswick St., Stratford, Ont.

J28485, F/L Glass, W. T., 203 Quebec St., Victoria, B.C.

J37162, F/O Glover, W. V. A., 612 Chamberlain St., Peterboro, Ont.

C17521, F/O Godfrey, W. H., 165 Oakwood Ave., Toronto, Ont.

J4242, S/L Goldberg, D., 28 Kent St., Hamilton, Ont.

J12557, F/L Gonyea, D. C., 239-21st Ave. N.W., Calgary, Alta.

J8613, F/L Goodman, K. S., R.A.F. Stn., Chivenor N., Devon, Eng.

J16633, F/L Gordon, D. C., 3612-16th Ave. W., Vancouver, B.C.

J37537, F/O Gordon, F. B., Marcella St., Haileybury, Ont.

J7908, F/L Gordon, M. J., 10124-107 Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

J27198, A/F/L Gordon, N. G., 22 Flinn St., Halifax, N.S.

J28247, F/O Gosling, D., 105 Alfred Ave., New Westminster, B.C.

J28237, F/L Gouchey, H. H., Sexsmith, Alta.

J29088, F/O Graham, M. G., Dutton, Ont.

J88170, F/O Gran, J. C. R., Meadow Lake, Sask.

J86990, F/O Granda, A. H., 7220 Wiseman Ave., Montreal 1, P.Q.

J10110, F/L Grant, F. J., 126 South Court St., Port Arthur, Ont.

J27189, A/F/L Grant, R. B., Stittsville, Ont.

J92382, P/O Grant, R. S., 21 Pine St., Weston, Ont.

J18650, F/O Gray, B. B., 1484 W. 10th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

J35291, A/F/L Gray, C. B., Viking, Alta.

J28504, F/O Gray, G. H., 1269 St. Patrick St., Victoria, B.C.

J26469, F/O Gray, J. A. D., Port Credit, Ont.

R198884, W/O2 Gray, J. G., Viking, Alta.

J24531, F/O Green, P. C., 315 Eleanor St., London, Ont.

J87391, F/O Gregoire, L. J. R., 2044-W-5th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

J19961, F/O Griffiths, W. F., 968 Balmoral Rd., Victoria, B.C.

J27419, F/O Griffith, W. J., 21 Bayfield Cres., Toronto, Ont.

J92387, P/O Grime, F. G., 85 Malvern Ave., Toronto, Ont.

J91034, P/O Guilbeault, J. J. J., 4230 Delanaudiere St., Montreal, P.Q.

J18397, F/O Guinn, M. W., 2119 Angus St., Regina, Sask.

J24140, F/O Guse, J. M., 20 Cameron St. N., Kitchener, Ont.

J89862, P/O Guthrie, W. A., 48 Inkster Blvd., Winnipeg, Man.

J13602, F/L Guttormson, J. K., 1077 Dominion St., Winnipeg, Man.

J27637, F/O Hagar, D. L. R., 244 College St., Port Arthur, Ont.

J20954, F/L Haig, J. D., 73 Chestnut St., Winnipeg, Man.

J16599, F/L Halcro, G. H., 473 Kent St., Ottawa, Ont.

J12193, F/L Hall, D. I., Millikens, Ont.

J17935, F/O Hall, G. A., Box 58, Minitonas, Man.

J14068, A/F/L Hall, W. H., Ste. 23, Harvard Apts., Furby St., Winnipeg, Man.

J13116, F/L Hamm, D. J. T., Box 206, Lunenburg, N.S.

Distinguished Flying Cross—*Con.*

Number — Rank — Name — Address

J35085, F/O Hanley, L. G., 0924 Charlevoix St., Montreal, P. Q.

J27485, F/O Hanson, A. W., 96 Broadway Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

J40921, F/O Harding, H. H., Pleasant St., North Sydney, N. S.

J20841, F/L Hardy, H. J. H., 3253-W-6th Ave., Vancouver, B. C.

J15232, A/S/L Hare, C. E. L., 403 Woodbine Ave., Toronto, Ont.

J86802, F/O Harewood, G. A., 27 First St., Welland, Ont.

J17406, F/O Harrington, J. B., 9856-85th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

J17400, F/O Harris, D. E., 97 Beaconsfield Ave., London, Ont.

J87593, T/F/O Harrison, A. H., Tofield, Alta.

J20203, F/O Harrison, R. S., Pavilion, B. C.

J90792, A/F/O Hart, F. C., 6914 DeLaroche St., Montreal, P. Q.

J90173, P/O Hartford, J. F., Port McNicoll, Ont.

J28134, F/O Hartley, J. R., 431 St. Paul St., Apt. 5, St. Catharines, Ont.

J90546, P/O Hartman, W. H., Kincardine, Ont.

J15896, F/O Hartrick, W. J., 1656 Burnaby St., Vancouver, B. C.

J87012, F/O Harvey, R. G., Hortonville, Kings Co., N. S.

J24818, F/O Harvie, M., 633 Cote St. Antoine, Westmount, P. Q.

J16353, F/L Haslop, G. K. A., 10013-63 Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

J35540, F/O Hastings, A. D., 14 Victoria St. W., Amherst, N. S.

C18638, A/W/C Hatton, R. F., 369½ Wortley Rd., London, Ont.

J25151, A/F/L/ Haus, H. J., Glasgow Lane, R.R. 4., Kitchener, Ont.

J26709, A/F/L Havenscroft, I. E., 66 Albanie St., Mimico, Ont.

J85775, F/O Hawley, H. J., 2234 McIntyre St., Regina, Sask.

J28768, F/O Hayley, D., 4801 28th St., Fairlington, Arlington Co., Virginia, U.S.A.

J88298, P/O Hays, R. M., 38 Comiston St., Oxford, Eng.

J28382, F/O Hazlett, C. C., 433 Mary St., Chilliwack, B.C.

J88849, F/O Hechter, J., 626 Henderson Hwy., Winnipeg, Man.

J85193, F/O Hemsley, J. A., Lashburn, Sask.

J27690, A/F/L Henderson, L. W., Herschel, Sask.

J90879. P/O Henderson, R. P., 3 Westcott St., London, Ont.

J37173, F/O Henderson, W. G., 173 Roxborough St., W., Toronto, Ont.

J14687, F/L Henry, J. C., 823 15th St., Saskatoon, Sask.

J14908, F/L Hepburn, D. T., 67 Courcelette Rd., Toronto, Ont.

J36863, F.O Herbert, R. G., 126 West 11th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

J19175, F/O Hermanson, E. E., Buchanan, Sask.

J27629, F/O Hewetson, H. J., 133 Ave., H, North, Saskatoon, Sask.

J29118, F/L Hicken, H. S., Raymond, Alta.

J36401, F/O Hickey, F. L., 9833 107th St., Edmonton, Alta.

J88264, F/O Hickmott, K. R., R.R. 1, Harrow, Ont.

C18022, F/O Hightower, C. E., Beverley, Alta.

J23838, A/F/L Hill, C. N., 53 Watson Ave., Toronto, Ont.

J89152, P/O Hill, E. C., 421 Mayhill Rd., Glasgow, Scotland.

J29708, F/O Hindle, J. F., 546 Arlington St., Winnipeg, Man.

J6821, S/L Hoare, T. H., 2033 Portage Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

J26079, F/L Hogarth, H. J., Box 294, Jackson's Point, Ont.

J92749, P/O Golstead, C. W., 57 Glenwood Ave., London, Ont.

J11050, F/L Holland, H. E., R.R. 3, Port Mann Rd., New Westminster, B.C.

J25787, F/O Hollowell, R. A., 56 High St., London, Ont.

J86678, F/O Hope, J., Haig Blvd., Lakeview, Ont.

J87285, A/F/O Horne, A., 175 Harbison Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

J92872, P/O Horne, E., Stony Plain, Alta.

R129968, W/O.1 Horner, V. H., 1086 Frances St., London, Ont.

C86575, F/O Horsnell, C. K., 15 Abbotsford Ave., Chateauguay Basin, P.Q.

J88137, F/L Horton, E. L., 43 Patterson Ave., Chatham, Ont.

J27717, F/O Houde, J. J. L. M., 7338 Berri St., Montreal, P.Q.

J14669, F/L House, K. G., 966 Moore St., Preston, Ont.

J10679, F/L Houser, J. H., 362 Herkimer St., Hamilton, Ont.

J27732, A/F/L Houston, R. B., 309 Warren Rd., Toronto, Ont.

J86647, F/O Hrynkiw, W., Viscount, Sask.

J87810, F/O Hubley, R. F., 116 Creighton St., Halifax, N.S.

J25362, F/O Huchala, A. P., Blairmore, Alta.

J90094, P/O Huff, C. C., 45 St. Clair Ave. W., Toronto, Ont.

J87364, F/O Humber, H. J., 1578 South Stanley Ave., Los Angeles (35), Calif., U.S.A.

J37202, F/O Hunka, W., 10718 93 St., Edmonton, Alta.

J88072, F/O Hunt, P., 281 Guilford St., W., Saint John, N.B.

J89308, F/O Hutchins, A. W., c/o Mr. W. A. Herriot, 133 Lakeshore Drive, New Toronto, Toronto 14, Ont.

J93462, P/O Hutton, G. E., 86 Wanstead Ave., Toronto, Ont.

J37118, F/O Hyndman, W. W. B., 474A 7th Ave., Lachine, P.Q.

J88255, P/O Idler, D. R., No. 5, 1922 Stephens St., Vancouver, B.C.

J20146, F/L Inches, D. J., Marks St., St. Stephen, N.B.

J16925, F/L Innes, B. E., 6 Beresford Dr., South Port, Lanc.

J21538, F/L Inverarity, W., c/o Dept. of Pensions, Tudor, Alta.

J9464, F/L Ireland, E. G., 112 Caledona Rd., Toronto, Ont.

J36336, F/O Irvine, R. D., Brigden, Ont.

J88230, P/O Irwin, D.G., Hazeldine, Alta.

R75219, W/O Jack, C. H., Metherill, Sask.

J25696, F/O Jackman, J. M., 24 Heath St., E., Toronto 12, Ont.

J28923, F/O Jackson, E. R., 34 Lanark Ave., Toronto, Ont.

J23816, F/L Jackson, J. I., 3803 West King Edward Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

J27416 F/O Jacobs, S. H., 613 Mary St., Oshawa, Ont.

J26115, F/O James, L. F., Oakwood Corners, R.R. No. 3, Sarnia, Ont.

Distinguished Flying Cross—*Con.*

Number — Rank — Name — Address

R181874, W/O2 James, N. H., 1095 Cartier Avenue, Moose Jaw, Sask.

J11572, F/L Jardine, J. K., 783 Jessie Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

J6996, P/O Jay, D. J., 2112 Hone Ave., Brooklyn, New York City.

J29068, F/O Jeffery, F. E. M., 151-31st St. W., Vancouver, B.C.

J92115, P/O Jensen, B. H., 252 N. Main St., Gloversville, N.Y., U.S.A.

J89320, P/O Jensen, W. T., 1273 Dundas St., London, Ont.

J11309, F/L Jenvey, D. E., 111 Charles St. W., Ingersoll, Ont.

J92646, P/O Jodrell, L. J., 387 Gerrard St. E., Toronto, Ont.

J19041, F/O Johnson, D. A., 510 Brunswick Ave., Toronto, Ont.

J12259, F/L Johnson, F. A., 27 Alexander St., Belleville, Ont.

J23885, F/O Johnson, R. E., 3191 Broadway, Boulder, Colorado, U.S.A.

J27276, F/O Johnson, W. A., Christina Lake Cascade, B.C.

J12690, F/L Johnson, W. M., Apt. "M", 691 Bank St., Ottawa, Ont.

J94516, P/O Johnston, G. S., 615-6th Ave. N., Saskatoon, Sask.

J29368, F/O Jones, C. R., Pembridge, Alta.

J13443, F/L Jones, G. J. L., 1781 Campus Rd., Los Angeles, Calif.

J25886, F/O Jones, H. L., Dinsmore, Sask.

J11550, F/L Jones, R. J., Box 113, Reserve Mines, N.S.

J93755, P/O Jones, R. J., Kindersley, Sask.

J15168, S/L Jones, T. M., 89 West Gore St., Stratford, Ont.

J16847, A/F/L Kagna, L. I., 10169-118 St., Edmonton, Alta.

J27098, A/F/L Kaiser, J. W., Harris, Sask.

J89206, P/O Kanas, P. C., 2044A Yonge St., Toronto, Ont.

J16510, F/L Kaplansky, B. M., 14 Rutherford Ave., Hamilton, Ont.

J17797, F/O Karleff, J. V., 359 Ronesvalles Ave., Toronto, Ont.

J20402, F/L Kazakoff, M., Wadena, Sask.

J85024, P/O Kelly, M. J., 540 Dovercourt Rd., Toronto, Ont.

J28647, F/O Kelly, T. J., 192 Bellefaire Ave., Toronto, Ont.

J37529, F/O Kelly, T. R. C., 219 College St., Port Arthur, Ont.

J36906, F/O Kemp, L. H., Erickson, B.C.

J19578, F/O Kennedy, D. M., 23 Richelier Apts., 418 Claremont Ave., Westmount, Montreal, P.Q.

J38695, F/O Keon, H. J. C., 368-13th St. E., Owen Sound, Ont.

J26103, F/O Kerr, D. J., Smithers, B.C.

J92975, P/O Kerry, I. G., Port Perry, Ont.

J24273, A/F/L Kilgour, G. N., Shawville, Que.

J25207, F/O King, D. G., Box 18, West Fort William, Ont.

J85588, F/O Kingston, W. G., 61 Springhurst, Toronto, Ont.

J88505, F/O Kirby, G. R., 274 E. 39th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

J23788, F/O Kirk, E. E., 524 Church St., Fort Frances, Ont.

J92663, P/O Kluczny, E. G., c/o Mrs. B. R. Kluczny, Winfield, Alta.

[Mr. C. W. G. Gibson.]

J29709, F/O Knox-Leet, E. R., Armdale P.O., Halifax, N.S.

J26685, F/O Krakovsky, M., 426 Markham St., Toronto, Ont.

J92701, P/O Kuczma, H. P., Box 325, Humberstone, Ont.

J35919, F/O Kumsky, F. J., 222 Shamrock St., Sarnia, Ont.

J28515, F/O Kuperman, A., P.O. Box 69, c/o Figes, Tel-Aviv, Palestine.

J89304, P/O Kutyn, M., Edson, Alta.

J27719, F/O Kyte, M. S., 503 Lauder Ave., Toronto, Ont.

J88540, A/F/L Lackman, E. F., 925-6th Ave. W., Calgary, Alta.

J25962, F/O Laflamme, A. J. E., 52A Fortier St., Hull, P.Q.

J11283, F/L Lake, R. G., Box 42, Langstaff, Ont.

J7467, A/S/L Lamont, D. W., R.R. No. 2, Turners, Ont.

J37508, F/O Langley, A. C., 2055 Smith St., Regina, Sask.

J18709, F/O Langlois, J. L., Port Daniel, Centre, Bonaventure Co., P.Q.

J18447, F/O Lansdall, F. C., 1044 King St., Saskatoon, Sask.

J6958, F/L La Porte, J. S. Y. R., 575 Villeray Blvd., Montreal, P.Q.

J8133, F/L Lariviere, J. D. V., 474 Isabella St., Pembroke, Ont.

J85239, F/O Larson, L. E., 2300 Smith St., Regina, Sask.

J37714, F/O Lavallee, L. J., 1251 St. Denis St., Montreal, Apt. 2.

J19574, F/O Lawrence, M. V., 326-4th St. E., Drumheller, Alta.

J24538, F/O Lawrence, R. F., 412 Crawford Ave., Windsor, Ont.

J88063, A/F/L Lawson, J. H., 1527 Angus Dr., Vancouver, B.C.

J92062, P/O Layton, H. C., 541 6th Street, Medicine Hat, Alta.

J92432, P/O Lea, C. N., 1014 River Avenue, Fort William, Ont.

J43893, F/O Leckenby, J. H., 37 Aberdeen Ave., Hamilton, Ont.

J89703, A/F/O Le Cren, H. H., 770 Franklyn St., Nanaimo, B.C.

J12266, A/S/L Ledingham, H. R., 38 Queen's Drive, Weston, Ont.

C911, A/W/C Ledoux, H. C., 3809 Marcil Ave., Montreal, Que.

J19825, F/O Lee, C. B., 57 Beattie Avenue, London, Ont.

J6644, A/S/L Lee, T. R., 121 Ann St., Ingersoll, Ont.

J16317, F/L Lefebvre, E. R. H. Y., Morinville, R.R. No. 3, Alta.

J7598, A/F/L Lefroy, H. K., 9 Church St., Wolverton Bucks, England.

J23040, F/L Le Gear, V. H. J., R.R. No. 2, Barrie, Ont.

J36116, F/O Legrice, E. G., 2 Oakdene Cres., Toronto, Ont.

J21460, F/L Lehman, W. H., 174 Leicester Rd. Blaby Leicestershire, England.

C89545, F/L Le Maistre, E. B., 308 Van Horne St., Port Arthur, Ont.

J6140, F/L, Levitin, N., 13 Nelson Street, Ottawa, Ont.

J18443, A/F/L Lewis, A. D., 141 Bates Ave., Harlington Durham.

J87691, A/F/O Lewis, V. F., Salisbury, N.B.

J25201, A/F/L Leydon, J. P., Estevan, Sask.

J86649, F/O Lightbown, J. R., Abbotsford, B.C.

Distinguished Flying Cross—*Con.*

Number — Rank — Name — Address

J89171, P/O Lincoln, G. E., Teulon, Man.
J28735, F/O Lindsay, J. B., 3438 McTavish Street, Montreal, Que.
J93379, P/O Lockett, H. J. P., 150 Selby St., Westmount, Que.
C8191, F/L Loftus, J. A., 34 Currie Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J22812, F/L Lott, A. M., 273 London Rd., Sarnia, Ont.
J91037, A/F/O Love, T. H., 64 Walnut St., Winnipeg, Man.
J18453, F/L Low, G. H., 19 Sherbrook Gardens Winchmoor, London, England.
J35520, F/O Lowry, G. H., Ste 19, Section "B", Balfouria Apts., Winnipeg, Man.
J14773, F/O Ludlam, W. F., 47-26th St., Long Branch, Ont.
J17061, A/F/L Lundeen, C. P., Preeceville, Sask.
J25705, F/O Lynn, J. P., Mt. St. Patrick, Ont.
J28573, F/O Lyttle, A. L., 880 W. 19th Ave. North Vancouver, B.C.
J88293, P/O MacDiarmid, J. K., 448 Kent Street, Ottawa, Ont.
J36974, A/F/L MacDonald, A. M., 8 Alhambra, Toronto, Ont.
J14099, F/L MacDonald, H. W., 102 Arkell St., Hamilton, Ont.
J15821, A/S/L MacDonald, J. T., 10 Prince Edward Ave., Valois, Que.
J25401, A/F/L MacDonald, M. W., Fitch Bay, Que.
J9156, F/L MacDonald, R. W., 16 Crescent Rd., Toronto 5, Ont.
J36834, F/O MacDonald, S., Little Sands, P.E.I.
J86834, F/O MacDonald, W. H. K., 4563 W. 3rd Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
J20004, F/L MacElwain, J. R., 181 Waterloo St., Saint John, N.B.
J36395, F/O MacFadden, J. H., 65 Burwell Ave., Cranbrook, B.C.
J90732, P/O MacGregor, J. A., Cranberry Lake P.O., Powell River, B.C.
J29237, A/F/L MacHale, J. B., 6025-31st Ave. S.W., Seattle, Wash., U.S.A.
J12635, F/L MacKay, J., 740 Rankin Road, Cloverdale, B.C.
J28257, F/O MacKay, J. H., R.R. No. 3, Sardis, B.C.
J87078, F/O MacKay, M. L., 58 Warren St., New Glasgow, N.S.
J25923, F/O MacKeracher, W. W., Plato, Sask.
J16058, F/L MacKinnon, T. J., Shaunavon, Sask.
J89429, A/F/L MacKirdy, D. H., 2174 W. 12th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
J89372, A/F/O MacLean, D. E., 98 Central Street, Summerside, P.E.I.
J89792, P/O MacLean, K. N., Sunnyhurst, Princes St., Monifieth, Angus, Scotland.
J87954, P/O MacLeod, R. H., Melfort, Sask.
J90866, P/O MacLeod, W. A., Kinross, Queen's Co., P.E.I.
J10295, F/L MacLise, D. J., Wadena, Sask.
J85961, F/O MacNeil, D. T., Ashlyn Caldecote, Cambridge, England.
J18500, F/L MacNeil, J. J., 21 Margaret St., Sydney, N.S.
R196541, WO2 MacRitchie, M. D., 1204 Victoria Dr., Vancouver, B.C.
J88080, A/F/L Madden, R. P., 911-4th Ave., N. Saskatoon, Sask.
J94106, P/O Maguire, J. N., 239 Heath St. E., Toronto, Ont.
J89750, P/O Mahony, E. P. J., 85 Howland Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J17806, F/O Mahoney, G. M., 50 Riverside Drive, Lachine, Que.
J25271, F/L Mair, F. J., Crossfield, Alta.
J29566, F/O Maloney, W. P., 45 Pearl St., Sudbury, Ont.
J13819, F/L Marier, J. E., Hq. No. 6 (RCAF) Grp.
J90495, P/O Marks, V. G., Leask, Saskatchewan.
J16113, F/L Marlatt, S. D., 26 Navy St., Oakville, Ont.
C89563, A/F/L Marsh, L. E., 68 Victoria St., Dumferline, Scotland.
C1205, A/W/C Marshall, C. C. W., 144 McLeod St., Ottawa, Ont.
J88173, A/F/O Martel, A. J., 162 Bertrand St., St. Boniface, Man.
J86185, P/O Martin, B. le V., 10168-107th St., Edmonton, Alta.
R102411, W/O Martin, W. A., Box 155, McTaggart, Sask.
J26467, A/F/L Martin, W. G., 1 Westminster Mansions, Great Smith St., London, England.
J26408 A/F/L Mason, W. E. B., 2468½ Hollywood Ave., Toledo, Ohio.
J90736, P/O Matte, L. E., Ste. 15, Ross Apts., Winnipeg, Man.
C19431, F/O Matthews, F. W., 3219-2nd Ave., S.W., Calgary, Alta.
J90125, P/O Maxham, A. G., 7296 Boyer St., Montreal, Que.
J25382, F/O Mayo, E. C., 42 Bowood Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J92516, P/O McCallum, K. F., 228-7 Ave. E., Calgary, Alta.
C12578, A/W/C McCarthy, F. S., 722 Dougall Ave., Windsor, Ont.
J26363, F/O McColl, A. C., 194 Selby St., Westmount, Que.
J85568, F/O McConnell, D. J. M., 352 Albert St. East, Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.
J90515, P/O McDonald, L. H., Abbey, Sask.
J89272, F/O McDowell, A. F., 616-8th St. S., Lethbridge, Alta.
J24691, F/O McGavin, D. C., Carman, Man.
J25552, F/O McGlone, G. F., 30½ Askin St., London, Ont.
J25885, A/F/L McGrath, D. E., Box 190, White Rock, B.C.
J89084, A/F/O McGuire, L. F., 2370 Hingston Ave., Montreal, Que.
J92682, P/O McInnes, A. D., 4 Dawson Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J23956, F/O McIntosh D. N., Stanstead, Que.
J36376, F/O McIntyre, J. J., 9927-114th St., Edmonton, Alta.
J92459, P/O McKay, D. H. A., Box 74, Beverley, Sask.
J88373, P/O McKenney, R. R., 1266 Argyle Rd., Windsor, Ont.
J19097, F/O McKenzie, A. A., 75 Lorne St., Sudbury, Ont.
J8786, A/F/L McKenzie, D. M., Stellarton, N.S.
J94278, P/O McKenzie, R. F., Tribune, Sask.
J26476, F/O McKeown, E. H., R.R. No. 3, Acton, Ont.
J35120, F/O McKillop. A. P., Chilliwack, B.C.
J26648, F/O McKinnon, D. B. O., Ste. 3, 2036 York St., Vancouver, B.C.
J86336, F/O McKinstry, C. I., 5665 Sherbrooke W., Apt. 2, Montreal, P.Q.

Distinguished Flying Cross—*Con.*

Number — Rank — Name — Address

J14558, F/L McManus, P. J., 148 Gore St. E., Perth, Ont.
J18506, F/L McNamara, R., 56 Glahom Park Grove, Leeds.
J26751, F/O McQuiston, J. H., 1320 Danforth Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J2939, F/L Mears T. C., 198 South Cout St., Port Arthur, Ont.
J37873, F/O Meek, J., 935 Lipton St., Winnipeg, Man.
J18414, F/O Mellstrom, M. L., 1226-21st Ave. N.W., Calgary, Alta.
J91021, A/F/O Meredith, H. R. H., 3715 Woodruff Ave., Oakland, Cal., U.S.A.
J88897, A/F/O Merlin, R. A. A., 1729 N.W. 1st St., Miami, Fla., U.S.A.
J37196, F/O Metcalfe, E. G., 160 Lansdowne Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
J5097, A/F/L Middlemass, J. G., Wainwright, Alta.
J88159, F/O Middleton, R. S., Killarney, Man.
J6220, A/F/L Middleton, W. M., R.R. No. 1, Fletcher, Ont.
J21688, F/L Miller, B. B., Carman, Man.
J27545, F/O Mills, J. M., 49 Barnesdale Ave S., Hamilton, Ont.
J27429, F/O Mills, R. A., 162 West St., Chatham, Ont.
J28874, F/O Mills, V. L. R., 353 Dufferin Ave., London, Ont.
J92854, P/O Millson, H. D., 17 Isabella St., Toronto, Ont.
J90550, P/O Millward, H. M. B., 68 McDonald St., Ottawa, Ont.
J36372, F/O Milton, D., 2256 McIntyre St., Regina, Sask.
J16658, P/O Minnis, H. B., 1825 Hollywood Cres., Victoria, B.C.
J20407, F/L Mitchell, C. G., 11705-97th St., Edmonton, Alta.
C175, W/C Mitchell, E. M., 212 Cobourg St., Ottawa, Ont.
R151145, WO 2 Mitchell, L. J., 49 First Ave. E., North Bay, Ont.
J23102, A/F/L Mitchell, R. K., 353 Lincoln Rd., Windsor, Ont.
J92256, P/O Moe, C. N., Morrin, Alta.
J36074, F/O Moffatt, J. E., 609-9th St., Lethbridge, Alta.
J29848, F/O Montagne, J. A., St. Rose du Lac, Man.
J12811, F/O Moodie, D. M., 62 Netherby Rd., Edinburgh, Scotland.
J86011, F/O Mooney, C. H., 18 McGill St., Hawkesbury, Ont.
J25942, F/O Moore, G. W., Box 211, Bridgewater, N. S.
J21629, A/F/L, Moote, F. G., R.R. #4, Dunnville, Ont.
J18935, F/O Monty, C. E. N., 434 Lansdowne, Westmount, Montreal, Que.
J24771, A/F/L Morison, J. D., Box H, Ponoka, Alta.
J92054, P/O Morris, S. E., 152 Mavety St., Toronto, Ont.
J19176, A/F/L Morris, W. E. C., 12 Acland House, Stockwell Gardens, Cladham Rd., London SW 9, England.
J89790, P/O Morrison, C. B., 1467 West 7th Ave., Vancouver, B. C.
J7451, F/L Morton, J. A., Didsbury, Alta.
J29163, F/O Morton, J. F., R.R. #2, Niagara-on-the-Lake, Ont.

[Mr. C. W. G. Gibson.]

J88877, A/F/L Mossing, F. W., 2319 Osler St., Regina, Sask.
J86694, F/O Mould, J. L., 44 Pendeen Ave., Mt. Denis, Toronto, Ont.
J27871, F/O Mowatt, E. A., New Richmond, Que.
J90939, P/O Moynes, E. A., 41 Victoria St., Brantford, Ont.
J28861, F/O Muldowney, W. G., 337 O'Connor Dr., Toronto, Ont.
J36985, A/F/L Mulholland, J. V., R.R. #3, Mitchell, Ont.
J29516, A/F/L Munro, L. E., 120 East Avenue, Brantford, Ont.
J25733, F/O Murphy, F. B., Cowley, Alta.
J22769, F/L Murphy, J. M., 34 Yarwood St., St. Thomas, Ont.
J27190, A/F/L Murphy, L. T., 253 St. Helen's Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J88722, A/F/O Murphy, T. C., Demers Centre, Que.
J92480, P/O Murray, A. M., Box 89, Fraser's Mountain, New Glasgow, N. S.
J92255, A/F/L Murray, D. L. H., 95 Bronghton Ste, Edinburgh, Scotland.
J22701, F/O Murray, J. M., 119 Richmond Rd., Ottawa, Ont.
J28235, P/O Murray, J. W., 226 Columbia St., Sydney, N. S.
J16199, A/S/L Murray, S. E., Warren, Man.
J92483, P/O Murrell, W. H., 1221 Rudlin St., Victoria, B. C.
C1639, S/L Mussells, C. H., 558 Lansdowne Ave., Westmount, Que.
C89528, P/O Mutton, J. B., 54 Wellington Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J23215, F/L Myers, C. D., 31 Elliott St., New Westminster, B. C.
J27791, F/O Nairn, T. J., 2371 Mariette Ave., N.D.G., Montreal, P. Q.
J86159, F/O Nash, J. A. M., Concord, Ont.
J37156, F/O Naugler, H. E., Box 404, Bridgewater, N. S.
J87200, A/F/L Nelson, H., Coronach, Sask.
J27081, F/O Nelson, J. E., 64 Crown St., Port Arthur, Ont.
J18394, F/L Ness, J. F., 203 Rawdon St., Brantford, Ont.
J6641, F/L Newman, D. A., 47 Valley Ridge Rd., Fort Worth, Texas, U.S.A.
J11625, F/L Newton, R. K., R.R. #1, Norwick, Ont.
J28107, F/O Nicholl, C. I. H., 3113 Regina Ave., Regina, Sask.
J92434, P/O Nickel, L. D., Waldheim, Sask.
J12774, A/S/L Nickel, W. H., 15 East Ave. S., #1, Hamilton, Ont.
J13067, A/S/L Nickerson, G. E., 515 Second St. S., Kenora, Ont.
J24973, F/L Nicol, A. M., 5817 McKinnon St., Vancouver, B. C.
J87221, A/F/O Nielsen, E. H., c/o Empire Hotel Office, Calgary, Alta.
J40949, F/O Nisbet, W. L., 519 Cedar St., Nelson, B. C.
J11816, F/L Northrup, J. R., 525 E. 6th Ave., Vancouver, B. C.
J40773, A/F/L Oakley, E. H., 124 Robinson St., Winnipeg, Man.
J14817, F/L Oatway, W. R., Ste 9, 1545 W. 14th Ave., Vancouver, B. C.
J13717, F/L O'Callaghan, F. J., Kemptville, Ont.
J17736, F/O O'Connor, P. C., New Dover Rd., Colonia, N.J., U.S.A.
J27479, F/O Ogle, L. P., 172 Read Ave., Crestwood, Tuckahoe, N.Y., U.S.A.
J35238, F/O Oldershaw, D. M., 136 Thames St., Chatham, Ont.

Distinguished Flying Cross—*Con.*

Number — Rank — Name — Address

J22046, F/L Olson, O., Lake Cowichan, B.C.
J25820, A/F/L Orser, S. T., 2918 Marine Dr., Hollyburn W., Vancouver, B.C.
J86666, F/O Page, J. E. J., Knowlton, Que.
J91102, F/O Paige, D. R., R.R. No. 1, Lennoxville, P.Q.
J93585, P/O Pallett, K. F., 155 Nepean St., Ottawa, Ontario.
J35880, A/F/L Pamplin, D. R., 7726 East Jefferson Ave., Detroit, Mich., U.S.A.
C5632, F/O Papineau, L. J. L. M., 1117 Parc Lafontaine St., Montreal, P.Q.
J29980, F/O Pappas, G., 10626 - 104th St., Edmonton, Alta.
J93879, P/O Pare, J. B. R., 4174 Northcliffe St., Montreal, 28, P.Q.
J10987, F/L Parker, L. H., 68 Hazelton Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J25040, A/F/L Parks, W. R., Heron Bay South, Ont.
J90447, P/O Parry, G. D., 71 Lamb Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J87903, F/O Parry, J. C., 366 Chipawa St., Windsor, Ont.
J13361, F/L Patchet, G. S., 259 Glenmanor Dr. E., Toronto, Ont.
J7440, F/L Patterson, G. R., P.O. Box 599, Kelowna, B.C.
J35807, F/O Patterson, J. C., 10706 - 105th St., Edmonton, Alta.
J35509, F/O Paul, A. B., 2258 W. 35th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
J35048, F/O Peach, J. H., St. Michael, Alta.
J26634, F/O Peacock, E. B., 230 Harvey St., Orillia, Ont.
J29380, F/O Peacock, J. E. M., 11 - 5th St., Noranda, P.Q.
C37909, F/O Pearce, N. J., 22 Third St. S., Portage La Prairie, Man.
J87605, F/O Pearson, F. C., 126 Ardagh Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J23882, F/L Penfield, J. G., 1282 Inglis Ave., Columbus, Ohio.
J37787, F/O Penner, E. R., Box 321, Beamsville, Ont.
J8600, S/L Pennington, J., Metchosin P.O., Victoria, B.C.
J93519, P/O Perry, A. J., Spencerville, Ont.
J35522, F/O Perry, R. A., 188 Wyandotte St. East, Windsor, Ont.
J85778, F/O Peterson, B. L., 319 Irving Rd., Victoria, B.C.
J28495, F/O Peterson, T. R., R.R. No. 2, Duncan, B.C.
J25778, F/O Phripp, C. F., 892 Woodbine Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J92986, P/O Plotkins, L. J., 2511 - 5th St. W., Calgary, Alta.
J90543, P/O Poirier, J. F. L. R., 5037 Chabot St., Montreal, P.Q.
R77085, WO1 Poitevin, D. G., 5588 Waverly St., Montreal, P.Q.
J92822, P/O Pollock, J. W., 525 River St. W., Prince Albert, Sask.
J26026, F/L Poole, D. F., Box 453, Kelowna, B.C.
J16309, F/L Pope, C. S., 282 Douro St., Stratford, Ont.
J11973, A/S/L Porter, C. H., 64 George St., Weston, Ont.
J6862, F/L Porter, P. W., 508 Penn Ave., Drexel Hill, Penna., U.S.A.
J87033, F/O Potter, A. L., 11 Cawthra Sq., Toronto, Ont.
J36200, A/F/L Powell, K. O., 9 Balmoral Ave., London, Ont.
J6233, F/L Poyntz, H. A. P., 101 Ballantyne Ave. S., Montreal W., Que.
J8139, F/L Prendergast, J. B., 1147 Camrose Crescent, Victoria, B.C.
J86187, F/O Pringle, H. M., 85 Indian Grove, Toronto, Ont.
J24138, F/L Proctor, B. W., Caledon East, Ont.
C89502, S/L Publicover, E. F., c/o H. Osborne, Bakers Dr., Armdale, Halifax, N.S.
R196158, WO2 Puchalski, A., Grandview, Man.
J37039, F/O Pudney, J. W. D., 4563 West 2nd Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
J38089, F/O Purkis, R. S., Salmon Arm, B.C.
J92042, P/O Quigg, T. J. F., Quyon, P.Q.
J92018, F/O Racicot, C. B. J., 4095 Blvd. Decarie, N.D.G., Montreal, P.Q.
J35124, F/O Rae, C. D., Cupar, Sask.
J26609, A/F/L Railton, C. S., No. 6, 1117 St. Mathew St., Montreal, P.Q.
C90730, P/O Rakus, B., R.R. No. 1, Blenheim, Ont.
J89659, P/O Ramsey, C. J. A., 920 - 19th Ave. W., Calgary, Alta.
J22884, F/O Rancourt, J. L. M. L. F., St. Victor de Beauce, P.Q.
R136687, WO2 Randall, R. E., Delbourne, Alta.
J18284, F/O Rathwell, D. W., 48 Cunnington Ave., St. Vital, Man.
J93257, F/O Raymond, W. F., 192 Connell St., Woodstock, N.B.
J23881, A/F/L Rayner, A. G., 5948 Balsam St., Vancouver, B.C.
J90642, A/F/O Rebick, I., 557 Markham St., Toronto, Ont.
J13751, F/L Redmond, D. R., R.R. No. 4, Middle Musquodoboit, N.S.
C1646, A/S/L Reed, J. T., c/o 1000 Somerset St. W., Ottawa, Ont.
J10644, A/S/L Reeves, H. J., 44 Kappele Ave. N., Toronto, Ont.
J26014, F/L Reichel, R. C., No. 19 Ross Apts., 437 Qu'Appelle Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
J87704, F/O Reid, W. R., Perdue, Sask.
J35869, F/O Reynolds, G. E., 310½ Wharncliffe Rd., N. London, Ont.
J92456, F/O Reynolds, J. V., 104 Bartlett Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J16727, F/L Rhude, C. A., WAAF Section RAF Station, Llandwrog, N. Wales.
J35537, F/O Richey, R. S. C., 27 South Park St., Halifax, N.S.
R202642, W/O2 Ririe, A. L., Magrath, Alta.
J92262, P/O Ritchie, W., Saltcoats, Sask.
J9566, F/L Rivers, R. N., 185 Beaton St., Kitchener, Ont.
J93966, P/O Roach, P. C., Spanish Point, Pembroke, Bermuda.
J9545, A/S/L Robb, D., 20 St. Michael Rd., St. Vital, Manitoba.
J37731, A/S/L Roberts, J. F., 78 Pacific Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J89779, P/O Roberts, K. G., 44 Castlefield Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J23747, A/F/L Robertson, D., 528 Telfer Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
J28216, F/O Robertson, J. D., 135 Beach Ave. E., Chilliwack, B.C.
J29252, F/O Robertson, J. D. A., 131 Constant Spring Rd., St. Andrew, Jamaica, BWI.
J90559, P/O Robertson, P. A., Pincher Creek, Alta.
C88231, P/O Robinson, L., Norton, N.B.
J36601, F/O Robinson, R. A., 208 Armour Block, Calgary, Alta.

Distinguished Flying Cross—*Con.*

Number — Rank — Name — Address

J88217, P/O Rogers, H. W., R.R. No. 2, Stewiacke, Col. Co., N.S.

J87999, F/O Rombough, D. A., John St., Gananoque, Ont.

J23903, F/O Rose, F. W., 547 Logan Ave., Toronto, Ont.

J15029, F/L Roseblade, N. L., 249 Concord Ave., Toronto, Ont.

J37780, F/O Rosebrugh, R. K., 20 Waterloo Ave., Galt, Ont.

J92889, P/O Ross, J. R., Innisfail, Alta.

J28357, A/F/L Ross, R. G., Oxford, N.S.

J26466, F/O Roulston, K. C., 349 Eva St., London, Ont.

J20230, F/L Roussell, J. L. A., Lac-au-Saumon, Matapedia, P.Q.

J92661, P/O Routledge, G. A., Qu'Appelle, Sask.

J18799, F/O Rowe, C. J., Aurora, Ont.

J27115, F/O Rubin, H., 187 Friel St., Ottawa, Ont.

J28185, F/O Ruffell, H. L., Route 2, Box 243, Olympia, Washington, U.S.A.

J88894, P/O Runciman, D. R., 53 Hubble St., Brockville, Ont.

J27738, F/O Russell, R. A., R.R. No. 4, Campbellford, Ont.

J29734, F/L Russell, W. L., 1026 West 7th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

J10351, F/L Rutherford, J. W., 1441 John St., N. Battleford, Sask.

J27679, F/O Sanders, S. D., Hay P.O., Ont.

J89293, F/O Saunders, D. R., the Gicarage Sowerbg-Thursk, Yorkshire, England.

J26371, F/O Saunders, P. D., 698 Melbourne Ave., Westboro, Ont.

J89420, F/O Saunders, R. F., 1456 Edgeware Rd., Victoria, B.C.

J20430, F/L Savard, J. G. E., 257 Forest Ave., West Kildonan, Man.

J24821, F/O Savard, J. R., 553 Nicolet St., Montreal, P.Q.

J27647, F/O Saye, W. P., 48 Amorth Ave., Toronto, Ont.

J35088, F/O Scanlan, P. D., 12 McKelvie Ave., Kirkland Lake, Ont.

J90970, P/O Scarf, J. C. J., 326 Phipps St., Fort Erie North, Ont.

J40478, A/F/L Schollar, J. A., Varsity View P.O., Man.

J36382, F/O Schoneck, C., Gull Lake, Sask.

J94302, P/O Schwandt, J. C., Singhampton, Ont.

J92556, P/O Scott, F. A., Freemont, Sask.

J25988, F/O Scott, G. L., Knee Hill Valley, Alta.

J45917, P/O Scott, R. A., Wawota, Sask.

P17560, F/O Seale, R. C., 6017 Vine St., Vancouver, B.C.

J24116, F/L Seary, J. E., 14 King St., Windsor, Ont.

J35183, F/O Sefton, J. A., Melford, Sask.

J18475, F/O Seigel, E. K., 130 Avenue Rd., Apt. 8, Toronto, Ont.

J20663, F/L Shail, V. G., 1757 Edmonds St., New Westminster, B.C.

J6859, F/L Shane, J. A. N., 2267 Old Orchard St., Montreal, P.Q.

C858, W/C Sharp, F. R., c/o Mrs. W. W. Weaver, 67 Murphy St., Trenton, Ont.

J18793, F/O Sharun, M. R., St. Paul, Alta.

J29530, F/O Shearer, R. H., 384 Waterloo St., London, Ont.

J25782, F/O Shenker, H. A., 57 Sherwood Ave., St. Catharines, Ont.

[Mr. C. W. G. Gibson.]

J90167, P/O Shepherd, D. A., 606 E. Windsor Rd., Vancouver, B.C.

J35858, A/F/L Sherwood, G. A., Hampton, N.B. No. 12.

J92079, P/O Shields, R. E., 1034 Bathurst St., Toronto, Ont.

J23850, F/O Shields, W. J., Coboconk, Ont.

J16399, F/L Shirley, C. A., c/o A. T. Fawcett, 938 Boundary Bay Rd., Ladner, B.C.

J13755, F/L Shnider, M., Inglis, Man.

J12966, F/L Shortts, F. C., 1140 Dovercourt Rd., Toronto, Ont.

J27703, F/O Shotton, W. H., 116 Thompson Blvd., Riverside, Ont.

J26991, F/L Sillers, D. E., Estevan, Sask.

J35216, F/O Simard, J. L. R. G., 26 Ave. Murray, Quebec, Que.

J85914, A/F/L Simpson, D. H., 3 Eddy Apts., Rose St., Regina, Sask.

C87319, F/O Simpson, J. W., Derby, N.B.

J29022, F/O Simpson, W. O., 5355 Waveland Ave., Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.

J28912, F/O Sinclair, S. J., 4362 Old Orchard Ave., N.D.G., Montreal, Que.

J89650, F/O Singer, J. W., 769A. Annette Street, Toronto, Ont.

J13141, F/L Sisman, J. E., 32 Yonge St., Aurora, Ont.

J87735, A/F/O Sisson, S. J., Perth, N.B.

J17092, A/F/L Skinner, F. W., 8 Rosemore Apt. Roslin Rd., Winnipeg, Man.

J25544, F/O Slipec, P., 342 West 19th St., Vancouver, B.C.

J85132, F/O Smale, J. L., 46 Broxtowe Lane, Nottingham, England.

J27798, F/L Smart, J. F., Box 205, No. 2 R.F.D. Monroe, North Carolina, U.S.A.

J23876, F/L Smiley, D. A. B., 50 Craig St., Perth, Ont.

J6496, F/L Smith, A. A., 2269 E. 6th Avenue, Vancouver, B.C.

J26325, F/O Smith, B. D., 757 Pape Avenue, Toronto, Ont.

J29218, A/F/L Smith, C. O. P., R.R. No. 3, New Westminster, B.C.

J12889, F/L Smith, E. G., Navan, Ont.

J27671, F/O Smith, H. V., 26 Furby St., Ste. 6, Winnipeg, Man.

J92992, F/O Smith, J. H., 8 Salisbury Ave., Toronto, Ont.

J90218, P/O Smith, S. D., 402-5th Ave., New Westminster, B.C.

J8620, F/L Snider, E. C., 216 Portland St., Dartmouth, N.S.

J88682, A/F/L Sobering, G. H., Gretna, Man.

J89782, F/O Souter, D. R., 1710 Broadview Rd., Calgary, Alta.

J26455, F/L Southward, L. K., 152 High St., Forres, Ont.

J92664, P/O Spearing, C. A., 307 Mary Street, Hamilton, Ont.

J20708, F/L Spencler, R. A., 491 Southwick St., St. Thomas, Ont.

J23538, F/L Spooner, R. E., 6238 MacDonald St., Vancouver, B.C.

J93923, P/O Springham, G., 11937-90th St., Edmonton, Alta.

J86687, F/O Squibb, A. G., 260 9th Avenue, Lachine, Que.

J28986, F/O Stadnyk, A., Spirit River, Alta.

J21947, F/L Stambaugh, D. C., 149 Main St., Glace Bay, N.S.

J37781, F/O St. Amour, R. A., 5578 Esplanade Ave., Montreal, Que.

Distinguished Flying Cross—*Con.*

Number — Rank — Name — Address

J90201, A/F/O Starink, E. N., RAF Southbourne, Bournemouth, England.

J11073, F/L Starkey, G. L., 4656 Sherbrooke St. W., Westmount, Que.

J89623, P/O Stedman, L. B., 19 Chapel St., Simcoe, Ont.

J36833, F/O Steer, R. E., Apt. 14, 921 St. Clair Ave. W., Toronto 10, Ont.

C1498, F/L Stevens, C. F. B., 493 Argyle Ave., Westmount, Que.

J92665, P/O Stevens, F. A., R.R. No. 3, Kelowna, B.C.

J86878, F/O Stevenson, I. A., 148 Old Forest Hill Rd., Toronto, Ont.

J20106, A/F/L Stewart, D. G., Ste. 24, 101 E 7th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

J37121, F/O Stewart, D. J., No. 1 Pawson St., Robin Hood Village, Leeds, England.

J17000, F/L Stewart, E. C., Camrose, Alta.

J24403, F/O Stewart, G. E., 71 Undermount Ave., Hamilton, Ont.

J38861, F/O Stewart, J. O., 50 Snowdon Ave., Toronto, Ont.

J89238, F/O Stewart, R. B., Box 2647, Hollywood (28), California, U.S.A.

J88524, A/F/L St. Laurent, J. L., Box 93, Atholville, N.B.

J13070, F/L Stonehocker, I. P., Box 97, Lacombe, Alta.

J20845, F/L Storms, J. L., 195A Roncesvalles Ave., Toronto, Ont.

J92666, P/O Stowe, R. S., 11220-96th St., Edmonton, Alta.

J10643, F/L Stowe, W. N., 206 Woburn Ave., Toronto, Ont.

R178879, W/O Stroich, N. W., 137 Avenue 120 St., West Edmonton, Alta.

R97531, W/O Strouts, F. S., Ste. 4, 604-13th St., New Westminster, B.C.

J17136, F/O Suddick, W. E., 161 Roehampton Ave., Toronto, Ont.

J90611, P/O Supergia, G., 2 Norton and George Sts., Georgetown, B.G., South America.

R155196, W/O2 Sutherland, G. A., 25 Duke St., Woodstock, Ont.

J14722, F/L Sutherland-Brown, A., 1931 Bowker Place, Victoria, B.C.

J10572, A/S/L Swartz, R. W., 91 Charles St., Waterloo, Ont.

J90838, P/O Tanner, F. E., Appeley, Ont.

J25790, A/F/L Taylor, A. D., Lincoln Ave., Beamsville, Ont.

J93520, P/O Taylor, E. T., Keeler, Sask.

J12337, F/L Taylor, J. D., Nurses Home, Jubilee Hosp., Victoria, B.C.

J36611, F/O Taylor, J. E., Athabaska, Alta.

J6861, F/L Taylor, S. T., 267 Frederick St., Sydney, N.S.

J26757, A/F/L Tegerdine, G. M., 3401 School St., Oakland, California, U.S.A.

J87333, A/F/L Telford, R. B., 1575 West 16th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

J88506, A/F/L Templeton, G. M., 883 Davaar Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

J7597, F/L Tew, W. R., 42 Isabella St., Apt. 306, Toronto, Ont.

J28989, F/O Thackeray, J. R., 1440 Montague St., Regina, Sask.

J37778, F/O Thauvette, R. D., 73A Falardeau St., Hull, P.Q.

J7975, F/L Thomas, J. F., 3949 13th Ave., West, Vancouver, B.C.

J23052, F/L Thomas, R. D., 3549 West 41st Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

J20025 F/L Thompson, C. A., 194 Woodward Ave., Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.

C2206, F/L Thompson, D. P., 673 Ross Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

J28501, A/F/L Thompson, P. C., R.R. No. 3, Mannville, Alta.

J88142, F/O Thompson, R. J., 231 Sydney Ave., E., Kildonan, Winnipeg, Man.

J87732, A/F/L Thomson, D. I., Thessalon, Ont.

J27498, A/F/L Thomson, N. G., 11028 88th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

C19120, F/O Thornicroft, H. E., 80 Leaside Rd., Aberdeen, Scotland.

J21186, F/L Thorson, E., 6415 St., Catherines St., Vancouver, B.C.

J17019, F/L Thorvaldson, W. M., 736 24th Ave., S. E. Calgary, Alta.

J37079, F/O Tibbs, R. B., 891 Warsaw St., Winnipeg, Man.

J87028, F/O Tierney, R. J., 100 Caithness Ave., Toronto, Ont.

J18869, A/F/L Tims, J. W., Abbotsford, B.C.

J29336, F/O Tinevez, F. L. J., Pathlow, Sask.

J86383, F/O Tonge, J. S., R.R. No. 1, King's Co., Rothesay, N.B.

J22776, F/O Tonnellier, R. E. A., Wauchope, Sask.

J21310, F/L Tribner, G. E., 319 First St. E., Cornwall, Ont.

J39721, F/O Troman, L. J., 1417 8th Ave. N., Lethbridge, Alta.

J35817, F/O Truax, C. W., 4778 Trafalgar St., Vancouver, B.C.

J41419, F/O Tulloch, W. A., 22 Harding St., Fairville, N.B.

J18180, F/O Tully, R. W., Chemainus, Vancouver, B.C.

J10223, F/L Tummon, E. E. Roxboro, Ont.

J35824, A/F/L Turnbull, W. L., 855 Elliott St., Regina, Sask.

J92863, P/O Turpin, J. A., 9 Pine Ave., Preston Park, Quebec, P.Q.

J35513, F/O Tustin, T. G., Bonnyville, Alta.

J92835, P/O Uffelman, S. L., 68 John St., Waterloo, Ont.

J35740, F/O Ullett, G. B., Woodroffe, Ont.

J35081, F/O Underhill, W. J., 95 Myrtle St. Thomas, Ont.

J9763, F/O Urquhart, R. A., 1034 Connaught Ave., Moose Jaw, Sask.

J89752, P/O Van Metre, R. B., 329 15th Ave., W., Calgary, Alta.

J10122, F/L Vann, G. C. J., Box 886, Flin Flon, Man.

J35508, F/O Van Tichem, J. V., Strathmore, Alta.

C1160, W/C Viau, J. J. M., 45 16th Ave., Lachine, P.Q.

J93012, P/O Vine, J., 285 Roseberry St., St. James, Man.

J15210, T/S/L Vickers, G. P., 310 Water St., Vancouver, B.C.

J5219, S/L Wade, J. C., Gromocto, N.B.

J85266, F/L Wagar, T. C., 75 Arch St., Kingston, Ont.

J87551, F/O Walker, H. W., 199 Dublin St., Halifax, N.S.

J12623, F/L Walker, S. J., 34 Park Ave., New Market, Ont.

J21276, F/L Walker, W. M., 350 Portage Rd., Stamford Centre, Ont.

J11946, F/L Wallace, A. C., 340 Light St., Woodstock, Ont.

J35878, F/O Wallace, B. C., 62 Albani St., Mimico, Ont.

Bar to Distinguished Flying Cross

Number — Rank — Name — Address

J14453, F/L Wallace, J. M., 10 Garden St., Halifax, N.S.

J27739, F/O Wallace, K. T., 171 Kingsmount Pk. Rd., Toronto, Ont.

J29015, F/O Wallace, W. J. L., 67 Woodside Ave., Toronto, Ont.

27414, F/O Ward, J. S., 437 Elm Ave., Westmount, P. Q.

J88101, F/O Wark, G. A., 618-4th Ave., W. Calgary, Alta.

J23061, F/L Waterfield, L., 22 Montye Ave., Toronto, Ont.

J17301, F/O Watson, J. V., M. T. Sec. RAF., Market Harborough, Leicester, Eng.

J86101, F/L Weaver, J. F., 267 Melrose Ave., Toronto 12, Ont.

J36339, F/O Webster, R. C., 241 Wright Ave., Toronto, Ont.

J87445, F/O Welch, J. A., Thornloe, Ont.

J22331, F/L Wenzel, C. L., Valhalla, Alta.

J46846, F/O West, R. B., Canning, N. S.

J18544, F/O Westby, M. A., Rose Valley, Sask.

J92560, P/O Weston, L. J., 256 Riddell St., Woodstock, Ont.

J27588, F/O Whetter, R. J. C., Dand, Man.

J93135, P/O Whippie, J. A. H., 6720 Victoria Drive, Vancouver, B. C.

J45138, P/O White, J. A., #6 1818 Barclay St., Vancouver, B. C.

J26819, F/L White, W. A. T., 2568 Trimble St., Vancouver, B. C.

J35718, F/O Wigle, J. G., Hagersville, Ont.

C19932, F/O Wilby, C., 1005 Garfield St., Winnipeg, Man.

R188286, WO2 Williams, A. J., R.R. #1 Penitang, Ont.

J86975, F/O Williams, C. D. F., 46 Elms St., E. Sudbury, Ont.

J92176, P/O Williams, E. N., Brigden, Ont.

J12969, F/L Williams, G. J., 45 Lawside Rd., Dundas, Scotland.

R190620, WO1 Williams, J. J., 54 Exeter St., Toronto, Ont.

J85826, F/O Williams, M. G., 224 Milton St., Nanaimo, B. C.

J27291, F/O Williamson, H. F., 221 Ann St., Belleville, Ont.

J26370, F/L Willis, J. E., 496 Williard Ave., Toronto, Ont.

J90640, P/O Wilson, G. D., 41 Strathcona Ave., Brantford, Ont.

J27745, F/O Wilson, T. R., 247 Millwood Rd., Toronto, Ont.

J22722, F/L Winship, J. J., Box 601 R.R. #1, Winnipeg, Man.

J35572, F/O Withenshaw, G., 138 Gordon Ave., Verdu, Que.

J18360, F/L Woldschuk, L., 6 Whitley Rd., Lelystone Shiremoor, Newcastle on Tyne, Eng.

J35750, F/O Woodhouse, R., 335 Cope St. N., Hamilton, Ont.

J9485, F/L Woods, J. H., 69 Cochrane St., St. John's, Nfld.

J19126, F/O Woods, M. D., R.A.F., Waltham, Grimsby, Lincs.

J29668, F/O Worster, W., 160 Hope Ave., Hamilton, Ont.

J93453, F/O Wright, F. F., 158 Charolette St., Peterborough, Ont.

J25937, F/O Wright, L. W., 138 Sutherland Drive, Toronto, Ont.

J26104, F/O Wright, S. G., 720 Jarvis St., Vancouver, B. C.

[Mr. C. W. G. Gibson.]

J35028, F/O Zlotnik, H., 2306-W. 16th Ave., Vancouver, B. C.

J24725, F/L Bayne, R. J., 437 McLeod St., Ottawa, Ont.

C13458, S/L Beirnes, J. R., 6 Whitmore Apts., Edmonton, Alta.

J10432, F/L Belanger, M. J., 4479 Blenheim St., Vancouver, B.C.

J87310, F/O Boyden, R. G., Markerville, Alta.

J8771, S/L Brown, M. G., Exchange Hotel, 2490 Mt. Royal Ave. E., Montreal, Que.

C2980, S/L Burnand, L. B., 14 Helena Ave., Toronto, Ont.

J24406, F/L Campbell, D. R., Foxboro, Ont.

J87548, F/L Cardno, M. B., 83 Belview Ave., Hamilton, Ont.

J17078, F/L Carrere, J. P. H., Box 192, Cochrane, Ont.

J24697, F/L Charley, W. A., R.R. No. 2, La Crescent, Minn., U.S.A.

J15143, S/L Christison, W. R., 23 Church St., Lennoxville, P.Q.

J10256, S/L Coffey, R. E., Greenview, Ill., U.S.A.

J23909, F/L Corrigan, J. F., Billings Bridge, Ont.

J16156, F/L Cox, J. E., 621 Johnston St., Kingston, Ont.

J22413, F/L Davies, D. P., 1610 Sherbrooke St. W., Montreal, P.Q.

J19955, F/L Duncan, J. D., Antler, Sask.

J20236, F/L Ebdon, F. A., 7916-79th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

J22622, F/L Edwards, T. K., 19 Elgin Ave., Toronto, Ont.

J13468, F/L Ellison, Thomas, 3525 W. 31st Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

J88878, F/O Forsberg, W. G., Riceton, Sask.

J15758, F/L Francis, J. E., 215 Josephine Ave., Windsor, Ont.

J28913, F/L Fultz, J. G., 123 Beech St., Halifax, N.S.

J16633, S/L Gordon, D. C., 3812-16th Ave. W., Vancouver, B.C.

J7547, S/L Gray, R. G., 10206-123 St., Edmonton, Alta.

J9656, W/C Hagerman, D. C., 16 James St., Rogerstone, Nr. Newport, Man.

J12193, F/L Hall, D. L., Millikens, Ont.

J25249, F/O Hampe, M. A., Eagle River, Ont.

J16801, F/L Heaton, P., 10 Belmont Road, Scarborough, Yorkshire.

J13447, S/L Hemhill, R. D., 2153 W. 51st Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

J29571, F/L Hiscott, R. W., Sutton West, Ont.

J24254, F/L Kettlewell, T. W., 254-10th S.E., Prince Albert, Sask.

J6958, F/L Laporte, J. R. S. Y., 575 Villeray Blvd., Montreal, Que.

J16669, F/L Laws, J. R., 12 Green Cliffe Dr., Clifton, York, Eng.

J16674, F/L Lyndon, A. B. S., Park Farm, Preston-on-Stor, Warwick, Eng.

J3103, F/L Macfadyen, D. A., 29 Chestnut Park Rd., Toronto, Ont.

J12635, F/L Mackay, J., 740 Rankin Rd., Cloverdale, B.C.

J24370, S/L Matheson, K. A., 308-4th St., New Westminster, B.C.

J5078, S/L McCaul, J. L., 224 Bloor St. W., Toronto, Ont.

J28487, F/L McConnell, W. A. S., 2704 Liberty Blvd., South Gate, Calif., U.S.A.

J19726, F/L McDonald, J. W., 2404 First Ave., Prince Albert, Sask.

Distinguished Flying Medal—*Con.*

Number — Rank — Name — Address

J25956, F/L McNaughton, D. A., Box 1300, Kelowna, B.C.
J16799, S/L Mitchner, J. D., 221-5th Ave., Saskatoon, Sask.
J23154, F/L Nicholl, G. F., 1438 Rae St., Regina, Sask.
J87217, F/O Peterson, J. A., 62 Noble Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
J27051, F/L Rodney, W., 222-10A N.W., Calgary, Alta.
J23331, F/L Rush, F. J., Spiritwood, Sask.
J16359, F/L Schultz, R. D., Bashaw, Alta.
J27491, F/L Small, L. V. J., Antelope, Sask.
J18445, F/L Smith, H., 1251 Closse St., Montreal, P.Q.
J6857, S/L Taylor, C. J. W., 750 South Dr., Winnipeg, Man.
J15535, F/O Taylor, R. W., 1905 Ernest Ave., Victoria, B.C.
J20252, F/L Tynan, G. G., 6138 Churchill St., Vancouver, B.C.
J19654, F/L Webb, G. W., 577 Wellington St. S., Hamilton, Ont.
J15301, F/L Weicker, W. J. L., 281 Wellington St., Kitchener, Ont.
J26095, F/L Whittal, H. R., 27-1311 Beach Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
J19402, F/L Wilson, G. E., 221 Army Ave., Louisville 12, Ky.
J16361, F/L Woods, V. T., St. Felix de Valois, P.Q.

Second Bar to Distinguished Flying Cross

J9069, S/L Fairbanks, D. C., 424 East State St., Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.

Air Force Cross

J9354, S/L Brown, A. L., Hawarden, Sask.
J23323, F/O Crawford, C. W., 469 Bowman Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
C89538, A/S/L Kaye, T. C., 453 Winterton Ave. E., Kildonan, Man.
J9873, F/L Marr, W. L., Fort Langley, B.C.
J11856, F/L McDonald, W. H., Apt. 1, 1506 St. Mark, Montreal, P.Q.
J17857, F/L Moore, L. A., 1328 Hale St., Philadelphia 11, Pa., U.S.A.
C9852, S/L Townsend, E. N., 26 Richelieu Place, Montreal, P.Q.

Conspicuous Gallantry Medal

R20588, F/S Crabe, W. E., R.R. No. 1, Fingal, Ont.

Distinguished Flying Medal

R112038, Sgt. Beck, E. F., Murray Harbour, P.E.I.
R113809, Sgt. Biles, N.J., Naskwooksis, N.B.
R222291, F/S Bower, D. A., R.C.A.S.C., I.C. 133, Lethbridge, Alta.
R205591, F/S Bragg, G. C., Sombra, Ont.
R268590, F/S Browne, R. R., 1601 Graham Blvd., Town of Mt. Royal, P.Q.
R133381, F/S Christie, R. G., 10969-127th St., Edmonton, Alta.
R199230, F/S Cozens, W. J. G., Ford Hotel, Toronto, Ont.
R85071, Sgt. Dahl, J. M. E., Bengough, Sask.
R83543, F/S Dempster, W. J., 136 Lindsey Ave., Toronto, Ont.
R190809, F/S Dixon, N. D., Port Carling, Ont.
R113015, F/S Edmond, R. W., 7809-112 Ave., Edmonton, Alta.
R218578, F/S Fisher, J. W., 239 La Rose Ave., The Pas, Man.
R71729, Sgt. Giles, R. G., 26 Dawson St., Dartmouth, N.S.
R209537, F/S Glover, K. E., Burgessville, Ont.
R68020, F/S Grayson, H. L., 61 Wellington Rd., London, Ont.
11634, Sgt. Greenough, L. H., Milton, Queens County, N.B.
R224884, F/S Gwynne-Vaughan, D. E., R.R. No. 4, Hamilton, Ont.
R209927, F/S Hamilton, J. W. G., Huron Rd., Goderich, Ont.
R269129, F/S Horne, A. J., Cedar Ave., Hespeler, Ont.
R89544, F/S Huffman, J. T., Port Colborne, Ont.
R223800, F/S Jones, C. E., 562 MacLaren St., Ottawa, Ont.
R201444, F/S Jowett, M. S., 612 State St., Eaton Rapids, Mich., U.S.A.
R135713, A/F/S Kanelakos, J., Smith's Falls, Ont.
R54603, F/S Kerr, E. E. R., 5149 MacDonald Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
R211088, F/S Lanctot, D. H., 73 Chambly Rd., Longueuil, P.Q.
R143517, F/S Lazuk, F., 455 Booth St., Ottawa, Ont.
R277564, F/S Magill, W. H., 647 Brock Ave., Toronto, Ont.
R219039, F/S Marcil, J. E. G., 1794 Grand Trunk Ave., Montreal 22, Que.
R172951, F/S Mason, L. R., Ste. 6, Virginian Apts., Welseley Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
R161211, F/S McKinnon, B. L., 9 Ida St., St. Catharines, Ont.
R88359, WO 2 McLeod, J. R., Guysboro, N.S.
H208806, F/S Molden, W., 846 Carter Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
R221382, F/S Nelligan, D. J., 11028 Cloverlawn, Detroit, Mich., U.S.A.
R176653, F/S Phillips, D. L., Wentworth Creek, Hants Co., N.S.
R210040, F/S Pyne, D. R., 281 Hampton St., St. James, Man.
R174405, F/S Read, W. R., 737 Melrose Ave., Verdun, P.Q.
R220282, F/S Robinson, C. M., Poplar, Ont.
R212937, F/S Romanchuk, T., 702 Cedar St., Oshawa, Ont.
R210293, F/S Saunders, F. G. K., Basswood, Man.
R140600, F/S Savas, T., 434 Wiley St., Fort William, Ont.
U208615, F/S Scarffe, C. E., Abbey, Sask.
R252756, F/S Scott, H. I., Beatty, Sask.
R160137, F/S Shutka, D., R.R. No. 1, Oshawa, Ont.
R193731, F/S Smith, G. B., 95 Hamilton St., Toronto, Ont.
R261435, F/S Taylor, J. H., 993 Walker Rd., Sub. 12, Windsor, Ont.
R271627, F/S Tulk, G. M., Lincoln Lodge, Grimsby Beach, Ont.
R137858, F/S Upcott, R. F., Ruthven, Ont.
R146488, F/S Young, R. E., 511 Bailey Rd., R.R. No. 2, Sardis, B.C.

British Empire Medal

R82420, F/S Campton, R. B., 137 Brock St., Brockville, Ont.
R116329, Sgt. Olson, A. P., Edberg, Alta.

Air Force Medal

R94867, F/S Walker, B. D., Kisbey, Sask.

FRENCH AWARDS

Legion of Honour

C788, W/C Desloges.

Croix De Guerre

R100752, F/S Adair, F. M.
J12346, F/L Alliston, A. J.
J25399, F/L Anderson, J. A.
J93069, P/O Beckingham, R. L
J15156, F/L Bishop, E. M.
J25281, F/L Blake, V. J.
R187809, W/O Botterill, M. A.
R74651, F/S Bowles, W. H.
J86959, A/F/O Burns, R. G.
J12030, F/L Cartmell, J. H.
J18469, F/L Charters, R. B.
J85854, F/O Clark, J.
J13478, F/L Cochand, L. E.
J22476, P/O Copp, L. R.
J20642, F/L Cush, H. H. S.
J28937, F/L Davidson, R. H.
J90716, T/F/O Donovan, M.D.
J28079, F/O Dutkowski, R.
J14324, S/L Fairey, W. M.
J11616, F/L Forman, G. W.
J8137, A/S/L Gardiner, W. G.
J21406, F/L Gibson, G. L.
J87974, P/O Gingras, P. H.
C17521, F/L Godfrey, W. H.
C24448, S/L Guillevin, F. E.
J28186, F/O Hannah, H. A.
C14356, F/L Harpur, G. A.
J27687, F/L Heron, G. L.
R133896 W/O Hill, J. E.
J23461, F/L Hunter, E.
J88230 P/O Irwin, D. G.
J14555, F/L Isaacson, L. J.
J22941, F/L Licquorish, S. J.
J88679, P/O Lippincott, R. T.
J12893, F/O Lowndes, J. A.
J17615, F/L MacNeill, G. E.
J90975, P/O Markey, W. J.
R57864, F/S McBean, R. P.
C60, A/V/M McEwen, C. M.
R197908, F/S McGregor, E. W.
J17195, F/O Mills, J. G.
J17866, A/F/L Prescott, T. H.
J13712, F/O Robertson, D. R.
R129052, W/O. 2 Scott, V. E.
J90331, F/O Sheppard, F. G.
C823, S/L Stephen, W. M.
J88517, F/O Sterling, I. R.
C27788, F/L Stevenson, J. M.
J14835, F/L Tyley, K.
J88228, P/O Watson, R. A.
J86101, F/L Weaver, J. F.
J93890, P/O Weaver, W. S.
J21994, F/O Wharry, G. G.
J91039, P/O Whelpdale, G. M.

GREEK AWARDS

Air Force Cross

J17354, F/O Granda, J.

NETHERLANDS AWARDS

Bronze Cross

R113044, W/O De Chaplaine, J. P.
J86965, P/O Ellis, J. F.
J9464, F/L Ireland, E. G.
J16799, F/L Mitchener, J. D.
J15101, S/L Prest, W. A.
J87361, P/O Selliars, D. S.
R105450, W/O Stewart, W. P.

Bronze Lion

C89500, W/C Sproule, J. A.

[Mr. C. W. G. Gibson.]

UNITED STATES AWARDS

Silver Star

C100 G/C Dunlap, C. R.
J22754, F/L Moore, K. O.

Distinguished Flying Cross

J25099, F/O Andrews, A. E.
J26705, F/O Brown, R. A.
J10113, F/L Cross, D. H.
J14035, F/L Davidson, J. B.
J10113, A/F/L Gross, D. H.
J7892, F/L Peglar, W. B.
C927, W/C Reid, J. W.
J5970, F/L Stephens, J. A.
J20110, A/F/L Wilkesman, B. W.

Air Medal

R87853, Sgt. Anderson, T. N.
C1376, S/L Benell, R. J.
J4524, F/L Elliott, E. B.
R77814, Sgt. Fraser, D. S.
J4900, F/L Gill, R. F.
J9286, F/L Warren, B.
C9735, F/L Warren, D.
J20446, F/L Warrington, G. R.

Purple Heart Medal

R86267, F/S Brown, W. D.

CANADIANS IN THE R.A.F.

Victoria Cross

118131, A/S/L Bazalgette, I. W.

Distinguished Service Order

3961, A/W/C Beall, H. R. M.
175715, A/F/L Cuthill, J.
39806, A/W/C Woodruff, P. H.

Bar to Distinguished Service Order

42216, A/W/C Grant, G. F.

Distinguished Flying Cross

174875, F/O Boulter, H. E.
189362, P/O Chalkley, D. E. J.
133101, F/L Graham, A. R.
62323, F/L Key, G. B. C.
156062, F/O Minnis, R. M.
61033, F/L O'Reilly, P. L. F.
37943, W/C Rodney, G. F.

Distinguished Flying Medal

1822281, F/S Robertson, J. S.

Mr. PEARKES: Mr. Chairman, I should like to be associated with the remarks which have just been made by the hon. the Minister of National Defence for Air (Mr. Gibson) in appreciation of the work that has been done by the Royal Canadian Air Force, and the Women's Division of the Royal Canadian Air Force, during this war. I have been extremely fortunate to have been closely associated with that service, although, of course, I was not in it myself. But I count it a high privilege to have been in England during those early days when I saw our Canadian pilots sharing the dangers with their British comrades in breaking up those dense formations of enemy bombers which came over to attack London and the south of England during the years 1939 and 1940. And never was any "forlorn" led with more reckless gallantry in those romantic days of warfare when citadels and fortresses were stormed and breaches were entered than the reckless gallantry shown by that "forlorn" of 1939 and 1940, when they forced the breaches in those formations of enemy bombers which came toward London. Singly or in pairs these fighters went up, and we on the ground stood in amazement. We watched them accomplish the impossible. Those formations of enemy bombers turned and went back to seek their lairs on the continent. Then, as months went by, we saw the great squadrons sally forth from the shores of England and carry a just punishment and revenge to the cities and fortresses of Europe then held by the enemy.

I should also like to say something in appreciation of the work which was done here in Canada, because it has been my privilege to fly many thousands of miles with the Royal Canadian Air Force. I have always received the utmost courtesy and kindness from the aircrews, and I have been tremendously impressed by the skilful handling of the aircraft, the quick decisions made and the coolness of pilots and navigators under the trying weather conditions while flying over the Rocky mountains and in the northern areas of this country.

I also wish to say a word in appreciation of the women's division of the air force and of the magnificent work done by all those who were connected with the commonwealth training plan.

It is my intention to examine this evening the proposals and estimates which have been presented by the minister under four headings: the defence of Canada and our ability to live up to the commitments which we have to assume during this interim period by reason of obligations derived from the united nations agreements; the question of efficiency; that of research, and that of the proposed continuation, in so far as types of organization and equipment are concerned, of following the British commonwealth of nations and United States of America air forces.

Dealing with the defence of Canada and such commitments as we may be called upon to assume during this interim period, I must express profound regret that the government has not seen fit to meet the request which was made in the house last Friday by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green) and which was repeated by me the day before yesterday, that before we went into a detailed examination of the various service estimates we should be presented with the general defence policy of the three services. At that time both the hon. member for Vancouver South and myself endeavoured to explain the difficulties under which hon. members would be working if they had to review piecemeal the various service estimates presented. I still maintain that it is impossible efficiently to review the separate service estimates without that over-all picture.

In the first place the strengths of the various services to carry out the roles of the defence of Canada and such commitments as they may be required to carry out under the united nations agreements are relative. For instance, to put it in the simplest possible terms, if we had a large air force and we had all the planes that we required for reconnaissance purposes over the sea approaches of our country we should not require as many surface craft to carry out the patrol work. On the other hand, if we had a very large number of surface reconnaissance craft, then we could reduce the number of our air force reconnaissance squadrons. Further than that, it is quite obvious to everybody, I think, that if we have ships afloat, then we must have bases from which those ships can operate, and those bases must be protected. It is the role of the army and of the air force to protect and to watch the approaches to those bases.

I feel that the three services are so correlated in these respects that we should have been given an over-all statement. Furthermore, when we come to the administrative services of the army, the navy and the air force is there not an opportunity whereby the services, perhaps the medical, dental, pay or commissariat services, might not in some respects be combined instead of there being a separate service for the army, the navy and the air force?

According to the press we have statements from senior naval officers who have told us

that certain types of ships are to be in the Canadian navy. The question of carriers was mentioned. If we have aircraft carriers they have to carry aircraft. Who is to supply those aircraft? I have not heard any mention in the minister's remarks about any aircraft being made available to those carriers I do not know whether it is the intention of the government to provide a fleet air arm. How can we make considered comments upon the estimates if we do not have such details? I feel that we cannot expect progress to be made unless we are presented in parliament here with a well thought-out and coordinated plan. I do not mind in the least if people tell me that they have never done that before. There is no use in our trying to adhere to the methods of 1919 or the time-worn formula of twenty years ago. Those will not produce an adequate defence for this country. If I am to believe that the government departments have worked out these estimates in collaboration one with another, then I can only feel that they have shown disrespect, if not contempt, of this house, by refusing to produce statements. If, on the other hand, they have not worked in close collaboration, then a most terrible and fundamental mistake has been made at the very beginning.

I turn now to the question of efficiency. Efficiency must not be destroyed. That, I feel, is a fundamental principle to which we must adhere and upon which we must insist. Dealing with this first under the heading of personnel, let me say that we have been told of the interim force. A hint has been thrown out to-day—and that was the first time I had heard it—that there will be a permanent or regular air force of some 15,000, 20,000 or 25,000 personnel. I have forgotten the exact number.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): It is 15,000 to 20,000.

Mr. PEARKES: I think the young men who to-day are making the decision as to whether they will remain in the temporary interim force would like to have more information regarding their opportunities for seeking a career in that permanent force.

I have heard reports of, and I have seen individuals who have been perplexed and who have wondered whether it is worth while staying on in the interim force, on the off hope that perhaps they may be able to stay on afterwards in the regular air force. They are concerned, because in many cases they have entered, as it were, into a contract with their former employers before joining the services at the beginning of the war. They were promised that when the war was over they would have their civilian jobs back again. If they sign on with the interim force they have the feeling that they are breaking that contract. And if at the end of two years they are not accepted, or the terms of service in the regular force are not acceptable to them, they will have no claim on the civilian jobs they left at the beginning of the war.

Therefore I say that they have waited long for the terms of service which will be announced regarding the regular air force, after the two-year period. I feel that we are wasting good material by not having come out before, and by not making it quite clear to-day as to what the opportunities for a career will be.

I understood the minister to say that the interim force was available for those who were in the Royal Canadian Air Force at the present time, or who had recently left that force and desired to go back. But no intimation was given that any new recruits were being taken into the force. If we are not taking in new recruits; if we are not taking in young men who are anxious to make the R.C.A.F. a career, young men of a type who might become commissioned officers and rise in the service, then we are going to have a gap, a hiatus, and in a few years time, if recruiting is not resumed before that period has elapsed, there will be a serious gap.

I believe I am correct when I say there has been no recruiting this year. If that is so, then the gap is getting wider and wider. We cannot have a Royal Canadian Air Force made up of old men. We must have a steady flow of young men coming in, if we are to keep efficiency to a maximum. I regret that no mention has been made of reopening recruiting for the service.

When I speak of efficiency, let it be understood that I do not want anyone to feel I am advocating extravagance or waste. If there has been any extravagance or waste in the past, there must be none in the future. I would urge all those who are thinking of remaining in the interim force or the permanent force as a future career to realize that they will be expected to do a full day's work. And if they are expected to do a full day's work, then this country must be prepared to pay wages and salaries which a full day's work in any particular craft or trade would command.

Before I leave the question of personnel, and while I am still talking about the possibilities of entering upon a career, may I say I should like to have heard the Minister of National Defence for Air give the committee some idea with respect to his policy in connection with enlisting those who would seek commissioned ranks in the air force.

Within the last week or so the announcement was made that the Royal Military College at Kingston will be opening its doors next year. We know that Royal Roads, the naval cadet college, is in existence on Vancouver island. I should have liked to hear—perhaps the minister will tell us later—what opportunities are offered to those young men who are now leaving school or college and who would like to follow the air force as a career. Is it the intention of the force to establish a special college of its own, or does it intend to receive entries through the Royal Military College, or some other university? I believe the country would like to hear his proposals in that respect.

Passing on to equipment, I would say simply this, that it is our duty—and the minister intimated that it was the department's intention to do this—to retain up-to-date equipment. We must cut our losses, and get rid of any obsolete or obsolescent types.

Mention was made of air fields. The minister said, I believe, that five operational air fields would be retained. I suggest that we should be told where those operational air fields are located.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): Operational stations, not air fields.

Mr. PEARKES: Those are headquarters, are they?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): We have other air fields as well, but I said that there were just five operational air stations.

Mr. PEARKES: We should know where those operational stations or air fields will be located. They are linked closely with the other services and there should be no mistake made in locating them. It is important that they should be located, not for political reasons, but purely for strategic considerations. No doubt there will be training stations in addition.

I come now to the detailed statement of figures just presented. I cannot help feeling that the country will be disappointed that there has not been a greater reduction with a further relief from taxation. We have heard about the expansion of the air force. From the financial point of view there has also been expansion. I believe that in 1940-41 the estimates submitted were for $54 million. This has grown and grown until last year the estimates were over one billion dollars. Then we find that there has been a reduction from that maximum figure of forty-four per cent, according to what the minister has told us.

That maximum amount was provided during a year when our armies were preparing to launch an invasion of the coast of France. Maximum air effort and maximum air bombardment were required. It could be estimated that during the months which would follow D day there would have to be continual and prolonged bombing, as in fact there was. There was also the war against Japan which it was generally expected would have to be prosecuted to the best ability of this country as soon as Germany had been defeated. Therefore it was reasonable that a large amount of money had to be made available.

When the estimates were prepared for this year it was known that the war with Germany was nearing an end, but it was also thought that the war against Japan would be continuing for some months after the cessation of hostilities with Germany. Therefore it is reasonable to think that money was provided in order to take care of air operations in Asia. It would seem that these operations would be expensive because of the great distances which would have to be covered. These operations did not develop. So I say the people of the country as a whole will be disappointed when they hear that there has not been more of a reduction than that which has been shown to us to-day.

Within a month of the passing of the estimates last spring V-E day came, and only a few months after that V-J day came. It is not surprising that we find the major reduction in the estimates made in connection with the maintenance of squadrons overseas. I believe the reduction has been in the neighbourhood of $216 million, very nearly half the total reduction. I will go on to examine these various items.

In the figures placed on *Hansard* the other day we find the money which was voted for the first five months of the fiscal year and the money still required for the remaining seven months of the year. Talking only in terms of millions, without bothering with the odd dollars, I find under pay and allowances that $130 million were required for the first five months, while $139 million will be required for the last seven months. We have been told to-day that there has been a reduction of 54,000 officers and men since V-E day. We shall have to ask the minister to give us a more detailed explanation as to why there is not a further reduction in pay and allowances when so many men have already been discharged from the air force.

The next item is travel, and $9 million was required for the first five months, while $14 million will be required for the last seven months of the year. Here again we know that personnel are being brought back, but I gained

the impression that a large percentage of those who were overseas are already back in Canada. While there will have to be transportation provided for a certain number of personnel from the Burma front to England, it seems to me that this amount of $14 million is too large.

The next item is construction, purchase, repairs and operating expenses of properties. During the war years temporary buildings were constructed to house and quarter various units of the Royal Canadian Air Force throughout Canada. Those buildings were well constructed and they have been well maintained. I feel that there is now little necessity for capital expenditures on additional buildings. If it is found necessary to construct any more permanent barracks I suggest that such construction be left and dealt with as a post-war project. There are civilian requirements which should have prior claim to permanent construction for the Royal Canadian Air Force. We are not told in detail how this item is divided between construction and repairs.

The next item is personal supplies and services, including clothing. A total of $7,400,000 was required for the first five months, while $7,600,000 will be required for the last seven months. Again I say that if there has been a reduction of 54,000 men and discharges are going on, why is it necessary to have such a large sum for this item? It may be that the men are obtaining civilian suits with that money, but I was under the impression that that would come out of another department.

Then for communications, signal and wireless equipment; during the first five months $3,000,000, and during the next seven months $12,000,000. Surely there will not be an expansion in the communication services after we have heard of the reductions in the number of stations and in the number of squadrons and units of the forces; and unless it may be that some expenditures in connection with the northwest territories communications are included, I believe we must ask again for a detailed explanation why so much more money is required under that head.

The same remarks apply to ammunition and bombs—$2,000,000 during the first five months and $8,000,000 when for all practical purposes the war is over. Perhaps we are going to build up stocks of bombs and ammunition. Perhaps we require them for training purposes. But it does seem to me that that is a very considerable amount.

The same with fuel costs—for the first five months $6,000,000 and for the last seven months of this year $18,000,000, when we know that there is a large reduction in the number of units and that many aircraft have been destroyed or otherwise disposed of.

The same thing with regard to aircraft, engines and spares—$25,000,000 during the first five months of the year and $46,000,000 during the remaining seven months.

The same remarks apply regarding reduction in personnel and reduction in units.

Then we come to the maintenance of overseas squadrons. There, of course, a big saving has been made.

Finally we finish up with the amusing little item of sundries, printing and stationery, and we see that there is no doubt about it, that the paper war at least is not over.

I am glad that the minister mentioned that a research development division was to be started, but I see no item here for expenditure on research. Is that expenditure to be in addition to the amount which is to be voted in these estimates? Is it to be included in some other estimate, or is it included as part of the various items I have mentioned? Perhaps the minister will be kind enough to explain that.

The minister referred to the atomic bomb, and of course everybody is tremendously interested in any developments along those lines. But there are many other fields in which experiment must be carried on, and I would recommend to the minister a careful study of jet-propelled aircraft and of radio-controlled aircraft. It is perhaps foolish to speculate, but while it may be said that the atomic bomb is going to increase the importance of the air force there must also be taken into consideration the possibilities of radio-controlled aircraft, and it may be no more fantastic than other developments would have seemed a few years ago to suggest that the air forces of the future will be launched from subterranean runways and guided toward their objective without a single airman being on board or in the air.

I should like to compliment the minister upon having started investigations regarding flying and radio control in the northern latitudes. That is of importance and we have a grand opportunity to study conditions in the northern climate. May I also suggest that our own shores are frequently fog-bound, and investigations might well be carried on to see how we can eliminate fog and improve landing conditions when our coasts are fog-bound.

Dealing with the question of radar—and this is harking back to my first statement as to the need for coordination between the three services—I feel that there may be scope to reduce overlapping and duplication in the

employment of radar. In the main, air forces are sending their beams into the air to locate approaching aircraft. But radar is also used for the detection of surface vessels, and perhaps if the navy and the air force would get together a big development might be made there.

My time is fast drawing to an end, but before I sit down I should like to ask a question, because we have had no statement regarding the matter. What is the present policy of the government as to following closely along the lines of either the Royal Air Force of Great Britain or the United States air force? There are two widely different views upon that question. There is a great difference between the organization and equipment of the British air force and the organization and equipment of the United States air force, and we may have to make a decision as to which we shall follow. No doubt the government has made a decision as to whether it will follow the Brtiish or the United States system.

In conclusion, I should like to feel that the remarks which will be made while discussing these service estimates will all be prompted by the highest motives, that we members of this house in all parties are determined to do all we can to preserve the peace. There is a feeling among those of us who have seen two world wars that we must make enormous sacrifices to prevent a world war III from coming in our time, because if a world war III does come it seems to me that the means of destruction are so developed that whole civilizations might be wiped out before those means of destruction themselves can be destroyed, and it is one of the ironies of fate that perhaps the means of destruction would be the very last thing to be destroyed.

If by any chance we speak with intensity and perhaps with some emotion, advocating the steps which we consider should be taken in order to achieve the preservation of peace, and based upon such experience or previous study as we have had, I want all hon. members, including those whose experience or study has led them to quite different conclusions from those which I have reached, to feel that while they may have ideas violently opposed to my own, I shall never attribute to any one of them less high motives than I hold myself.

Mr. ALAN COCKERAM (York South): Mr. Chairman, at the beginning of my remarks I should like to pay tribute to those gallant men who served in the Royal Canadian Air Force and those Canadians who served in the Royal Air Force. We in this country owe a great deal to the courage and sacrifice which they showed on our behalf.

In discussing the estimates before this committee, I believe there are certain matters which we should take into account. We have to remember that, as the hon. member for Nanaimo has just said, within a few weeks of the estimates being presented to the house during the last session, V-E day came. Prior to V-E day many men were being transferred to the R.C.A.F. reserve, and there was therefore a paring down in that service at that time. I intend to analyse the figures which are to be presented to this committee in a greater degree than did the hon. member for Nanaimo, because I believe it is time that we in this chamber took account of how the people's money is being expended. We are voting money at the rate of millions and millions of dollars, and we owe it to the taxpayers of this country to see that there is rigid economy in government and in the services for which we provide the money.

Since we came here this evening we have been presented with a statement which paints a very rosy picture of this matter of air-force estimates. In my opinion this is a dextrous transposition of words and figures, having a semblance of face but lacking substance when one analyses it. I propose, taking the figures under the same numbers as the government allots to them, to analyze the monthly expenditures for the first five months of this year, and to show the committee what the government proposes to spend on this service in the remaining seven months. It will be found that in the majority of cases, in spite of the fact that our main war was in Europe, and that the fight we were to undertake in the future was to be a total war against Japan, the expenditures of this department are much greater than they should be. This statement was presented to us to show a very great reduction in expenditures, but we as a committee must remember that the last fiscal year was the greatest expenditure year in the war, and that there has been only one month of war in the estimates we are now to consider.

As to item No. 1, when I average the expenditures I find that we have saved a little on civil salaries and wages. The average monthly expenditure for the first five months was $1,258,924; for the last seven months the estimate is $828,530, or a saving of $430,394 a month.

No. 2, pay and allowances, shows an average for the first five months of $26,006,663, and for the last seven months, an average of $19,913,431, or a saving of $6,093,232 during the later months. I think the minister should tell us if it is the intention to cut down on that figure of pay and allowances as regards the

high ranking officers. We know very well that many junior men are being put out of the services, and the same applies to all branches of the armed forces. Where a saving can and should be made is in cutting out the overhead which bogs the whole department down.

No. 3 deals with travel, transportation and freight. In the first five months there was an average expenditure of $1,815,272; it is estimated that the amount for the next seven months will be at the rate of $2,119,487, an increase of $304,215 a month. There may be some excuse for that, because men are coming home, but after all they are being let out of the service fairly rapidly. The minister has told us that 54,000 men have already been demobilized, and that a further 30,000 will be let out in the immediate future.

Item No. 4 is for construction. In spite of the idea held by the people of this country that construction expenses and the cost of camps and military establishments throughout this country pretty well reached their peak a year or so ago, we find that in the first five months there is an expenditure averaging $2,035,892; in the last seven months the expenditure amounts to $2,378,995. Therefore, in spite of the fact that many camps should be empty at this time and that air stations have been closed down, it is proposed to spend another $343,000 of the taxpayers' money a month on that branch of the service.

Under item No. 5, personnel supplies and services, we find that for the first five months there was an average expenditure of $1,484,793 a month; in the last seven months it is estimated at $1,091,107 a month, or a decreased cost of $393,686.

Then there is item No. 6, communications, signal and wireless equipment. Why there should be this great increase I do not know, but certainly we have not been equipping planes to the extent that we did when we were actively engaged in war. We find that for the first five months the figure is $772,895 a month, and in the last seven months that increases to $1,837,120, or an increase in excess of $1,064,225 a month. At a time when all fighting has ceased, when there must have been a great deal of equipment on hand in all these stations, we find they will spend $1,000,000 a month more of the taxpayers' money during the remaining seven months of the year.

Item No. 7 deals with ammunition and bombs. I do not know why in the last seven months of the year our expenses on ammunition and bombs should go up so high, but we find that in the first five months we spent $457,626 a month, while it is estimated that for the last seven months our expenditures will be $1,171,262. When the war will have been over with Germany for practically eleven months we propose to spend $1,000,000 a month more on bombs, and the taxpayers' money goes up in smoke.

We come now to item No. 8, which deals with mechanical transport and marine craft. There is a small decrease here. We spent $232,636 during the first five months, on an average, and it is to be the magnificent sum of $198,336 in the last seven months, a decrease of $34,300 a month.

Then we come to an amazing figure, item No. 9.

That deals with fuel costs for aircraft and marine transport and marine craft. In the first five months of the year we spent an average of $1,203,940 a month, and it is estimated that the expenditure for the last seven months will reach the colossal total of $2,618,239 a month, an increase of $1,414,299 a month.

It is generally known in this country, and certainly it is known to members of this house, that the air training scheme was cancelled many months ago, and that was the branch of the air force where great amounts of gasoline and fuel were used. We did not have that expenditure in the last part of this year, but at the same time costs are to go up for this one item for the remainder of the year, $1,413,299 a month. We talk of social services and wonder where we shall get the money, and still we spend money like this. This money, in my opinion, could be much better spent in providing social services.

We come now to item No. 10, aircraft engines. In the first five months we spent $5,040,827 a month, and in the last seven months we propose to spend $6,668,141, or an increase of $1,627,314 a month. When the aircraft is on the way out we propose to spend more money on maintenance of engines and such things, when we shall not have half the personnel. The whole thing does not add up.

We come now to item No. 11, miscellaneous stores and equipment. In the first five months we spent $481,626, and in the last seven months we propose to spend $565,269 a month, or an increase of $83,000 a month.

In items Nos. 12 and 13 there are substantial decreases. One deals with the suspension of training operations and flying contracts, and the second deals with maintenance of overseas squadrons.

Item No. 14, the sundries item, is the one about which the hon. member for Nanaimo spoke. We spent an average of $225,919 a month in the first five months, and we pro-

pose to spend $428,924 on these sundry items in the last seven months, or an increase of $203,005. At a time when the force is rapidly disappearing our sundry expenses are doubled.

It is interesting to take the total war expenditures given on page 549 of *Hansard,* showing $920,016,936 for the first five months, whereas for the last seven months it is proposed to spend $1,063,167,252. Worked out, this would show that the whole of the government departments of defence will make a saving for the last seven months of the year at the rate of $32,122,351 a month. At a time when we have been spending billions, and when, with the end of the war in Europe, our expenses for shells and fuel, transportation, and to a large extent equipment, came practically to an end—because the government cancelled a lot of contracts—we find that for the last seven months of the year the savings to taxpayers will not exceed much more than $1 million a day.

How is the Minister of Finance to bring about a reduction in taxation? How will he bring in all these social services unless we as members of this house do our duty, the duty which the people expect us to do, namely, to scrutinize to the last dollar every cent we vote in this house.

I should like to give warning to the ministers, especially the defence ministers, that we intend to scrutinize these estimates down to the last dollar. We want to know month by month how many men were in the services at the first of the month and how many were out by the end of the month, how many planes were being flown at the beginning of the month and how many at the end of the month, so that we can see whether the expenditures are warranted or not.

The Minister of Finance in bringing down these figures the other day could not have studied them very well. At page 548 of *Hansard* the minister is reported to have said:

> Moreover, it will be noted that the amount required for the latter half of this year is very much less than that required for the first half, even though many of the expenditures to be made in the latter half were really incurred during the period of fighting.

With the mass of figures that I have given the committee to-night, I ask whether that statement of the Minister of Finance is an honest one, because it certainly is not borne out by the figures as presented to the house. I have said it before, and I am going to repeat it, that I can see no evidence in this department of government of any attempt to try to improve the situation that faces the people of Canada to-day. The people are paying enormous taxes, and it is the duty of every government official, whether he be an army officer, an airforce officer or a naval officer, or in whatever department of government he happens to be, to see to it that the people get value for the dollars that the government extracts from them. If we continue along the way we are going there will be no dollars to get. I should like to ask the Minister of Finance—he is not in his place at the moment—how he proposes to ease the burden of taxation, as he mentioned many times during the election? How does he propose to do that, unless he gets co-operation from the departments of government, and unless they give us good government with rigid economy so that the people will get value for the dollars spent? The people of Canada will put up money for victory bonds for just so long. I wonder whether the Minister of Finance is satisfied to go into the hole all the time and to keep on borrowing. If that is what he intends to do I think we should fight him. We cannot keep on borrowing, but it appears that is what we shall have to do.

I should like to close my remarks by reminding the minister again that we propose to examine his estimates as we propose to examine the estimates of every department of government. We are not going to vote millions of dollars in a few minutes just to please the government side of the house. This time we are going to have an explanation for the money we spend. Everybody knows that we must raise this money; everybody knows that since the war our national debt has increased enormously. Those of us who are business men—and it does not matter what the size of the business may be—know that there are only two ways in which the government can get this money, namely, by taxation or by borrowing. There must be a tax rate that the people are able to pay. If there is that tax rate there must be a pool from which those taxes can be extracted. I ask the government to have regard to the conditions of the pool where you and I and the average individual in Canada have our money to-day. If the government have regard to that they should see that they do not dry up that pool too quickly.

I am serious when I say this. I believe the Minister of National Defence for Air should stop this debate now, take his estimates back and have them rewritten, because I think they are an insensible bunch of figures to be produced in the house and to ask us to vote. I believe the minister should ask us to go on with some other business and should take these figures back to his high officials and have them reexamined.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): I think I had better say something on the point raised by the hon. member who has just taken his seat.

Mr. MARSHALL: I should like to make a few comments before the minister speaks. I believe that the two hon. members who have spoken at great length have been working on the wrong premise from start to finish. At page 551 of *Hansard* of September 28 are to be found the estimates and the amount already granted. That does not necessarily mean the amount already spent. Consequently I believe, as I have already stated, that the premise upon which these hon. members have been spoken is incorrect. If I remember correctly, the government asked for two appropriations totaling somewhere in the neighbourhood of $2 billion, and the amount that was actually allotted or granted to the air service was $325 million. That amount has been broken down, but this first column does not mean that the amount was actually spent. Would the minister be good enough to break down for us at this time the amount that was actually spent during the first five months of the year out of the amount that we granted as an allocation up to the present time?

Mr. BRACKEN: I think the hon. member who has just sat down is referring to a table at page 551 of *Hansard* where there are three columns of figures. The first column is "amount already granted". The way I interpret that is that it covers the expenditures for five months and that the second column gives the extra amount which the minister expects will be required for the remaining seven months. Is that correct?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): When the original estimate was put in for this year we were allotted funds for five months, based on the estimates of the previous year. The fact that the average monthly expenditures for the last seven months of the year would appear to be greater than those in the first five months is no indication that our expenditures are increasing, as the hon. member for York South has suggested. When the accounts are actually paid, whether it be early or late in the year, is no indication that a considerable saving is not being made in the department throughout the whole fiscal year.

I have placed on the table, although I do not know whether copies have been distributed or not, a comparative statement showing the cash requirements for the year 1944-45, and also the cash requirements for the year 1945-46 for the various items. This table indicates the over-all saving which is being made in the whole fiscal year, and shows a reduction of some forty-six per cent in the requirements for this year. Of course in the early part of the year we had commitments for large expenditures; the war was by no means over. We had commitments which had to be paid. In many cases they were not paid for in the first five months of the year; consequently they are outstanding and will have to be paid in the second part. I think in dealing with these estimates by far the most satisfactory method is the one we have adopted in the past of dealing with them item by item, and getting an explanation on each item as we reach it, rather than for each hon. member to go through the whole list and deal with his criticism of the various items, without making any progress. If that meets with the approval of the committee I suggest that the Chairman call the items, one by one, and we can deal with them in rotation.

Mr. BRACKEN: With all deference to the minister, may I say that the other day the Minister of Finance gave us this statement of figures. I think the house ought to understand what they are supposed to mean. If the minister will look at page 551 of *Hansard* he will see what is perplexing the hon. members over here who raised the question, and what is in my mind. Does the first column not mean what the minister thought his requirements would be for the first five months of this year when the amount asked for was $2,000 million? Hon. members are entitled to think that is still what is meant. When the second column is put in, showing the dditional amount required to March 31, 1946, we are entitled to think that is what is required for the last seven months. That is what is the matter with the situation, and that is what these hon. gentleman have been discussing. Maybe the minister could make it clear; what do these columns mean? And if they do not mean anything, why were they given to us?

Mr. JACKMAN: What were they five-twelfths of?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): The first amount voted in the last session of the last parliament was five-twelfths of the requirements for the year, based on the estimates of the previous year. We had not got our estimates for this year ready at the time that that amount was voted.

Mr. MARSHALL: Could the minister tell us, for example, how much money has been actually spent during the first five months of this year on civil salaries and wages? Is the minister in a position to give us that informa-

tion to-night, so that we can compare his figure with the figure which is shown at page 551 of *Hansard,* namely, $6,294,610?

The CHAIRMAN: The minister has suggested that the committee might consider the statement item by item. In previous years, before going into the items, a certain latitude has been allowed for general discussion. I am wondering if the general discussion has been completed.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

The CHAIRMAN: Then, would it be agreeable to hon. members to have the committee continue with the general discussion? This would not preclude the asking of questions of the minister. When the general discussion is over we could consider the items individually.

Mr. MARSHALL: In order to guide the discussion along the proper lines I think it is necessary for us to clear up the point as to what the three columns on page 551 of *Hansard* actually mean.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): I should like to give the committee that information. The amount required for the whole year for civil salaries and wages is $12,094,320. The amount voted for the first five months of the year was $6,522,000, and what was actually expended amounted to $6,294,610.

Mr. MARSHALL: Then the figures at page 575 are not correct. The second set of figures the minister gave did not correspond with the figures found at page 575.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): The $6,522,000 was the money voted. The amount shown as being already granted is the amount that has been released by the treasury board from the amount voted.

Mr. MARSHALL: That cannot be correct, because if hon. members will look at page 551 they will find that the total amount we voted for the air force was $325,985,039. We find those same figures at page 549. Under the heading "air services" we find those exact figures. Then, right at the bottom of page 573 is a figure of $2 billion, the amount of the apportionment for the first five months of the year.

Mr. BRACKEN: If I might make a suggestion, I think the minister could clear this up. As I see it, the first column is the allocation of the portion of the $2 billion that was allowed the airforce for these special items. The minister has indicated that he has the actual expenditures for those five months under each of those headings. I suggest that the committee ought to have the actual expenditures under each of these headings for the whole estimates—not only for the estimates that are here, but the actual expenditures from one end to the other in connection with all these estimates.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): The actual expenditures are available for four months. The amount released by the treasury board is for five months. However, I can tell the committee the actual expenditures under each item for four months.

Mr. BRACKEN: If the minister could do that it would help the committee.

Mr. MACDONNELL: Mr. Chairman, I should like to take the time of the committee for only a very few moments, not to discuss figures, but to discuss a principle. I wish to refer to the request made the other day by the hon. member for Vancouver South, which was supported by the hon. member for Nanaimo, a request which I thought was a very reasonable one. It was simply this, that in discussing the items for any of the services we should, if possible, have before us a statement for all the services.

So far as I know that request has never been referred to. It struck me as reasonable, and I should have thought that the common courtesy which is usually practised in this chamber would result in some reference to it. If it is impossible to have that done we should have been told why it was impossible. The reason for it seems to me to be this, that in a consideration of two or three departments which are so closely inter-related it would be desirable to know how they are inter-related, and it would enable us better to scrutinize expenditures. What did we, in fact, get to-night from the Minister of National Defence for Air? We got a statement which made us all very proud of what had happened during the last war. Secondly, we got a statement of the strength of the air force in the future. But we did not get any statement of the strategic position. We did not get any statement, so far as I know, of our relations with our allies, either within the empire or outside it, or with the United States.

We got no statement of the strategic position at all. There was only some reference to our position in North America, up near the north pole, and a reference to certain physical difficulties which that caused in connection with radar. But I submit to the committee that when we look forward to the situation which we face, which in spite of our hopes from the united nations agreement, we all

realize, is a very dangerous situation, I submit that we who are here now should not be left to think in a vacuum.

We are told that the airforce will be 10,000 in strength. But I have no way of knowing whether it should be 10,000, or whether it should be the 30,000, which the hon. gentleman who did not make the speech last night is reported to have said.

I should like to submit with great deference —to the Minister of Reconstruction that we who are in this chamber are being very much put into the position into which a group of business men are put if someone came to them and offered them a proposition whereby they are asked to subscribe a large sum of money to a company. Then they are told that this company has close associations with another company, but are not told anything about what those associations may be. In the same way we are told nothing about the business of our enterprise; we are not told what its operations cover; we are not told what its objectives are to be, but we are just asked to put up a large amount of money, and to put it up blindly.

The estimate we are now discussing runs into something like $600 million, and in Muskoka-Ontario we think that is a lot of money. I am sure the Minister of Reconstruction would not put any such proposition before any group of business men to whom he might be trying to sell business; and I submit it should not be put up to us in that way.

I remember hearing the hon. member for Macleod saying the other day—and I greatly regretted hearing him saying it—that we ordinary members were just ciphers, and counted for nothing. I hope that it is not going to be true. We are being asked to act and to vote large sums of money without the slightest idea of what we are doing. As has been already suggested, I suggest with great deference and respect that these figures should be taken back. I do not say this because I want to argue about $5 or $10 here or there, but because I feel that when I come to vote hundreds of millions of dollars I should be given some intelligible basis for why it is being done.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall we consider the first item agreed to?

Mr. MERRITT: I waited until you rose, Mr. Chairman, hoping that the minister was going to reply to the many demands or requests that have been made in connection with this matter. I do not think the present situation is a new one. I believe it is connected with the situation raised during the last few days by the hon. member for Lake Centre and the hon. member for Kamloops. I think the present procedure is exactly in line with what they were complaining about. Like the hon. member for Macleod, I do not wish to be a cipher in this committee. I agree with what the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario said and I had the same thought before he voiced it. If this broad statement could not be given by one of the ministers of national defence, then I think it would be only a courtesy to this committee to tell us the reasons why a statement could not be made.

I do not believe the committee will be satisfied until the minister has considered that request. Everyone in the committee and everyone in the country knows it was a reasonable request. It is being commented upon from time to time by the press and I think it is time it was done. If the minister cannot make a statement he should explain why he could not give us a statement even in its more narrow aspects. This is a matter upon which the minister certainly can speak. I should like to refer briefly to some points upon which I have not been enlightened and upon which I think I should be enlightened if I am to vote sensibly upon these resolutions.

I have one short observation to make with regard to money. Along with other hon. members, I am concerned over the size of this vote, but I am concerned also about another fact. I want to know how much of this vote is for war purposes and how much will be used for a peace-time airforce. That is a very important matter. We are starting off with a great revolution in our airforce, and from the amount of money that is voted in the ensuing year we shall know what kind of airforce we shall have. The amount the government is providing this first year will give us a key to its intentions. We shall know from that what efficiency we may expect from our peace-time airforce.

Putting aside the question of money, I should like to refer to a few other things I expected to hear from the minister. We have been told that the airforce is going to be a force of 15,000 to 20,000 men. We got one little crumb out of his statement, that two of the eight Pacific heavy bomber squadrons are to be maintained. We are told that the remainder of the air force will be made up of bombers, fighters and transport planes. I do not suppose there is an hon. member who would not have known that even if the minister had not told it. Really all we know about this airforce, apart from the occupational force, is that we are going to have two heavy bomber squadrons. I hope

we shall not learn of the specific size of our airforce from the newspapers to-morrow morning. We have not had it here to-night. So much for the specific size and the number of squadrons which give us some idea of what we may expect in the future.

There are many more matters to be considered. For instance, there is the question of policy. Is this force to be an operational force, plus a training force, or is it to be what it was before the war, a training force only? That is an important question and I am surprised that the minister did not tell us.

I go on again to mention a few other items. The minister mentioned the size of the regular force and told us there was to be an interim airforce for which people will be allowed to volunteer. This committee and the country want to know whether volunteers are coming forward for this interim airforce. We want to know the success he has had to date in getting recruits for this force, the name of which would drive away almost any recruit. It is a most unhappy name and I suggest to the minister that he change it.

Then we want to know if it is part of the policy to maintain a paratroop training field with the necessary aircraft suitable for that purpose. We have heard a great deal about the atomic bomb and we have heard about rocket and V weapons which are capable of shooting several thousands of miles. No one can say what the effect of that kind of thing will be. If I were charged with any responsibility in this matter I know that one of the things I would require would be paratroops who could be sent back to deal with the points from which these weapons are launched. That would be the best possible defence in the world against the atomic bomb or anything like that which might be in the hands of the enemy.

If we do not go on with paratroop training we shall be omitting one of the most vital things necessary in cooperation between the airforce and the army in any future war. I do not suggest that we have thousands of paratroops or that we have a large establishment, but I think the minister should give us some idea as to what arrangements are being made for th ecarrying on of this type of training. Perhaps he intends to discontinue it for a short time, and perhaps he can indicate to us that within ten months or a year it is the intention of the government to start again with this training.

The minister mentioned that the auxiliary airforce was to be set up again and I was pleased indeed that that is to be the case. Many of us remember the auxiliary airforce that existed before this war. For many years they used Tiger Moths, and it was only in the immediate months before the war that they had any operational type of aircraft. We should like to know from the minister how these auxiliary squadrons are to be equipped. Is preliminary training only to be given so that when war breaks out it will take months before they can become operational, or are aircraft to be supplied which are suited to their skills so that the force will be ready at once, as was the R.A.F. auxiliary during the Battle of Britain, to step right in and meet any threatened danger?

Before I sit down I would ask the minister to make a general statement upon this question, or if he would prefer it, although I do not want to do so, I would be prepared to ask him specific question after specific question until we obtain the information which I believe the committee is desirous of getting. I am not prepared to go on with any of these items until I hear from the minister as to the substance of this airforce and, as the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario said, I am not prepared to go on in a complete and perfect vacuum. Here is a test of the charges that were laid at the door of the government the other day of legislating by order in council. Here is a request that they can easily grant, a request that commends itself to every member of the house. There are two ways of doing this business. One is to sit like an oyster and rely upon the majority to vote everything through. The other is the way which I am sure would commend itself more to all of us, namely, for the minister to stand before his peers in this house to whom he is directly responsible as the people's representatives and tell us what we wish to know, not because he must, but because he wants to take us into his confidence so that we may discharge our duties in an intelligent manner. I offer that alternative to the minister and I should be glad to hear from him upon the points I have raised.

Mr. MacINNIS: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MERRITT: I sat down expecting the minister to make a reply.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): I would be very glad to reply now if hon. members would give me the opportunity.

Mr. MacINNIS: Before the minister replies, may I say that I think we are at cross-purposes. I do not see these estimates in the way that my hon. friends see them. I may be wrong, but, if so, I should like to be shown. That we are considering these estimates when the year is half-way through

instead of at the beginning of the year is on account of the peculiar circumstances this year. If we were discussing these estimates last March or last April, we would have before us the estimates for a whole war year, and the government would give us—at least we would ask for it—all the material that was available to enable us to compare the expenditures this year with those of last year. When these estimates were prepared, if I understand aright, they were prepared for a war year. But now the war is ended, and part of the estimates cover that part of the year when we were at war and the remainder are required for the demobilization period and for the maintenance of whatever forces may be retained after demobilization takes place.

What my hon. friends are asking for now is something that could be asked for with a great deal of force when the house meets at the next session, but it does not seem to me possible that they can reasonably ask for or get the information they have been asking for to-night, because I doubt very much whether in the United States or in the United Kingdom or in any other country governments have their plans completely prepared for the armed forces that will be required between now and the next war, which we hope will never happen, or that this government is in a position to know just what forces will be necessary to keep our share of the peace in the new international order that is to be set up. I think that is the situation.

I can see no great difficulty in dealing with these estimates. The minister can tell the committee what the expenditures were in the four months or so for which he has an accounting of the five or six months for which we granted an appropriation. As to the remainder of the year he can, in my opinion, give the committee only a fairly approximate estimate of what will be required for the demobilization of the forces that are to be demobilized and for the forces that will have to be maintained. I do not think we should play with this thing. It is too important. If we do play with it, we shall be kept here and be unable to carry on the work for which this parliament was brought together.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Chairman, there are two things to consider. There is the question of audit, and the question of the use of the airforce. In two days the session will have lasted a month. The discussion that has taken place to-night has been the most informative since the beginning of the session, and I congratulate all the members who have spoken. I congratulate the hon. member for Nanaimo upon his change of tone He is older in years than I am but younger in parliamentary experience, and I may tell him that a speech like the one he made to-night will carry him much farther than his first speech in this house.

During the war I looked at the estimates and I was not satisfied with them. I spoke of that to some business men, who could not understand them. I had the support of my very dear friend the hon. member for Davenport, one of the pillars of the Conservative party before he became a Progressive Conservative.

Mr. MacNICOL: I surely have not slipped since, have I?

Mr. POULIOT: A pillar, a great man and a great explorer. Also my very dear friend the hon. member from Broadview, who has done more for the city of Toronto than any other living man. Those two hon. gentlemen supported my contention, and there were even editorials in the Ottawa *Journal* and in the Vancouver *Sun* to the effect that the views expressed by those hon. gentlemen were sound. What we suggested was that there should be a detailed account of the expenditures, and that simply because we were spending billions of dollars instead of hundreds of millions was no reason why we should not have vouchers. The point was, to build vaults if the ones which existed at the time were not large enough to contain all that stationery. The argument we made was that it was essential to the business of good government that everything should appear in the public accounts. Even though no one looked at them it was a protection, because those who handled the business would have known that anyone in this country, any man belonging to any party, could have found the details of expenditures in the public accounts. We carried on the fight; we were lone warriors—a Grit with two Conservatives—and we succeeded in getting something. I remember that one of the members for Lambton—Lambton-Kent, I think it was—asked the Minister of Finance if it was upon his suggestion that there had been a change in respect of the public accounts, and he said, "No; I am answering the member for Temiscouata." That is a long time ago. The hon. members for Davenport and Broadview and myself foresaw then what is happening to-day. During wartime very few members had the courage of their convictions about the public accounts. They forgot that the troubles we had in this country one hundred years ago about parliamentary government were on the question of dollars and cents; at that time it was pence and shillings. When it comes to public accounts there is not a citizen in Canada who has not the right to know how the money

which comes from the taxes is spent. We fought that fight because we did not want parliamentary institutions to fall into disrepute; we wanted parliament to stand high in the minds of all Canadian citizens. That is the first point.

Of course the sound minds of so many gifted Canadians were blurred in time of war. Their conceptions of the true duties of a member of parliament were clouded, and they thought it was patriotism to vote money blindly. That is what happened. I do not blame the government for that; I blame the whole membership of the house, excepting a few, for having fallen so low through prejudice and passion as to forget the elementary duties of members of parliament. What the new members who were not parties to those debates and discussions are saying now is in fact an arraignment of the past. But they cannot blame the government for that. They may blame Arthur Meighen and R. B. Hanson and all the others who have been leaders of the Conservative party, just as they may blame the leaders of the Liberal party. But my hon. friends of the other groups cannot complain either, because they themselves fell in the trap. Was I not alone in denouncing from my place in the house a man who was connected with big business in Montreal, when he was running the Department of National Defence, and I said that he was a tool of international finance. My hon. friends of the Social Credit group, where were they? Discussing theories. They remind me of the fellow who drives his car and, seeing an obstacle in the way, instead of getting out to remove the obstacle and put it in the ditch, rises in his car and makes a speech to the obstacle: "O obstacle, disappear from my sight; let me proceed farther." They think their eloquence is so powerful that the log or stone will roll into the ditch. They are afraid to call a humbug by name.

Mr. FAIR: The hon. member voted for the "obstacle", did he not?

Mr. POULIOT: Pardon me. Oh, I will describe to my hon. friend the obstacle I had. He came from Montreal; he was a Social Crediter; he was running in Temiscouata county, and he spent half of his time in canvassing in a neighbouring county thinking he was in Temiscouata. His address is Holy Grace street, Ville Marie, Montreal. He went back to Montreal, and we have not seen him in Temiscouata county. But he lost his deposit five or perhaps ten times over; I do not know.

Well, now, hon. members see what it is. My hon. friend who has just spoken is just as gifted as are all the sons of Erin, the emerald of the sea, the island of the saints. But the question is not who is gifted. I concede that my hon. friend is more gifted than I am. But when I was carrying on that fight I was alone; I was alone with two Tories.

Mr. COLDWELL: That too is reminiscent of the emerald isle.

Mr. POULIOT: We were fighting for responsible government, which dates back a long time before good Canadians were divided into Liberals and Conservatives. We were fighting for the principles for which my great-grandfather fought and voted, when he supported the ninety-two resolutions and afterwards helped Robert Baldwin after his fight in York to be elected in Rimouski. The principles for which my grandfather fought and my father fought are the principles for which I have been fighting. The question for me is not so much what happened in the past, but what is happening now and what will happen in the future. There is no use in crying over spilt milk. Everybody is responsible, and the important point is not to perpetuate the argument between those whom Swift—not Swift of the Canada Packers, but Swift the author—called the Big Endians and the Little Endians.

The minister now in charge of the department took it over after the conclusion of the war, and he inherited a very heavy legacy. I cannot understand why a greater tribute was not paid to Doctor Cyrus Macmillan, who was the back-bone of the department for air, for all the good which was done during the time that he was parliamentary assistant. A fine man, most unassuming and devoted to his task, he also honoured himself as chairman of most difficult committees like those on reconstruction and veterans affairs. He was making no noise but he was doing the work nevertheless. He was not alone, however, because there were others in the department, one of them in a swivel-chair, occupying the highest post, a group captain or a squadron leader. At any rate, he occupied the highest post although he was a man of no military training except for a Cook's tour of fifteen days in England. But he is the big bug of the department now, the nigger in the woodpile, an intriguer of the worst kind, a man of the old regime. I tell the committee, and the country will know to-morrow, that the big bug of the former regime is still the nigger in the woodpile in the air department, or one of them. There are eighteen million negroes in the Belgian Congo and I do not know how many there are in the woodpile of the department. But there they are and here we are, and they are flying everywhere, flying to files, flying to

the doors, flying everywhere, but flying in Ottawa. And they are omnipotent. They decide about the length of the war.

It is my deep conviction that if the example of that great man who, although unknown in Canada, is well known in Europe, General Henri Guisan, the commanding officer of Switzerland, has not been followed, there is a reason. What did General Henri Guisan do? In the month of August he decided to retire, because the war was over in Switzerland. But here it continued. It is impossible to get boys out of the airforce at the present time. There is one who was employed as a technician with the telephone company down home. He is sick; his health is bad. His family lives down there and he could be useful in the telephone company, but it is impossible to get him out of the airforce, where he does nothing, just on account of some commanding officer who wants to keep all his men around him to show how indispensable he is to the country. And we have to pay prebends to these parasites.

An hon. MEMBER: Brass hats.

Mr. POULIOT: I do not know whether he is a brass hat or not, but he is a parasite, and he is not alone. Here we see them in Ottawa, fellows with absolutely nothing to do, and girls who do nothing but who remain in the air force, because the number must be large enough to justify a continuance of the prebends to some big man, some big powerful man who has waged wars in Ottawa. They waged the war in Ottawa. Just before this war there were veterans of the South African war who were in office in Ottawa and who had waged also the first great war, and now they have been waging the second great war in Ottawa, not moving out of Ottawa. They do not travel on railways or in aeroplanes; they stick to their swivel-chairs. And they are heroes.

Well, sir, it is a serious matter, but there is a ridiculous side to it. Of course it is ridiculous to think of it. We are discussing two things at the same time. We are discussing the burden of taxation, but nobody uses the scissors in the right place to simplify our discussion. You know very well, Mr. Chairman, that so long as we have that large number of parasites in Ottawa and throughout the world—yes, I will say the world, because they are in Europe as well as in Canada—it will be impossible to reduce taxation. What struck me in the argument made by the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario was this. Speaking as a business man, he said he did not understand the whole thing. I agree with him. I cannot understand it either.

We are, all of us, complaining of the burden of taxation, and we have reached the point where the people will not be willing to suffer taxation as we did during the war, now that the war is supposed to be over. There is not the same incentive to continue paying taxes, although we shall have the same amount of taxes to pay on account of the expenditures, and that has no *raison d'être* at all. The continuation of war expenditures for the sake of those who did not go to the war is incredible.

There are two classes of those who did not go to the war and there is one class that deserves less sympathy than all others. That is the class of those who did not go to any theatre of war but who thought it was their duty to send others there; and those fellows are heroes, mark you, because they remained here in Ottawa or Toronto or Montreal or Quebec city or Winnipeg or Vancouver. They were everywhere.

An hon. MEMBER: And they got decorations.

Mr. POULIOT: Surely, by sitting still in their swivel-chairs, and perhaps by turning a little. When they turned to the right they got a decoration and when they turned to the left they got another decoration, because they could not move, so that when they made the least move they deserved a decoration. At this stage of the discussion I challenge all my colleagues to defend the brass hats, but I do not think one will rise in their defence.

Now, sir, can it go on any longer like that? Is it possible for the Canadian people to continue paying taxes, the same amount of taxation, now that the war with Italy, Germany and Japan is over, just as when the war was going on? I cannot believe it. A very important thing was said to my hon. friend the member for Davenport, the hon. member for Broadview and myself, during the war when we were asking for more information, and that was, "Oh, it is a war secret." It was a war secret! Well, are there any more war secrets now in connection with these expenditures, now that the war is over? And these expenditures are the same, exactly the same as when the war was still on. No change was made in them because the brass hats made their calculations to stay as long as possible in office and to continue to be the hidden power behind the throne. That is all. It is no secret; everyone knows it. But does anyone dare to say it? It is the truth acknowledged by everybody, but nobody says anything about it because they may have a friend there or a cousin or an uncle or a brother-in-law; they may have a son; I do

not know what, but they may have somebody close to them and they are afraid to condemn that silly practice, just to protect a few friends, or because they are afraid to speak. That is the point. The other day I was unfair to the hon. member for Royal; I was too quick. Sometimes it happens to me. I regret it very much, because I give him credit for being a faithful member of the house. Besides that I cannot forget that he helped me, along with the hon. member for Vancouver South, on the civil service committee. I do not wish to offend any hon. member. Sometimes when I use strong language it is because of the depth of my conviction.

But the time is coming in the very near future when there will be a readjustment of feeling and of mentality, not only throughout the country but perhaps in this house too. It will be the great divide. When I was sitting on the other side of the house I spoke of a union opposition composed of all the elements who were opposed to some fellows who were intriguers of the worst kind and who have since been discarded. I give credit to the Prime Minister for having discarded them. But now, sir, conditions are very serious in this country. The people think a lot, and deeply so. They are worried; they are worried about the future; and they make a distinction between those who are Liberals at heart, whatever their label may be, and those who have not the same understanding of things. I will not say any more about it tonight, but if it is necessary, and in the very near future, something may happen to be the occasion of that adjustment. All party labels may be discarded, may be thrown into the wastepaper basket, and there may be a readjustment not on party lines but on beliefs, on beliefs in the future of this country.

What is the privilege of a member of parliament? It is to be free; it is to be free of all ocular powers in Canada as well as anywhere else. The freedom of parliament is the most essential thing in this country. I consider it so important that I am ready to pass over many things that may displease me so as to find some ways and means to cut down that nefarious bureaucracy to a nonentity. Will it be done? I do not know, but it is a hard task. No one who considers the future of this country may see it in pink. The future is not rose; it is not pink. It will be very hard. We shall have to have the spirit of pioneers to meet our task.

Each member of parliament who was elected on June 11 knew very well that the future would be hard, difficult and most strenuous, and that the hills to climb toward prosperity in this country were very abrupt. It was done just the same. It showed that each member and each candidate—I pay the same tribute to the candidates who were running, except to the imports that came to Témiscouata from Montreal and Quebec city—most of those who were running, and each one of those who was elected faced the future. At the time of their nomination and at the time of their election they knew very well that we were pretty far away from some of the easy times we had known before the war and before the depression, the easy times that followed the first great war and until 1929; far from it. The future is hard, and it will require more courage on the part of hon. members to take the necessary steps to face the future for the benefit of this country than was required when they accepted the nomination sometime before June 11.

Mr. BLACKMORE: It will take intelligence too.

Mr. POULIOT: My hon. friend has it. I give credit to the hon. member for Lethbridge. He is liked by all hon. members. It is not so much a question of intelligence as of character, of determination, and of patriotism. That will be understood only by those who will not be ashamed or afraid to call Canada their country, and to call it their own country in the first place, and who will be good enough citizens to be proud to be good Canadians.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I may not be able to maintain the high level of debate that has been set by the previous speaker. There are some answers that I should like to give to points raised by various hon. members. The hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard asked me if I would give some indication as to what forces we were planning in the post-war period. I did not mention it before. It was not that I was trying not to put all my eggs in one basket when I made the report, but I do hesitate to make any definite pronouncement as to what our post-war forces will be, because obviously we cannot determine at the present time what we shall be required to provide. We do not know what international commitments we may have, and what those commitments may require from this country. But at the same time we are working on plans that are subject to change from time to time. In connection with the airforce we are planning at the present time on the basis of ten squadrons, of which four would be bomber reconnaissance, two fighter, three transport, and one photo. In addition

to that, we would have communications flights and possibly some other small number of flights of other types of planes.

It may be said that that is not a balanced force. On the other hand we have the auxiliary squadrons that are being planned. That, too, is subject to change because it has been considered that any auxiliary squadron that is to function adequately must have a proportion of permanent force personnel attached to it in order to maintain and care for the aircraft which are on charge with that squadron.

I would hope to have at least in the neighbourhood of twenty auxiliary squadrons. They would probably be fighter squadrons, or equipped with fighter aircraft to a large extent, and, of course, trainer aircraft as well, which would mean that we would not need as many fighter squadrons in our regular air-force in view of the fact that we would have fighter squadrons available from our auxiliary forces.

Then, of course, we have the reserve. I am not making any pronouncement as to what they will be called upon to do, or what we shall be able to do for them. I should like to see the reserve called up and given the opportunity for training each year. However, that is a matter to be decided in the future. I do not wish to be committed to any definite policy either as to auxiliaries or reserves until a considerably later day.

The hour is getting late, and I should like to mention again the question of figures, because it does not seem to me that some hon. members are clear as to what we have shown in the figures we have produced. As I said before, at the last session we got a supply vote of five-twelfths of the amount that had been voted in the previous year. All that money was not expended. While the five months supply that was voted amounted to $453,876,000, the amount that was released by treasury board was $325,985,039. All that amount was not actually paid out in cash, because a large amount of it is still on hand. But it was released by treasury board, and available to be paid out by the airforce.

Mr. HAZEN: Are the words "amount already granted" as they appear in the first column of page 573 incorrect?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): No. That has been granted by treasury board to the airforce; but that does not say that we have actually paid out that much money.

Mr. JACKMAN: How much is on hand?

[Mr. C. W. G. Gibson.]

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): For the four months the actual expenditure amounted to $196,965,237. But the point I wish to make clear is this, that there is no use in going on a month-to-month basis, and averaging out our expenditures according to the amount we have spent in five months of the year. I would suggest that hon. members, from the schedules I have placed on the table of the house, make a comparison of the expenditures or requirements for the year 1944-45 with the amount asked for this year.

In 1944-45 the actual amount was $1,090 million. This year we are asking for $598 million, which is, roughly speaking, about fifty-four per cent of what was voted in the previous year. Consequently, that is the comparison which should be made, and not the comparison as to what we were authorized to spend in five months, or what we actually spent in five months; because it is the overall commitment for the year that gives the indication as to whether we are actually saving money or whether we are being extravagant.

Mr. BRACKEN: What purpose is served by the first column on page 551 of *Hansard*?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): It just shows the amount released by treasury board to the department.

Mr. BRACKEN: It is no good to us.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): It just tangles us up.

Mr. BRACKEN: I think every hon. member wishes to help the minister to get ahead with his estimates, to a point where he can give us whatever information he has concerning his expenditures. A short time ago some hon. member asked if the minister had the expenditures for five months in connection with the first item, and the minister answered. Then he said at a later time that he had the expenditures only for four months. I suggest that if the minister has the actual expenditures for four months he should give them to us to-morrow. Perhaps that is all he has and all he can give us.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): Possibly I can obtain them for five months. I have them with me for four months, and I shall try to-morrow to have them for five.

Mr. BRACKEN: If the minister could give us that, perhaps that is all he could give us.

Mr. FRASER: Mention has been made of the five months; but if the minister will look at items Nos. 9 and 10 he will see that in item No. 10 there is a reduction of $117,066,440 for aircraft, engines and spares, including overhauls. But in item No. 9, which covers fuel costs for aircraft, we find an increase of

$4,455,341. In other words, this means that although the department has reduced its aircraft, engines and spares, and the overhauling of engines it is going to use or it has used about ten million more gallons of gasoline.

That does not gibe, and it is one reason why this statement does not work out, when viewed from a business basis. I suggest that to-morrow the minister should give us a proper break-down and tell us how many more aircraft he is using, the amount of gasoline used, and why it is necessary to have an extra ten million gallons of gasoline; because I think that is the way it works out. I believe the gasoline costs fifty cents a gallon, for the 100-octane rating. We should have a proper statement on this item, and on others. Those two do not seem to work out.

On October 22 the victory loan campaign is to be opened. I suggest that it would be to the advantage of the minister and the government to do everything possible to show the people of Canada that there is no waste. If the minister can do that I feel that every man here will go out in that campaign and help to put it over—because we cannot get along without the victory loan. We shall have to show the people just where their money is going.

We cannot ask questions on every item of the estimates to bring out all the facts. The minister should break this down, item by item.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): The increased fuel cost comes about solely because of methods which have been adopted for payment. During the time of the training agreements in Canada the fuel was being secured through lend-lease by Great Britain, and supplied by Great Britain as part of her contribution, so that we did not have to pay for it. Later on, there was a change in the method of providing fuel, and the cost of that item was consequently increased.

However, the actual consumption of gasoline in 1944-45 was 170,907,400 gallons. The estimated amount for 1945-46 is 66,278,800, showing a very great saving in the consumption of gasoline. The increase in that item is owing to the method adopted for payment.

That is why I should like to have the committee go through these items, one by one, so that explanations can be given in logical order. We would not have to go from one item to another and hop about without having full explanations of the various questions brought up. I should like to deal with each question fully when we come to each item.

Mr. FRASER: As I said before, items Nos 9 and 10 go together. That is why we should have extra information in a properly prepared statement. If the minister could prepare another statement for to-morrow it would help a great deal.

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Friday, October, 5, 1945.

The house met at three o'clock.

NATIONAL EMERGENCY

BILL TO CONFER CERTAIN POWERS UPON THE GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce bill No. 15, to confer certain powers upon the governor in council during the national emergency following the war.

He said: This is the bill to which I made some reference in my remarks to the house on Tuesday night. It is in terms somewhat similar to the War Measures Act although more limited in scope. It is designed to remain in force for one year only unless parliament should choose to extend it beyond that period.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Has the bill been printed?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Yes.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

ALBERTA NATURAL RESOURCES

CONFIRMATION OF AGREEMENTS BETWEEN GOVERNMENT OF CANADA AND GOVERNMENT OF ALBERTA

Hon. J. A. GLEN (Minister of Mines and Resources) moved for leave to introduce bill No. 16, to amend the Alberta Natural Resources Act.

He said: The purpose of this bill is to confirm the agreements between the government of Canada and the government of Alberta set out in schedules I and II.

Schedule I: The agreement in schedule I of the bill provides for the settlement of differences which have arisen between the dominion and the province as to the effect of the natural resources transfer agreement and

the ownership and control of three developed power sites on the Bow river lying within or adjacent to the Stony Indian reserve. The three sites known as the Horseshoe, Kananaskis and Ghost sites were developed by the Calgary Power Company Limited and are being operated under authorizations issued by the dominion government in the years 1909, 1912 and 1929 respectively, when they were under exclusive dominion jurisdiction prior to the transfer of natural resources in 1930.

The agreement in schedule I provides that the land and water power at the two sites in which the Indian interest predominates, namely Horseshoe and Kananaskis, are to remain under dominion jurisdiction, while the Ghost site, where the provincial interest is substantial, shall be deemed to have passed to the province at the time of the transfer of the natural resources. The Minister of Mines and Resources will issue all three licences which are to replace the existing authorization and will continue to administer the Horseshoe and Kananaskis developments, while the province will be responsible for administration of the Ghost development as soon as the final licence is issued.

Schedule II: Under the Alberta Natural Resources Transfer Act, 1930, certain public shooting grounds and bird sanctuaries were preserved. Many of them have now dried up or are otherwise unsuitable for the purposes for which they were originally set aside. The agreement in schedule II provides that these reservations may be cancelled by agreement between the two responsible ministers concerned with the approval of the governor in council and the lieutenant-governor in council

Concurrent legislation by the dominion parliament and the legislature of Alberta will be necessary.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

RECONSTRUCTION AND SUPPLY

ESTABLISHMENT OF DEPARTMENT TO ASSUME FUNCTIONS OF RECONSTRUCTION AND MUNITIONS AND SUPPLY

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply) moved that the house go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to present to the house a bill to establish a department of government under a minister of the crown to be known as the Department of Reconstruction and Supply to which will be transferred the functions of the Department of Reconstruction and the Department of Munitions and Supply, and that provision be made in the bill for the appointment of a deputy minister and officers, clerks and employees of the department.

He said: His Honour the Deputy Governor General, having been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the consideration of the house.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

THANKSGIVING DAY ADJOURNMENT

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs) moved:

That when this house adjourns this day, it stand adjourned until Tuesday the 9th instant.

Motion agreed to.

HOUSING

INQUIRY AS TO USE OF AVAILABLE MILITARY CAMPS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. L. O. BREITHAUPT (Waterloo North): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of National Defence which is definitely related to a national housing emergency, particularly as it relates to returning service personnel.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. When a question is put on the orders of the day the hon. member is not allowed to make a statement. The question must be brief and to the point.

Mr. BREITHAUPT: I will put the question now. In view of the very serious housing situation in the city of Kitchener and other towns and cities throughout Canada, is it the intention of the Department of National Defence to adopt a policy of making military camps throughout the country available for urgent housing accommodation as and when these camps are closed for military purposes? What is being done in the case of No. 1 C.W.A.C. camp at Kitchener?

Mr. HUGUES LAPOINTE (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member sent to me in the absence of the Minister of National Defence a copy of his question.

The Department of National Defence is doing all possible to render army camps available for civilian housing, subject to continuing requirements of the army for demobilization. The district officers commanding have been authorized in the event of an emergency to place vacant army buildings at

the disposal of civil authorities. This measure is of a temporary and emergency nature only.

From the long term viewpoint whenever a camp becomes surplus to requirements this department takes immediate steps to declare the buildings surplus to the crown assets allocation committee, which has jurisdiction in the matter of reallocation of accommodation between government departments or agencies or for disposal through War Assets Corporation. At the time of declaration of surplus this department brings to the attention of crown assets allocation committee any requests for accommodation by civil authorities or private individuals.

With particular reference to the C.W.A.C. T.C. at Kitchener, the district officer commanding military district No. 1 has been instructed to make any vacant accommodation available to the city of Kitchener in the event of an emergency, as I have just mentioned.

The training centre is being disbanded at 31st October, 1945, and will be declared surplus to requirements immediately, and crown assets allocation committee will then be in a position to make any final arrangements for the future use of the camp, either directly or through War Assets Corporation.

Mr. MacNICOL: May I ask the parliamentary assistant, if the answer he has just given the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Breithaupt), with regard to the use of government or war-time buildings for emergency housing in congested cities, or in communities in which housing conditions are acute, applies also to Toronto, where the housing situation is nothing short of appalling.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I was informed by the officers of the department that the district officers commanding all military districts had been given authority to make available all vacant accommodation.

QUESTION AS TO PRIORITIES ON BUILDING MATERIALS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): The question I am about to ask I do not expect to be answered to-day, because I did not have an opportunity to present it to the Minister of Reconstruction before now. It is a matter which has been raised before. I raise it with all deference, because we are receiving so many representations with respect to it. It has to do with priorities on building materials.

As a member of parliament—and I think this applies to all members of the house—I am receiving urgent representations from business concerns, suppliers of building materials and other individuals desiring to build, or to complete construction of, or to repair, their own houses. The chief source of grievance in these representations is that because of priorities in favour of Wartime Housing Limited, bottle-necks are being created in the building trades. The fear exists that unless some early and reasonable modification is made in the present code of priorities, the purpose of their existence will be defeated and will have the effect of shutting off large sections of private enterprise from the building field. In view of the urgency of this matter, I would like to ask the Minister of Reconstruction if not necessarily now but at the earliest possible date, he would make a statement to this house as to the advisability of making some reasonable modification in present building material priorities.

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction): There is a great misconception about the matter of priorities. In so far as I am aware, there are no priorities in building materials. There seems to be a theory that we have large stocks of building materials frozen or tied up in warehouses.

I received notice a short time ago of a question. The question was not asked, but I had the answer here. Perhaps it is typical of the situation. The question stated:

> Approximately 700 houses now under construction by private persons or contractors of which 174 are for veterans. This is in addition to houses already completed. Meantime materials furnished for Wartime Housing will not be used for some months and are lying in warehouses while houses under construction by private contractors cannot be finished for lack of priorities on materials furnished for Wartime Housing.

That referred to Calgary. The situation was investigated. The situation regarding the Wartime Housing project in Calgary is this: The roofing, shingles, rock wool and mill-work have all been ordered and are in various stages of process and shipment. Four cars of lumber are on hand and sufficient rough plumbing to build the first twenty houses. Concrete is being poured at the rate of four houses per day. There is, therefore, no hold-up in the project, and the material on hand and in process is definitely not too far advanced for the progress being made.

In other words, Wartime Housing orders material for delivery to fit the completion of the work. No stocks of material are being held by Wartime Housing. Wartime Housing

deals on a mass production basis and buys its material in carload lots, which gives it an advantage over the private contractor. Of course it buys wholesale, which is not particularly popular with the local dealers. It has of course the advantage of building a large number of houses which are constructed from the same plans, and also the large-scale buying of a number of identical articles which arises out of that advantage.

I may say also that it is in the unfortunate position of furnishing an excellent alibi for those who do not plan as well as Wartime Housing in the carrying out of their projects, and of that fact advantage is being taken. I do not think there is a house building organization in this country which has not written me that it cannot carry on because Wartime Housing is building; but I think hon. members will hardly regard it as reasonable that Wartime Housing should modify its procedure on that account.

Mr. COLDWELL: Is there actually no priority in respect of veterans' houses over the private building of houses—in this city, for example?

Mr. HOWE: There are no priorities.

Mr. COLDWELL: I have been told by people who asked for lumber that they could not get lumber because of the priority on veterans' houses.

Mr. HOWE: In the case of lumber it is wholly untrue.

Mr. TUSTIN: I wish to ask a question relating to the same matter. I have had several complaints recently from retail lumber dealers who claim that there is a priority operating in the wholesale market and that they cannot purchase these goods to distribute to retailers. Is there any priority given to Wartime Housing in the wholesale trade?

Mr. HOWE: Wartime Housing does its purchasing wholesale. It has the advantage of being a large buyer in the wholesale market which the ordinary house builder does not have. Wartime Housing has the advantage of buying on a large scale.

Mr. JACKMAN: Unfair competition.

Mr. HOWE: Nevertheless I may say to my hon. friend that I presume the purpose of all this is to get houses for veterans, and Wartime Housing is building houses for veterans.

Mr. TUSTIN: Only in some centres.

[Mr. Howe.]

MEAT RATIONING

SPECIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF RETAIL DEALERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): I have two questions to direct to the ministry on subjects that have been raised before, but which I now with all deference raise again. One is to the Minister of Finance and the other to the Minister of Reconstruction. I would ask the Minister of Finance what changes in meat rationing have been recommended by the retail meat advisory committee, and what is the attitude of the government in respect to these recommendations.

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I can read a statement in reply to the question. It is a bit long and I dislike reading long statements on the orders of the day, but probably there is no help for it.

In replying to the question of the hon. leader of the opposition, of which he was kind enough to give me notice, I should like to say just a word, in the first place, about the position and function of the wartime prices and trade board's advisory committees. The board has about two hundred voluntary advisory committees across the country with which it consults from time to time on problems relating to their particular sections or levels of a trade or industry. It has always been clearly understood both by the board's officials and by the members of these advisory committees that all discussions and exchanges of views at such meetings are confidential. This is because premature or partial disclosure of suggestions relating to possible changes in board regulations would often be confusing or misleading, and also because the board must necessarily accept full responsibility for all administrative decisions reached.

However, in view of the considerable interest in the house and in the country in matters relating to meat rationing, it may perhaps be regarded as not improper if I make a brief statement in reply to the question asked by the hon. leader of the opposition.

I should like to make it clear that there are four or five advisory committees to the board which have a definite interest in meat rationing, from the primary producer right through to the retail meat dealer. During the past three or four weeks the board has been in renewed consultation with all these committees, and in addition the board has received a great many communications suggesting particular modifications in the rationing system. All the views and suggestions

have been carefully considered by the senior officers of the board and by the technical rationing officials.

Among its advisory committees the board has had for nearly four years both a national and regional retail advisory committees, but not a national advisory committee composed solely of retail meat dealers. At the conclusion of its meeting with the large retail meat dealers' delegation on September 19 the board invited the Retail Merchants' Association of Canada to nominate a special advisory committee of representative retail meat dealers with which the board could confer from time to time on matters relating to meat rationing. This invitation was accepted and the first meeting of the committee took place on Wednesday of this week.

I should like to make it clear that this was a meeting of the board and an advisory committee, and not a meeting with a delegation that came to present a case. The nature of the meeting was a review of the system of meat rationing in the light of three weeks' experience, and in the course of the discussions, which lasted through the entire day, many suggestions were made by members of the committee and many practical problems were fully discussed. On some of the points put forward there was fairly general agreement, on others there appeared to be a majority view; still other suggestions appeared to relate more particularly to local situations. And the same kind of discussions took place in the meetings with the other advisory committees mentioned above.

Perhaps the most generally held view among the retailers was that such cooked meats as bologna, weiners, meat loaves and jellied meats should be off the ration. The position of the board is that it is not possible to accept this suggestion and still stay within the target of 130-135 pounds per capita consumption. Under our earlier system of meat rationing two years ago most of these cooked meats were off the ration, with the result that during the ten months of rationing their current rate of production nearly doubled, from an estimated rate of about 100,000,000 pounds a year to a rate of nearly 200,000,000 pounds a year. If these cooked meats were off the ration, the board would have to place rigid and complicated quota controls limiting all production at the source, and would also have to reduce the so-called "red meat" coupon values in order to stay within the over-all meat consumption target. This would be even more objectionable to both the secondary meat processors and the retail trade.

The board is, however, taking steps to revise the coupon values of most of these cooked meats, and assuming that they cannot be ration free, this appears the most acceptable alternative to all interested sections of the trade.

The next most general subject of comment by the members of the retail committee was that coupon values for some cuts of meat appear not to be accurately matched with consumer buying preferences, with the result that some cuts of meat appear less readily saleable. On these points there appeared to be a considerable variation in actual experience between individual butchers and between districts. Some members reported little difficulty along these lines, others reported a good deal of difficulty.

The board is carefully reviewing all these detailed suggestions, and while it will take a few days to work out the technical adjustments, I am able to say that the board will be making changes in the coupon values of several of these items which will go quite a long way in meeting the consensus of views developed with the retail advisory committee.

I cannot be precise as to the details or as to the date upon which these changes will go into effect. It will take a few days to work out the details, but I am informed by the board that they will be advertised in the press and in effect by the middle or at the latest the end of next week. Reprints of the revised and consolidated ration charts will be distributed as soon as possible, probably within a couple of weeks.

Perhaps I should add a word about the use of "tokens". The decision to make use of tokens was made in the light of very numerous and widespread expressions of opinion by the retail trade and consumers during the rationing period two years ago, when the need for some sort of "small change" for coupons became apparent. While there are some places where the use of tokens still appears to be something of a difficulty, I think it is now reasonably clear that retail meat dealers in most parts of Canada are finding them a very acceptable improvement in the mechanics of rationing.

Mr. BRACKEN: I thank the minister for this very full statement.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

STRIKE AT FORD MOTOR PLANT, WINDSOR

On the orders of the day:

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): Last evening just before the dinner recess I was unavoidably absent from the house when questions were directed to the Minister of Labour. I took note of them, however, and would like to answer them now.

The hon. member for Essex West (Mr. Brown) asked:

Can the Minister of Labour inform this house as to developments in the proceedings with respect to the strike at the Ford Motor Company plant at Windsor, and other threatened strikes?

My reply is that there is no change in the situation. The union concerned has not altered its attitude towards the company's objection that its officers are not willing to enter a conference with union representatives and the ministers of labour for the dominion and the province, while the union persists in its policy of picketing the main office of the company and preventing its officers and clerical staff from gaining access thereto. The position of the company has been made known to the officers of the union, and the union's reply thereto was transmitted to the company.

The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) asked:

In view of the gravity of the strike situation at Windsor, will the government or the minister consider the immediate appointment of a controller to take charge of the Ford plant and resume production there pending the negotiation of an agreement between the parties?

My reply is: It is the opinion of the department of labour of the Ontario government, which is in the direct line of responsibility, as well as the Department of Labour of the dominion government, that the plan of bringing the parties together is the one which has the best hope of successful conclusion of the work stoppage.

THREATENED PACKING PLANT STRIKE IN VANCOUVER

On the orders of the day:

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): The hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Irvine) asked:

Has the minister been advised of a possible packing plant strike in Vancouver, and if that is an imminent danger what has he done or what does he propose to do to settle the grievance before the strike takes place.

My reply to this question is: I have been informed of a feeling of unrest on the part of packing house workers in Vancouver because the regional war labour board for British Columbia has rejected an application for increased wage rates and a shorter work week. Proceedings on appeal before the national war labour board have just been instituted by the union.

FUEL SHORTAGE IN WESTERN CANADA—ALBERTA AND BRITISH COLUMBIA COAL MINERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. ROSS THATCHER (Moose Jaw): Has the attention of the Minister of Labour been drawn to the acute fuel shortage which is reported developing in western Canada? If so, is the department taking any steps to end the strike of coal miners in Alberta and British Columbia?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): I have been informed by Mr. Angus Morrison, who is secretary of district 18 of the United Mine Workers of America in western Canada, that, after a conference with the Acting Prime Minister (Mr. Ilsley), he has been in touch with president Robert Livett of the mine workers in Canada, and the executive board is meeting on Monday in an effort to conclude the strike. I hope they will be successful.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

INTERIM SUPPLY

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Acting Prime Minister): It will be necessary for me to ask the house for another instalment of supply on Tuesday next, that is, one-twelfth of the main estimates. It will be remembered that the house voted one-twelfth shortly after parliament assembled on September 6, and I indicated at that time that it would probably be necessary for me to come back at the end of the month for another one-twelfth. I hope therefore that the leaders of the other parties, and indeed the members of the house, will facilitate the passage of this additional one-twelfth, since it is necessary in order to meet bills that are coming due.

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): With respect to the voting of another month's interim supply—of the main estimates, I gather—

Mr. ILSLEY: The main estimates, yes.

Mr. BRACKEN: I may say that under the circumstances in which the house finds itself the official opposition will be glad to facilitate the passage of this measure in every way possible.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): May I say something similar. I realize that the government must have money with which to meet its bills, and we shall not place any obstacle in the way of the granting of interim supply.

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): The members in this group will also co-operate with the minister.

THE BUDGET

ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO PRESENTATION ON FRIDAY, OCTOBER 12

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Acting Prime Minister): Another matter I should like to mention is the date of the budget. I have given the question of an appropriate date some thought and it seems to me that the best date would be a week from to-day. I may say that I have arranged to make a trip to western Canada in the following week to speak in the interests of the victory loan, and I should like to present the budget before I go. On the other hand, our progress in the preparation of the budget has not been so rapid that I can advance the date much before, or at all before, a week from to-day, that is to say, on Friday. The question arises about the hour. I think it is important that parliament should adhere to the practice of evening budgets, the presentation of the budget at eight o'clock in the evening, and if the house would be disposed to consent to forgoing consideration of private bills, which might be ready for discussion between eight and nine o'clock on Friday a week from to-day, I will present the budget at eight o'clock one week from to-day.

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): With respect to the budget, which the Acting Prime Minister announces he would like to bring down a week from to-day, at eight o'clock in the evening, let me say that if he feels it is in the public interest that it be brought down at that time, we shall be glad to give way in respect of any private members' business in order that his proposal may be carried out.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): As regards the consideration of private bills, I think we should do all we can to meet the wishes of the minister, who has important engagements elsewhere, and we shall be glad to cooperate in that respect.

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): The members in this group, Mr. Speaker, will also cooperate with the government in this regard.

POSTAL SERVICE

PARCELS TO GREAT BRITAIN—WEIGHT LIMITATIONS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. ERNEST BERTRAND (Postmaster General): Yesterday I was asked a question by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) with reference to the weight of gift parcels being sent to England, which is limited to five pounds. While we are now in a position where we can send parcels of eleven pounds to Belgium and France, the weight of parcels to England is limited by the British government to five pounds and we cannot do anything to correct this situation. The initiative must come from the British government. There is a good deal of misapprehension about this, so much so that I have to-day received a letter from the ministry of war of the United Kingdom with respect to the same question that was asked yesterday by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar. As I have said, we cannot do anything, but to the least expression from the government of the United Kingdom indicating that they desire to increase the weight to eleven pounds we shall at once respond.

WAR AND DEMOBILIZATION

PROVISION FOR APPROPRIATION OF $1,365,000,000 FOR WAR PURPOSES, DEMOBILIZATION, PROMOTION OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY, ETC.

The house resumed from Thursday, October 4, consideration in committee of a resolution to grant to His Majesty certain sums of money for the carrying out of measures deemed necessary or advisable in consequence of the war—Mr. Ilsley—Mr. Golding in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE FOR AIR

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): Just before we proceed with this resolution, the minister last night suggested that it might be better if we took the items on the sheet that was distributed to hon. members in the order as listed there. If that is the wish of hon. members, we will so proceed. On the other hand, if any hon. members wish to have further discussion before we go into these items I think that they should be permitted to have that discussion. I believe we would make better time if we took the items as they are listed, but that is for the committee to decide.

Mr. MacNICOL: In the course of his remarks yesterday the hon. member for Nanaimo made some reference to aircraft carriers. If Canada has aircraft carriers, has there been an effort made to transfer to the Canadian service the young Canadians serving on British aircraft carriers as flyers or pilots? I am informed that a number of them have been transferred, but that others who have been flying in the Pacific have not been approached and have not been transferred.

Hon. COLIN GIBSON (Minister of National Defence for Air): In answer to that question may I say that I am not in a position to speak on behalf of the naval air service, as it comes under my colleague the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services. He will be dealing with that when he continues with his estimates.

Yesterday the suggestion was made that an over-all statement should be made concerning the three defence services. I should like to point out to hon. members of the committee that the estimates that are before the committee at the present time are very largely made up of expenditures that were incurred during the period of the war, and also expenditures incurred in connection with demobilization. The war has been over only a matter of seven weeks, therefore it will be realized that we have not progressed very far in determining what our post-war organization shall be. The atomic bomb was dropped something like eight weeks ago, and will possibly revolutionize defence forces hereafter. As a result, no very definite programme can be produced at the present time.

On the other hand I can well realize that the committee may want to have before it the defence programmes of the three services before passing on the defence estimates. I regret that the Minister of National Defence was called away yesterday and was therefore unavoidably absent, and is not able to be back to-day. I think it can be arranged for him to go on and complete his naval estimates next Tuesday, and possibly continue on from there to make his report in connection with the army, so that the committee will have before it the programmes of the three defence departments before coming to any final consideration of the estimates for each department.

It was suggested that perhaps the programmes of the defence departments were not carefully coordinated. I want to assure hon. members of the committee that estimates are not prepared in watertight compartments by the departments concerned, and have been correlated before being brought in here. In the first place, programmes are prepared in the various service departments. They are then outlined by the various departmental officials and are subject to revision by the defence council, which has on it representatives of the three defence services. That revised programme for each of the services is then considered by the defence committee of the cabinet, and finally approved by the government. Therefore in that way the appropriations of the three services are carefully considered and balanced before they are presented to the house.

[Mr. MacNicol.]

In considering the air force estimates that are before the committee at the present time the question was asked yesterday, what purpose is served by the first column on page 551 of *Hansard*? The leader of the opposition said: "It is no good to us". The hon. member for Souris said: "It just tangles us up." I should like to explain as carefully as I can the reason for that first column. The heading of that first column is, "Amount already granted." That leaves us the additional amount required to see us through the remainder of the year. The additional amount required is $272,502,077, which is the amount that I am asking the house to approve in committee at the present time. It is quite true that the total amount granted has not been spent. I should like to make it clear that the amount that has been granted has been turned over to the air force. We have some of it on hand at the present time. But the amount that will be required in the final seven months of the year is the amount we have on hand plus the additional amount asked for, amounting to slightly over $272 millions.

I was asked if I would produce a statement showing the actual expenditures made in the first five months of this fiscal year. I have it here, and I shall read it to the committee so that it will appear in *Hansard*. The total expenditures amount to $238,081,440. They are made up as follows:

Civil salaries and wages	$ 5,478,570
Pay and allowances	111,782,941
Travel, transportation and freight	6,902,051
Construction, purchases, repairs and operating expenses of properties	4,689,630
Personnel supplies and services	3,172,506
Communications	2,545,032
Ammunition and bombs	1,395,464
M.T. vehicles and marine craft	660,659
Fuel cost for aircraft, M.T. and marine craft	7,069,861
Aircraft, engines and spares, including overhauls	4,209,522
Miscellaneous stores and equipment	1,914,400
Flying training contracts	429,706
Maintenance of overseas squadrons	87,291,529
Sundries	539,569
Total	$238,081,440

I should like to refer once again to some of the comparisons that were made in comparing the expenditures as shown in one part of the year as against another part of the year. I should like to make it quite clear that in making such a comparison, to use a homely expression, you might as well take a family budget where the bills come in during the early days of the month and are collected and probably paid toward the end of the month. If you average the expenditures day by day, in the early days of the month they will be low; then suddenly, on the day you

pay the bills, the housekeeper will be accused of going haywire and running up terrific expenses in one particular day. That would not be sound. The only way to ascertain whether you are going behind one month is by comparing it with the previous month or with the same month in the previous year, to find out what the over-all expenses were for that period. Consequently it is fallacious to start comparing payments made in one month with payments in the previous month or the months just before that. I would suggest, if it meets the approval of the committee, that we continue to examine this statement item by item, so that any information required on an item may be given as we come to it; and I can assure the committee that the fullest possible information is available.

Mr. POWER: Before we go on to an examination item by item I should like to say a word with respect to the creation of a fleet air arm and to lay before the two ministers concerned, the Minister of National Defence for Air and the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services, certain factors which I believe should be considered very carefully before they embark upon any large undertaking in the way of a fleet arm.

I do not propose in any way to oppose the creation of such an arm. The naval air force did credit to itself, to its country and to the allies during the last war, but I think the attention of hon. members should be called to the fact that in creating a fleet air arm we will be creating a duplicate service. My hon. friend the minister may say that I was minister when the fleet air arm was brought into being, and I shall have to admit that my better judgment was coalesced into acquiescing, in the stress and strain of the war and probably because of the glamorous deeds of the flat tops and aircraft carriers of the Royal Navy. But here is what it means, and this was pointed out at the time. In all probability it means a double set of aerodromes, a double set of training schools, a double set of technical schools to train the technical men, a double set of staff officers to plan—and a great deal of planning goes on in the armed services. I notice the hon. member for Cape Breton South in his place. I am sure he and all his socialistic friends would be only too pleased to be members of the staffs of the armed services, because they spend a very great deal of time planning. It would mean a double set of planners and a double set of designers. I think it is fairly well known to hon. members that the design of the aircraft used by the fleet air arm is not the same as the design of the aircraft used by the army, by the Royal Air Force and by the R.C.A.F. There are perhaps reasons why they should differ in certain respects, but I would point out that the most famous raid made during the war, that of Doolittle on Tokyo, was made with army aircraft.

So it goes, all through the piece. But it means more than additional expenditures. I believe I am justified by the experience in the last war in saying that it means a certain amount of rivalry, a certain lack of harmony as between two very great organizations, the navy and the air force. It is not betraying any secret to say that it was notorious in the United States that the United States navy did not get on with the army, and that situation was particularly glaring with respect to their air services. There have been rumours that in Britain the high lords of the admiralty were even a bit sticky; and that the people of the air force, as perhaps befits a young and growing organization, were a bit cocky, so perhaps they did not get along any too well either. In any case Canada had to furnish training schools for the fleet air arm at Kingston, Aylmer, St. Eugene and I think one or two other places.

Mr. MacNICOL: Was there not a school at Collins Bay?

Mr. POWER: That is Kingston. The fact of the matter is that while there was a surplus of pilots in the R.C.A.F.; while thousands of them were kicking around Bournemouth in England and thousands more were being put on the special air crew reserve here, the fleet air arm was asking for new men to come in for training, because there seemed to be no co-ordination as between the R.A.F. and the fleet air arm. Without opposing the creation of this arm, I am pointing out to this committee—

Mr. MacNICOL: Did the hon. member mean the R.C.A.F. or the R.A.F.?

Mr. POWER: The R.A.F., because a large number of our men were being trained for the R.A.F. My contention is that if some of the men who had been through their elementary and intermediate stages of training had been taken on and given the last phases of training which would be necessary to make them fleet air arm flyers, it would not have been necessary to begin training all over again. I fear that with two great organizations such as the navy and air force competing for recruits, both endeavouring—and this is a legitimate ambition on the part of those within these services—to build up a better organization, in this country we will have a lack of harmony which will not serve the purpose either of the nation or the forces themselves. So I suggest

to the two ministers that before we get into the position of creating this fleet air arm; before the inevitable happens, as it will happen in this house and this country, and people say we are paying too much for the armed forces; before we create a duplicate service; before we do an injustice to those who may very properly embark upon a career in the fleet air arm, by perhaps axing them later on, after a few years, we carefully consider not whether we should have men flying from carriers but who shall be responsible for the organization.

In the last war it was possible for the Royal Air Force and the R.C.A.F. to organize observation units, as I think they were called. Hon. gentlemen who are more familiar with what happened overseas than I am will remember that the army desired to have artillery officers trained as observers. We thought it would be easier to take a pilot who had gone through a year and half or two years of flying training and train him to spot for the artillery than to train an artillery man to fly to the place he wanted to be. The discussion did not last very long, and the army won, but eventually, during the course of the war, those observation units came under the control of the air force. So whether it be the R.A.F. or the R.C.A.F. it seems to me it should be possible to reconcile the training, the supply and the organization of men who will fly from battleships or carriers and men who will fly from the ground, without creating a very expensive organization.

If I may do so I would like to suggest to the ministers that they get together the officers of their departments, for there are excellent officers in both departments who know this whole story far better than perhaps anyone in this house knows it. Let them get together and put their cards on the table, because we are starting something new. That was done in the old country after the last war, where there was a controversy which lasted for years. Eventually the big navy people won and a fleet air arm was created; but before embarking on this policy let us give it careful consideration. I think the ministers could discuss it with their officers, and if they cared to have it, there are men in this house who could in an informal way give them all the advice possible. There are men on both sides of the house able to do that. Before any of us get into a controversial argument or wed themselves to a big navy or a navy air arm or a land air arm, let us have all the facts and give them serious consideration.

[Mr. Power.]

Mr. BRACKEN: Mr. Chairman, we have all listened with interest to the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. I am not rising to comment on the subject he raised, but I am sure that with the splendid record he had as Minister of National Defence for Air, this house and the country will listen with respect to the statement he has made.

I am rising for another purpose. It is as to procedure in this committee. There is only the one resolution before us. It is asking that $1,365,000,000 be voted for war expenditures and demobilization. Any member may get up and discuss anything that may be included within the details of that appropriation. It seems to me that unless we arrive at some understanding and discipline ourselves, we may very well talk here for a couple of months. As leader of one party I want to say that we are prepared to discipline ourselves and to confine ourselves to a discussion of individual items when we come to them. However, before that time arrives I think a full discussion of the general situation should be open to any hon. member who wishes to speak. I feel also after the experience of last night that I should say something more at this time.

The different ministers of defence have been asked to give us an over-all statement of their policy with respect to defence, but up to now such a statement has not been forthcoming. The Minister of National Defence for Air referred to this request to-day, and indicated that he was not in position to make any such statement except for an interim period. A good many hon. members will be disappointed that we have not heard more. However, he said that the Minister of National Defence—army and navy—would be here at a later time and might be able to supplement what he had to say.

Quite frankly when we reached these estimates last night I felt a good deal of frustration. The tables that were given to us a few days ago by the Minister of Finance either mean something or they do not mean very much. They were taken by me, and I think by most hon. members, to mean that the figures in the first column showed the amounts that had been allocated or voted for the first five months of this year, while the figures in the second column showed the amounts that would be required for the remaining seven months. The minister has now indicated that they do not mean that they have been allocated out of the $2,000,000,000 that was voted last year, but that the treasury board has apportioned the amount to each item. Is that correct?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): The amount that has actually been received by the department concerned and that had been allotted to it during the five months' period.

Mr. BRACKEN: But it was not apportioned out of the $2,000,000,000 voted last year?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): It was the grant actually drawn; the proportionate amount of that $2,000,000,000.

Mr. BRACKEN: As I remember it last night—

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): The $2,000,000,000 has been allocated and granted to the various departments as shown in this table.

Mr. BRACKEN: As I remember, last night the minister intimated that a certain amount had been allocated, first of all for the first item in his estimates. He then went on to say that some treasury board had altered that amount, and that the allotted amount was the figure shown in the first column. What I am getting at is that that column does not mean very much to us. The minister has come along to-day and has given us the expenditures for five months—expenditures for the five months under each of these items. I agree with the hon. member for Vancouver East, however, that that information is not very helpful to us in considering these estimates.

As I look back over the last half dozen years of war I find that this house granted to the government large amounts of money without much question and without much consideration. Now the ministers are relating the present requirements to the amounts voted in the past. Our position is that these total expenditures increased too rapidly and are not decreasing rapidly enough. In view of the situation in which we find ourselves I should like to say something to-day which I had planned to say on an earlier occasion but which I was unable to say for reasons which the committee will understand.

The resolution before us has to do with war expenditures and demobilization. It asks that we approve the granting to the government of $1,365,000,000 for expenditures on these items over a seven months period. On Friday last the Minister of Finance presented to this house a statement in explanation of his request for this appropriation. When he got through we saw what the total was; in fact it had been intimated before. Since that time many hon. members of this house have spoken, including the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green), the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Low), the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell), the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker), the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton) and others. If I may say so, for moderation and tolerance and non-partisanship I doubt if those addresses have been excelled in this house at any time that I can recall.

A few days ago the Minister of National Defence presented another statement. It was with respect to naval expenditures. When he got through he intimated that he wanted $172,000,000, after indicating that the force would be reduced, if I remember correctly, to 10,000. Yesterday the Minister of National Defence for Air presented his statement in which he indicated that the air force would be reduced to 15,000 or 20,000, and he outlined his idea of what its interim organization should be.

I submit that the government has done itself less than credit in the case it has presented in asking for $1,365,000,000 for seven months. This leads me to deal with one aspect of this measure, the business aspect. The other day the hon. member for Vancouver South dealt with defence policy. He asked for an over-all statement from the government, and he volunteered some constructive suggestions. We are still waiting for that statement. The hon. member for Vancouver South was followed by the members for Lake Centre and Kamloops in criticism of the policy of carrying on, now that the war is over, by order in council under the War Measures Act.

There are four major aspects of the measure now before us to which we might give attention. One is what we might call the remnants of the war expenditures. Another is the welfare of the returning men and of the dependents of those who will not return. The third is defence policy for the future, and the fourth the business aspects of the whole matter. I shall not take more than two or three minutes to refer to the first three.

With respect to the remnants of the war expenditures, obviously our commitments must be met. But in saying that, I think we should also say that unnecessary expenditures and waste must be eliminated. I am sure that the ministers are endeavouring to see that that is done right now. I think also that the huge expenditures of the past should be brought under review, not in closed session, but in open session.

With respect to the welfare of the returning men and their dependents, this has been the subject of earnest consideration by a committee of this house in the past and will

be again, as well as in the deliberations of this committee, and I am sure it will receive long and considered judgment by the members. We must try to see that the young men who fought in this war shall not be economically worse off for having done so. Physically they should be restored to the maximum of health that modern medical science can achieve for them. With respect to their adjustment from war-time to peace-time activities, we should see that they are given the training that they missed when they went away, and any additional training we can give them, and that they shall have work suitable to their capacity at reasonable rates of pay on their return.

With respect to the defence policy of the future we shall await a further statement from the government. The member for Vancouver South the other day made some suggestions which received favourable commendation from many sections of the house. Whatever we may decide upon in detail in our plans for the future, I think we must do two things: we must plan to protect ourselves against attack, and we must cooperate fully with other nations to try to see that we are not attacked.

Now I come to the phase of the matter with which I wish to deal in greater detail, the business aspects not alone of this particular measure but of the sum total of them all.

I think at the outset that we should take stock of where we are at to-day. Here we are in the middle of a fiscal year, and we have had no budget—meeting in the middle of the fiscal year with half of a year's money spent without the expenditures having had adequate consideration either by this parliament or the previous parliament; meeting in the middle of the year with civil estimates for six months already passed—five months last winter and one month for which we granted interim supply three weeks ago; meeting in the middle of a fiscal year with war estimates for seven months already voted without much consideration—with five months supply voted last winter and $400 million or the equivalent of two months' interim supply voted three weeks ago; and now here we are meeting in a short session with insufficient time to give to these tremendous expenditures the full consideration they should receive.

It is a most unusual situation. In our judgment, Mr. Chairman, it is an inexcusable situation. It has never happened before, so far as I have been able to learn. It should not have been allowed to happen now; it must never happen again. There is no reasonable defence for our being in this position, discussing expenditures that reach the huge sum of $5,000 million a year, over half of which has been already spent.

What does this measure aim to do? This is the first step in a procedure to make available $1,365 million for seven months for certain purposes. That is a lot of money—$200 million a month—$7 million a day. Since this measure was introduced a week ago $50 million of the Canadian taxpayers' money has been spent under this measure. And that is not all. The civil estimates were laid before us some time ago asking for an expenditure for the twelve months' period of more than $1,000 million. In addition to that there had already been voted last winter the huge sum of $2,000 million for war purposes, making a total of these three items of $4,388 million or the equivalent of some $12 mililon a day. But that is not all either, Mr. Chairman.

At page 565 of *Hansard* the Minister of Finance indicated that there were other expenditures not included in these amounts. He indicated that there were war service gratuities and reestablishment grants that would amount to $240 million a year, to be added to these other appropriations. On the same page he indicated that export credits and foreign exchange control expenditures would have to be added as well. He did not give the total amount, but he summed up by saying that the total would come to more than $5,000 million for the year in which we now find ourselves.

That figure is large, but it is not all we should be thinking about. What we should be thinking about as well is that this is the people's money we are dealing with, and that when we approve these measures we approve the taxes necessary to raise the money, and we approve the debts necessary to pay for the deficits. It is important that we should realize the full implications of our action. It is only because I feel that these expenditures, which were increased to such tremendous heights under the patriotic impulse of war, are not being reduced fast enough that I have taken these few minutes to bring out some of these points to-day.

My general criticism of the situation in which we find ourselves may be mentioned under four headings.

The first criticism is the disrespect which has been shown to parliament by letting six months go without a budget, by permitting six months to pass without adequate consideration of these tremendous expenditures, and in bringing us here too late to deal adequately with them. Hon. members know very well the reason. Parliament was called to meet here

last January 31. It met one day and prorogued the same day; it was called again for March 19, and sat for four weeks or until the life of that parliament expired; and it ended without a budget and without adequate consideration having been given to expenditures. Now, late in the year, with half the money gone, and very little time left to deal with the matter, we are here and are asked to consider and take responsibility for passing these huge amounts.

The second criticism I want to make, and I make it in all seriousness, is that in the manner of bringing these expenditures before the house the government has removed the most effective check it had upon the prevention of waste. We have before us one resolution asking for $1,365 million. When the civil estimates come down for $1,000 million you will have over four hundred different resolutions. When these resolutions pass, no branch of the service can exceed the amount voted under each item. It has not the power to do it, and the only way the government can get any additional money for any such item is by governor general's warrant. But what do we see here? The government brings in one resolution and has provided us with a breakdown to help us consider the total, but it does not carry the breakdown into the bill; so when we are through, the government for this purpose will have $1,365 million in one lump sum into which hundreds, yes, thousands of officials can dip, and the government is at once put on the defensive. The most effective means the government has of preventing waste has been given up by bringing in estimates in this fashion. The government has forfeited the help which might have come from the heads of five hundred or a thousand sections of the service, in each one of which it would have been some responsible official's duty to see that the expenditures were not increased. But now, everybody is against the government; every service there is will want more money; and in spite of the best efforts of the government its expenditures will be greater than they need be had they been brought forward in the way that ordinary expenditures are brought before parliament.

I realize the answer of the government. In war time nobody raised serious objection to the course it followed. But in peace time it ought not to be permitted. I think that is one reason why the expenditures to-day are as high as they are. As I said, under this plan nobody is helping the government to keep the expenditures down. On the contrary, practically the whole public service is against the government. There is perhaps not a service but thinks that its work is good and wants to extend it, so the whole pressure of the officials is against the government. Thus, in spite of the government's best efforts, its expenditures will be higher than they need to be.

The government's practice is not in the interest of the minister himself; it is not in the interest of the government; it is not in the interest of the taxpayer.

I have said that the expenditures are unnecessarily high. Let us take a little perspective of what we are doing.

We have no public accounts before this house. The last public accounts available come only to March 31, 1944, and therefore are eighteen months old. That makes it very difficult for hon. members, even if the expenditures of that time were warranted to pass upon these items now.

Mr. MacNICOL: It makes it impossible.

Mr. BRACKEN: But let us try to get a little perspective of the situation. In the year the war started this government spent $550 million, the next year $700 million, the next year $1,200 million, the next year $1,900 million, the next year $4,500 million, last year $5,300 million. I do not know exactly what it is this year, but the minister indicated the other day that it would be over $5,000 million. Thus the amount in the first year of peace is to be nearly ten times as much as in the first year of war.

Hon. members may not like it; the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) did not like it the other day when I mentioned it; it does not matter; these things must be said. In the last six years this government has spent approximately $20,000 million without adequate consideration by parliament. That is more than was spent by this nation in the whole period of its history up to this war. All of it was spent without any adequate checking up by the government itself or by this parliament.

Because of that huge growth in expenditure, taxes had to be increased. The war-time taxation in 1939 was $300 million, in 1940 $300 million, in 1941 $550 million, in 1942 $1,000 million, in 1943 $1,800 million, in 1944 $2,100 million. I suppose it is even higher this year than it was last year. Last year the total revenue from war-time taxation and other sources was $24,000 million, and that is more than the Canadian people paid in taxes during the first fifty years of the history of this country. Even this large amount paid only half or less than half our total expenditures last year. The balance was raised by borrowing, and how much did we borrow?

In 1939, the year war was declared, the total debt of this nation—in round figures—was $3,700 million, the next year $4,000 mil-

lion, the next year $5,000 million, the next year $6,600 million, the next year $9,200 million, the next year $12,360 million. I do not know what it amounted to on March 31 of this year, the end of the last fiscal year, but it probably approached $16,000 million. As that is gross debt, it is not quite a complete picture. Perhaps a more accurate statement of the position is indicated by the net debt, but even that has increased very largely—from $3,100 million in 1939 to $3,200 million in 1940, $3,600 million in 1941, $4,000 million in 1942, $6,200 million in 1943, $8,700 million in 1944, and while we have not been given the figures, it is now probably in the vicinity of $11,000 million. In other words, in these six years we increased our total debt from less than $4,000 million to, I suppose, in the vicinity of $16,000 million, and our net debt from something over $3,000 million to approximately $11,000 million.

The other day the Minister of Finance, in presenting his statement, as reported at page 566 of *Hansard*, said that interest on the debt, together with one of the social services, family allowances, now came to more than half of the total expenditures in the civil estimates. You have them before you, $1,000 million. The minister said that these two items, interest on debt, and the cost of family allowances, came to half or more of the total figure, or in other words as much as the whole expenditure of the government the year before the war.

I mention these figures, Mr. Chairman, because I think we should have them before us when we are considering what we are going to spend from now on. I want to read two or three extracts from the minister's address in introducing this proposal. The first is on page 548. He says:

It will be noted that this amount—

That is, for war expenditures and demobilization.

—of $3,365,000,000 is $1,085,000,000 less than the total of the war and the Mutual Aid appropriations provided last year.

I do not know exactly why the minister mentioned that reduction. It is true it is a reduction in that item. Later he went on to say that there were almost as many additions to the budget as there were reductions in it. You will find reductions in the estimates for the department of defence for navy, army and air. The figures you will find on page 563 of the minister's address. But I wish to read one other item from the minister's address on page 565.

The amount which we estimate will be required for war service gratuities and reestablishment credits is approximately $240 million which will, of course, be an expenditure in addition to the appropriation being requested under this resolution.

I simply want to bring together these different items in the government's proposed expenditures so that we can see the total. Further on, on the same page, he said:

To this must be added certain other cash requirements, particularly those for export credits and the financing of the foreign exchange control board which will bring our total requirements for the year above $5 billion.

Or only a little bit short of the total for last year, in this year, the greater part of which is after the war is over. I want to read another statement on the next page. It refers not to this year, which ends next March, but to the year that follows, the year that ends March, 1947.

During the year following this ninth victory loan, and for which it is expected to provide the moneys required over and above our revenues, our expenditures and other cash requirements, including the loans we propose to make to allied nations for reconstruction, will probably amount in all to about four billion dollars.

In the second year after the war is over the government is now anticipating an expenditure of $4,000 million, which is twice as much as in the war year 1942, three times as much as in the war year 1941, nearly eight times as much as in the pre-war years, namely, $3,500 million more than in pre-war days. And that is for the second year after the war is over.

Mr. HOWE: Does my hon. friend say the second month after the war is over?

Mr. BRACKEN: No, the second year.

A little further on the Minister of Finance makes this statement:

In view of these large requirements I believe we must borrow something approaching two billion dollars for this period. This is a huge amount, even though it is much less than the totals we have borrowed in recent years.

And now listen to this. He continued:

Something on this scale is required, however, if the total reduction in our expenditures and cash requirements is not to be reflected solely in our borrowing.

What does that mean? It means that to the extent that they are short they are going to borrow; that in order to make any kind of reduction in taxation they will make it up by borrowing. No other meaning can be read into that statement. In other words, he says that if we borrow enough we can reduce taxation. Mr. Chairman, I have only one comment to make on that, and it is this. In peacetime, to the extent that we depend on borrowing for financing ourselves, we are not

facing the issue squarely, and financing on borrowed money is a concession to the well-to-do.

However, the main point I wish to make is that the minister is obviously making it clear now that in order that there may be some reduction in taxation we shall resort to borrowing $2,000 million in the second year after the war is over.

But I must hurry on. In view of the fact that we have had no public accounts since March 31, 1944, I would ask the government to let us have two or three figures. What has been the total expenditure for the fiscal year 1945? There are only three questions; they are very simple. What has been the total revenue from taxation and other sources for the fiscal year 1945? What was the total indebtedness, gross and net, at the end of the fiscal year?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Ended March 31, 1945?

Mr. BRACKEN: Yes. If the record were brought up to date it would be appreciated. The government may or may not be in a position to give it to the present date, but there is no reason why now, many months after March 31, we should not have the figures at least up to that time.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): I did not hear the third question.

Mr. BRACKEN: The total indebtedness, gross and net, as at the end of the last fiscal year. I have outlined the situation. It is only a statement of facts. We either continue those expenditures at a very high rate or we reduce them; it is for the house to decide.

In talking about the $4 billion a year expenditure two years after the war is over, the Minister of Finance intimated the other day that about one-third of it would be for what we call the civil estimates. That is more than $1,300,000,000. As I see the picture that faces us, it will not be $1,300,000,000, it is pretty sure to be $1,500,000,000. When the minister intimates that there will be a total expenditure of $4 billion, and says he is to borrow $2 billion, I am wondering if we are not heading for a civil budget approaching $2 billion. When intimations of this kind are given to us I think it is time that we should take into serious consideration where the voting of these huge sums of money is going to lead us.

There is no use in pointing out a situation like this unless one makes some constructive suggestion. I wish to make some. I hope nobody in the government will take offence at them. We have a duty to perform here; we have to present these matters. We are not allowed to help the government to shape policy; we are not allowed to share with them the responsibility of administration. Whatever other duties we have under the party system, one of them is to try to point out the errors the government is making, and, to make constructive suggestions toward correcting those errors. I have five suggestions I wish to make.

Parliament must meet on time in the future. There is not an hon. member in this committee but realizes that, with the other work the government has brought forward, we have not time to deal with this huge problem effectively.

Mr. HOWE: May I ask what limits our time?

Mr. BOUCHER: The Prime Minister.

M. BRACKEN: Yes, I shall tell you.

Mr. HOWE: We are prepared to sit here in this session until next year.

Mr. BRACKEN: You should have been prepared to come here months ago. As I said, parliament met on January 31 and adjourned the same day, then it did not resume its sittings until March 19, although the government knew that the end of the life of parliament was only four weeks ahead. That was where the first mistake was made.

Mr. MACKENZIE: It sat more days last year than the British parliament.

Mr. BRACKEN: It met on March 19 and prorogued on April 16. That is where the first error was made. The second error was made in not getting us here earlier for the session and now there is talk of having another session meeting shortly after the new year, and the idea is to hurry through this one. No, the mistake was made by the government. There is nothing that we can do now to give us adequate time to deal with these matters.

The second point I wish to make is that there should be no more opening of the public purse for thousands to dip into. That is what this very policy is. When the government brings forward its civil estimates there is not one resolution but 426 or so; and no branch and no department can expend more than the amount that is within each one of these resolutions. The officials in charge of each branch are concerned to see that they do not spend more than that because they have to justify asking for a royal warrant to spend more. All that protection which the ministers and the government have is gone. I sympathize with the government. But its officials are thus all against it. They do not mean to do any harm to the

state, but all the state's protection is gone. They are all against you when you should have five hundred or one thousand tried and tested officials there trying to see that these expenditures are not exceeded. By this procedure all that protection is gone.

Nobody raised that question seriously during the war, and I do not raise it too seriously now, although I think in the government's own interest they should have that protection. But I want to give the government fair warning that if it comes forward with requests for these huge amounts in this way next year we shall certainly use all the energy we have to see that it is done in a better way.

My third criticism is that the dictatorial powers allowed the government in war must be taken away in peace. We have had some discussion on that, and I need not go into it in any larger field than what is before us now. It is an easy way for the government to proceed, but it is not an easy way for the government to keep down its expenditures. The government has taken away from itself the best protection it had.

My fourth criticism is that consideration of public expenditures behind closed doors must end.

My last one is that the government must get out of its head that it is a dictatorship.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Oh, oh.

Mr. BRACKEN: I know; my hon. friend may laugh. The government did not deliberately plan to become a dictatorship, but when it gets to be one it likes to hang on to it too long. I suppose we would be acting in the same way if we were over there, and if you were over here you would be saying exactly the same thing that I am saying to-day. If you were saying it you would be correct.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Exactly, we did before.

Mr. MacNICOL: The time you took the buttons off.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): Order.

Mr. BRACKEN: The government must get it into its head that while a democracy will stand for a dictatorship in war, it will not stand for a dictatorship in peace.

We are going to look upon this government as the custodians of the people's money, the people's taxes. As representatives of the people, like any other hon. members, we intend to try to hold the government responsible for its trusteeship, and it is a very heavy responsibility.

[Mr. Bracken.]

I do not propose to keep the committee any longer. I rose to point out where the government's policies have led us. I did not criticize it too seriously during the war, although with proper controls these expenditures could have been kept down then. But I do criticize it when they are not going down fast enough now, and when from all indications the prospects of getting them down very fast in the future are not bright.

We expect the government to justify these expenditures, and to justify the meagre measure of tax reduction they will bring in because of the size of the expenditures.

Mr. HOWE: I do not propose to reply in detail to the remarks of the leader of the opposition, but in the absence of the Minister of Finance I think I should cover one point. He spoke of the requirements for 1947 being $4 billion. The Minister of Finance made it clear, I think, that this is a cash requirement and not a budgetary requirement. It would include the loans which will be necessary to countries that have been traditional customers of ours, particularly the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, Holland, Norway and our sister dominions. A period will be required before the Bretton Woods agreement can go into effect, and before the international monetary fund can come to the rescue of the financial difficulties in converting currency as between one country and another. In that period we contemplate having to finance purchases in Canada of foodstuffs and other materials for these countries. The cost of such purchases is a cash requirement, but it is not a budgetary requirement. Naturally the money so furnished will be a debt owing by these countries to Canada, just as the bonds that will have to be sold to provide the cash to make the purchases will be a debt owing by Canada to the people of this country who will be the owners of the bonds. I believe that distinction should be made, because I should not like any hon. member to think the budget for 1947 will be $4 billion or anything approaching that sum.

Mr. BRACKEN: Perhaps the minister would permit me a question. Does he really expect that these credits or advances, or whatever they are, will be repaid?

Mr. HOWE: I certainly do.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Louder.

Mr. BRACKEN: I asked if the minister really expected that these credits or advances would be repaid, any more than the advances under Mutual Aid were repaid. He replies that he certainly does. I doubt if anyone else in the house will give that answer to the question.

Mr. HOWE: I am sorry my hon. friend takes such a pessimistic view of the future of the United Kingdom and the great powers of Europe. Mutual Aid was a gift, and there was never any suggestion of a loan or of any repayment in that connection. The first billion dollars provided for aid to Britain was called a gift and was passed as such by this house. Other money was provided in the form of Mutual Aid, which meant that Britain would pay to the extent of her ability, and that the balance would be a gift. That was made clear to the house. Those moneys will not be repaid. To-day, however, we are making loans which call for repayment to several countries. All these are countries which have paid their debts through the ages; and this applies between Canada and the United Kingdom. I cannot be as pessimistic as my hon. friend, if he suggests that the debts now being incurred by these countries will not be repaid. If we take that attitude, I think we must take the view that the world can never recover from this war.

Mr. COLDWELL: I fully agree with one thing said by the leader of the opposition this afternoon. During the several years we have been discussing these war expenditures under a resolution and a bill I have suggested from time to time that we should follow the practice we adopt in connection with our other budgets and estimates; that is, attach to the bill a schedule which would limit the appropriations to the items approved. I understand the difficulties in that connection, and when this method was discussed with the Minister of Finance earlier I reiterated the objection which was raised this afternoon by the leader of the opposition and urged that as soon as possible we should get back to the normal way of doing business and see to it that the estimates were brought down in the usual way both for ordinary expenditures and for what we now term war or demobilization expenditures. I think the argument that has been advanced this afternoon, that the limitations placed upon the departments and officials by the house when the method suggested is adopted, is a valuable safeguard both to the government and to this parliament. We know there are difficulties at the present time, and for that reason we have been inclined not to press the matter during the war years. But now that we have emerged into the peacetime era I think the sooner we get back to the normal way of budgeting our estimates, the better it will be not only for the country but for the government itself.

The other day the Minister of Munitions and Supply said it was planned again to set up the war expenditures committee, to deal with war expenditures and war assets; and I believe that should be done as soon as possible. I think these expenditures should be very carefully examined. The public accounts committee has a different function to perform; it is more concerned with the ordinary civil estimates and expenditures. I do not think there should be any further delay in establishing the committee to which the minister referred and which during the war we have always called the war expenditures committee, in order that we may go into the criticisms that are heard across the country, although sometimes I feel sure, unjustifiably, from what I know of the Minister of Munitions and Supply. The disposal of our war assets properly comes into a discussion of this kind, because those war assets account for a very large percentage of the money with which we are now dealing. In that connection I have just received a telegram which indicates the misgiving or alarm which some of our people are feeling. I should like to place on record this telegram, which comes from Toronto, Ontario, and reads:

> Whereas the Ontario Federation of Agriculture is greatly concerned to hear that the federal government is planning to dispose of the nitrate plant at Calgary to private interest and contrary to proposals submitted by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture it is urged that no action be taken by government until a further meeting with the Canadian federation at which time full disclosure as to costs, markets, benefits to Canadian agriculture, etc., is made and future action planned.

That is signed by V. S. Milburn, secretary of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, and I take this opportunity to bring it to the attention of the minister. There we have a concrete example. We have made very large industrial expenditures for war purposes, and many of our people are anxious that this house should protect the interests of the country to the greatest possible extent. Where we can use these new establishments for the benefit of the Canadian people they should be so used.

May I say just one other word along the line of what the minister was saying a few moments ago. The Minister of Finance has stated that the $4,000 million is a cash requirement. We know perfectly well that a large part of that amount will have to be used either for Mutual Aid or for loans, as the minister has said. I am quite sure the people of Canada realize that while we can set up all the security councils we like; while we can

do everything possible in the way of rearmament among our own nations, still we may not obtain the security the world needs if we allow any of the nations who have been our partners in this war to sink into the mire of want and poverty. I believe the large amount involved this year in the way of loans to potential customers, to our allies during the war, will receive support throughout the country, whatever may be involved in the way of borrowing or taxation or other means of raising the money. But before the house is asked to go ahead and confirm these tremendous expenditures which have been made and are proposed, I believe the war expenditures committee should be set up and hon. members given an opportunity in public to go into all items of past expenditure. That is what the committee should do. Then as soon as possible we should return to the old method of going into the budget proposals item by item, having the details of our expenditures attached as a schedule to any bill or bills that may be required. As soon as possible we should provide for expenditures in the normal way, in order to protect this house, this country and indeed the government itself.

Mr. REID: Without wanting to be accused of diverting the trend of the discussion, I should like to propound a question to the minister. This has to do with the control exercised at the moment by the R.C.A.F. over civil aviation. Just praise has been given to the work done by the Canadian air force and the commonwealth air training scheme, but any one who has read the history of aviation knows perfectly well that had it not been for those good citizens who kept aviation to the fore during the days of peace, who pioneered, shall I say, and laid the basis for the commonwealth air training scheme, the great success which was accomplished during the war by our air forces and the air forces of other countries might not have been so great. There are men on the Pacific coast who are anxious to enter into civil aviation, but information has reached me to the effect that at the moment the R.C.A.F. has direct control over civil aviation. Has the minister given consideration to this question of control by the R.C.A.F. on the Pacific coast and in other parts of Canada?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): Civil aviation comes under the Department of Transport. Perhaps the Minister of Reconstruction could speak with regard to the hon. member's question.

Mr. REID: Information has come to me that these boys have to receive permission from the R.C.A.F. in order to be permitted to fly so many miles over and around the airports.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): The R.C.A.F. would have control over the R.C.A.F. airports, but they do not control the activities of civilian flying clubs or civilian flying associations. That would be under the Department of Transport.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Mr. Chairman, there are only one or two references that I intend to make, one having to do with the statement by the leader of the C.C.F. that he thought a committee similar to the war expenditures committee should be set up. It was indicated the other day by the Minister of Munitions and Supply that it was the intention of the government to bring in a motion to establish such a committee. I speak now for myself, but I think I speak also for those on this side of the chamber when I say that if such a committee is to be set up, the day of secrecy is over as far as we are concerned.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): And the necessity too.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I am glad to have the concurrence of the minister in that regard.

Mr. JACKMAN: Perhaps the war will be over some day.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I am glad to have the assurance of the Minister of National Defence for Air that when this committee is set up, the question of security no longer arising, there will be no longer any justification for that committee sitting behind closed doors.

The other day when certain questions were placed on the order paper the Minister of Munitions and Supply asked that they be allowed to stand because this committee was to be set up. Let me say that I do not believe this country will consider that the setting up of a committee can be taken as a substitution for the responsibility of the minister to answer in this house for the activities of the War Assets Corporation. In other words, whether or not a committee is set up, we retain our rights to scrutinize thoroughly, by the means of proper questioning, what has taken place in connection with the War Assets Corporation and to disposal of assets and plants. I notice the minister is laughing. He always laughs when any question is raised as to the necessity of his accounting to parliament.

Mr. HOWE: I just said that the hon. gentleman should pay an entertainment tax if he wants both.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: What was the observation?

Mr. HOWE: I just said that if the hon. gentleman wants to be entertained in two sessions he should pay an entertainment tax.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: What that means I do not know and I doubt whether the minister does.

Mr. HOWE: My hon. friend attempted to interpret what I said and I told him what I said.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I always listen to the minister courteously and do not interfere at all, but for some reason, whenever there is an assertion on the part of anyone on this side of the chamber that he as one of the ministers is answerable to this house and to this parliament, he immediately resents it and commences to make remarks similar to the one he has just made.

Mr. HOWE: On a question of privilege, I do not resent it.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Last evening the hon. member for Nanaimo asked for an over-all plan. That over-all plan was not given, nor has there been any endeavour to give such a plan to the committee. Dealing with the post-war plans, the minister made this statement, as reported on page 765 of *Hansard:*

> No definite decision has yet been made as to the strength and composition of the post-war air force, as until the nature and extent of any commitments that we may have under international or regional agreements have been determined it is obviously impossible to reach any final decision.

First, the minister very pertinently used the words, "no definite decision," and again, that awaiting this definite decison, no "final decision" could be made on the part of the government. I wonder if the minister is in position to place before the committee and the country what the intention of the government is with respect to the contribution that Canada will make, first, to the common defence within the British commonwealth of nations. Have there been negotiations between Canada, Australia, New Zealand and the United Kingdom with respect to the setting up of a British commonwealth air force or the continuation of the British commonwealth air scheme in the days of peace? Have there been negotiations among the various component parts of the empire which may lead to the setting up of a composite air force to be available in the event that war should break out?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): There have been no such negotiations.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: As I understand the situation arising out of the united nations agreement, Canada's contribution in the main will be an air contribution. Am I correct in that? I understand that the present plans of the government are that Canada's responsibilities under the charter will, either definitely or in substance, be an air contribution. Is the minister in position to answer that?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): I have no idea what contribution Canada may be called upon to make.

Mr. HOWE: If I may be allowed to interject, I think it has been made quite clear that the reason we cannot prepare a comprehensive plan at this time is that Canada's obligation under the united nations security charter is undetermined. As soon as these obligations are known—and I assume they will be known within the next several months—we shall be able, I think, to announce our peace-time position.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Has any tentative plan been made? The reason I ask is that only the other day the high commissioner for Canada, speaking in Australia, was reported to have said that the Canadian government with a view to uniting Australia, New Zealand and Canada closer together purposed at the earliest possible date to establish an air service between Canada, Australia and New Zealand. Was he correct in that?

Mr. HOWE: That is civil aviation. I think that is rather outside the point.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Was he correct in that statement?

Mr. HOWE: Yes, it has been announced that the plans of Canada for post-war civil aviation include a service between Canada, Australia and New Zealand. But that is not a matter of defence; it is civil aviation. The structure of the post-war security council was laid at Dumbarton Oaks and was further discussed in San Francisco, but my hon. friend will appreciate that the respective responsibilities under the charter have not been determined. At least that is my understanding.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I quite agree. My question was simply this: Are there any tentative arrangements among the different parts of the empire as to the contribution which the various parts of the empire may make to such a scheme? Has anything been determined along that line?

Mr. HOWE: No.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: So that what Canada's contribution will be toward world peace so far as the air force is concerned has in no way been determined, either officially or unofficially?

Mr. HOWE: Correct.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: There is one other matter I should like to bring up at this time. It has to do with repatriation. The minister gave the figures last evening of the number that had been repatriated, 37,907 since V-E day. In the last few days—and I think this applies to most members of the house—letters are being received from our men overseas strongly objecting to the slowness of repatriation. Only to-day I received a letter in which the writer, a responsible man overseas in the armed forces, points out that there is a strong feeling of resentment among the armed forces overseas at the delay in repatriation. He states that during the last few weeks there has been an acceleration of repatriation on the part of the Americans whereas, so far as Canada is concerned, within the last few days the men overseas have been advised that not only will the rate at which repatriation has taken place within recent weeks be diminished but that the bulk of repatriation has been hoisted for a period of eight weeks.

Mr. BENIDICKSON: In order to make the rates relatively equal.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That is not what the men overseas think. The men overseas feel that the rate of repatriation planned for the next eight weeks is such that there is unfairness to Canada in the allotment being made by the united nations' shipping pool. They have been advised that during the next month there will be available only two small ships for repatriation purposes. I bring this matter up at this time because two or three letters I have received are dated within the last few days and they all indicate a strong feeling of resentment. I would ask the minister to advise the committee just what is being done to ensure that Canada's share of the shipping available for repatriation is a fair one and that this feeling of resentment on the part of the men will be entirely removed at the earliest possible day by an official statement from the minister.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): The shipping which is allotted to Canada to bring our service men and women home is dependent upon the allied shipping commission. The matter of repatriation is handled by the army, which allots space on the ships to the air force. The air force has been allotted its quota every month. We have received our fair share and are continuing to receive it. The number of air force personnel to be brought back from April to June, according to the programme that was drawn up, was 15,001, and from July to September, 20,602, or a total of 35,603. That was the programme. Actually we brought back 37,907. From October to December next the number projected is 9,000; January to March, 9,239; June and July 1,496. In addition, those who were employed with our 8th Bomber squadron, came back by air. That was an additional number.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: How many of all services are to be brought back in October?

Mr. GIBSON: I do not know. The figure I have given is for the air force, and that is the quota allotted. It has been worked out on a fair basis and as long as the shipping remains available those are the numbers we expect will be coming to this country.

Mr. PEARKES: The hon. member for Quebec South advanced some very sound arguments in support of the contention which was made here the other day that we should be given a clear statement regarding national defence policy. While I realize perfectly well that it is impractical for the government to tell us their final policy over a long period after the war, yet from what has been said this afternoon it is quite evident that Canada will have to stand very much on her own during this interim period. The allotment of commitments to the different nations has not yet been made. Therefore I submit that it is of great importance that during this interim period we should be coordinating our own services for defence. However, I know that we shall not get such a statement from the ministry and I do not intend to labour the point.

The Minister of National Defence for Air was unable or unwilling when this debate started to say whether the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services was going to establish a fleet air arm. Might I ask the Minister of National Defence for Air whether he has included in these estimates any funds for personnel, aircraft or equipment of the Royal Canadian Air Force which might be serving on any carriers with the Canadian navy, should the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services provide such ships?

Mr. GIBSON: No such expenditures are included in the air estimates for the year.

Mr. FOURNIER (Hull): Mr. Chairman, in the last hour three hon. members have spoken about setting up the war expenditures committee. The only reproach that was made of

the war expenditures committee which sat from 1941 to 1944 was that it sat behind closed doors. Perhaps a little history of the war expenditures committee would enlighten certain members who were not in the last parliament.

In 1940 the acting leader of the opposition, Mr. Hanson, suggested in the house that we follow the example of the British parliament in setting up a national committee on expenditures and that we follow as closely as possible the procedure in the mother country. In 1941 the committee was set up, composed, I believe, of twenty-four members divided among the different groups. When they met they decided to follow the practice of the committee in Britain, which always sat in camera. The reasons given were reasons of security and that, if the sittings were held in public, revelations might be made which might give comfort to the enemy. Those were the two reasons advanced for sitting in camera.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): I think the minister will agree that only the government members on the committee approved that procedure.

Mr. FOURNIER (Hull): The hon. member for Cumberland in 1941 was a member of that committee. It was subdivided into three subcommittees, and I do not recall that the hon. member absented himself from the sittings, although we had adopted sittings in camera. He regularly attended the meetings and was very helpful.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): That is very true, but I did so under protest.

Mr. FOURNIER (Hull): I know the opposition would not admit that we were right in taking that decision. They did protest. But they will also notice that what was said before those subcommittees was, in many instances, of a secret nature. We spoke of production, of what we were doing in munitions and supply; we got details from every branch of that department. We studied the three service departments; we discussed pay and allowances and the procedure of the service departments. We even got information as to numbers, formations, and all that. I am still convinced that we were right in hearing evidence of that kind in camera. Those sittings were held to give information to hon. members with a view to reporting to the house and to the government.

I myself do not like the procedure of sitting in camera, but during wartime I thought it was in the best interest of the state to do so. If a committee on war expenditures were set up this session, I agree with the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar that the sittings should be public and that all these expenditures should be inquired into and investigated. I do not believe there is anything to hide, or that any harm has been done. There would be at this time no reasons of security. I did not hear the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar complain about the sittings being in camera when meetings of subcommittees were held. Both of us were members of those subcommittees.

Mr. COLDWELL: Just on that, I did. My view was that there were certain occasions on which a subcommittee had to sit in camera, but otherwise the proceedings should be open. That was the view I expressed throughout.

Mr. FOURNIER (Hull): We did, if you recall, meet that objection because one of the subcommittees sat openly. I recall that the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Harris) was a member of that committee. He refused to sit on it unless the meetings were public, and that subcommittee sat publicly. It was dealing with questions which did not affect the security of the state or information which would give aid and comfort to the enemy.

As to the setting up of the future committee, I believe the government agrees with what has been said. But I resent aspersions on the former committee. Hon. members sat for three years in and out of session on that committee. They gave valuable time to it; they acted from national and patriotic motives and I really resent suggestions from certain hon. members that the work was not useful or was not well done. I was a member of that committee from 1941 to October, 1942, when I joined the government, and no better group of men could have assembled to study seriously what was taking place and what expenditures were being made.

Mr. COLDWELL: I do not think anybody suggested that the committee did not do good work. I believe it did good work, and I am willing to say so.

Mr. FOURNIER (Hull): I am glad to hear that from the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar. But when the assertion is made that we did not sit in the open to consider these matters, I must point out that certain information could not have been given had our proceedings not been in camera. I do not think hon. members should criticize that procedure. They themselves are aware that we could not let the people know exactly what was taking place in the armed services or in the Department of Munitions and Supply.

Some of those who served on that committee are not now members of this house, and I wish to pay tribute to them for the time and energy and talents which they devoted to that task.

Since this is a new house, and we are not in war time, even though it has not been so legally declared, I hope that the hon. members who will constitute that committee will do as good work as was done in time of war by those of the past parliament. I was so pleased at being on that committee and seeing how it was run, and finding that the government was doing its utmost to protect the public treasury, that were I not a minister I would insist upon being on the next war expenditures committee. I have no doubt it can do useful work and let the public know exactly what we have done with public moneys throughout the year.

The CHAIRMAN: I wonder whether hon. members, who have now had a pretty good discussion, will agree to take the items up as they appear in the list which has been distributed. I think we would make better progress if that were done.

Mr. MERRITT: Before that is done may I ask one question. The minister said yesterday that he could not give any definite or long-term decision as to the size or composition of the air force. That of course is quite understood. But he did say that it would consist of about ten squadrons and about fifteen to twenty thousand men. Will the minister state now on what principles and for what purposes the figure of ten squadrons and fifteen to twenty thousand men was decided? Why, for instance, is it not fifteen squadrons, or five squadrons?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): I did not say those were definite figures. I said we were planning on that basis. We are planning on the basis of what has been recommended by the advisers of the department as a balanced force, a force which would be capable of being extended in time of necessity in order to produce a strong offensive force and a defensive force. At the same time we would have in this country the nucleus of a force which would at all times be available if its services should be required at the time of attack, should this country be in the unfortunate position of being attacked. That is the basis on which the matter is being worked out.

I might say further that, under the programme which is being considered—it is not yet definite—the only expenditures for new planes will be on those in the nature of transport planes. We realize that it is necessary to have adequate transport planes. The type we are ordering and hope to secure is the new C-54. No steps are being taken at present to secure new bombers or fighters. It is felt that we have large stocks available which have been in service in this war. There will undoubtedly be very rapid developments in that type of aircraft, and while experiments and research are going on in those fields we do not consider it advisable to commit ourselves to the purchase of large numbers of either fighters or bombers, but believe rather that we should continue for the present with those we have available. These, of course, will also be available for the auxiliary squadrons as they are formed.

Mr. GILLIS: Mr. Chairman, I agree with you that to take the estimates item by item is perhaps the only way in which they can be disposed of. One might talk a long time on the thought-provokers which are on this sheet of paper which has been distributed. But I merely rise to ask a couple of questions which I do not think I could relate to subjects that are on the paper. Before I do that I should like to say that I listened with great interest to the leader of the opposition, particularly a statement that we spent more money the last six years than we had spent in the whole history of the country previously. While he was saying that I was thinking that, regardless of that fact, it did not affect the standards of living of the Canadian people.

An hon. MEMBER: It is going to, though.

Mr. GILLIS: Their standards of living were much higher than they were from 1930 to 1939. If government spending affects the economy of the country in this way it is not a bad idea to continue to spend government money. That could be elaborated on; it is merely a thought. The criticism that the money we have spent in the last six years affected the welfare of the people of Canada is not valid.

Second, the observation was made that we paid more taxes than we did in the previous fifty years. That, too, is an indication that the people had an income and were able to pay taxes. The fact that we were not paying taxes in the previous fifty years is an indication that we were a poor nation and had nothing with which to pay taxes. I hope that we continue to give the people purchasing power so that they may be able to pay taxes and advance the services of the country.

With respect to the national debt, it does not worry me at all. The only thing that worries me about the national debt is the interest we pay on it. The debt accumulated during the war should be free. There should

be no interest on it. No one should sit back in a bond house or in a bank and extract interest out of blood money, because that is what it was. Investment in war should not bear interest but should be interest free. In my opinion, the hundreds of Canadian boys who laid down their lives have paid the bill, and when the war is over, the debt should be cancelled. There is no reason why when they come back and go into overalls, into plants and factories, they should start to pay tribute by way of interest to people who sat back comfortably and secure and invested their money. The national debt, apart from the interest, we owe to ourselves. It is not a liability but an asset.

Mr. FULTON: Will the hon. member permit a question? Does he think that the soldiers, sailors and airmen who invested their money in war bonds should not receive interest on them when they come back?

Mr. GILLIS: The amount of money the soldiers, sailors and airmen invested is so small—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh no.

Mr. JACKMAN: What about the war workers?

Mr. GILLIS: They are not worrying about it either. The war workers are not worrying about it. The soldier who was drawing the large sum of $1.50 a day—

Mr. FULTON: One hundred dollars is a lot to him.

Mr. GILLIS: —had a lot of money to invest in war bonds. That is only an alibi; it is not an argument.

Mr. JACKMAN: What about the war workers?

Mr. GILLIS: So that the whole story with respect to the debt accumulated, and the moneys spent, as far as I am concerned, does not ring on me.

An hon. MEMBER: That is the reason why you will never be in the government.

Mr. GILLIS: That is all right. We may be there a lot sooner than you will. What I rose to say, Mr. Chairman, was this. There are two categories within the Canadian air force who in my opinion did not receive just treatment during the war. The first is the Canadian nationals serving in the R.A.F. A considerable number of Canadian nationals went to the old country prior to 1939 and became members of the R.A.F.

Mr. MACKENZIE: 1936.

Mr. GILLIS: Yes. The question I should like the minister to answer is this. As regards Canadian nationals returning to this country who served in the R.A.F. during the war, are they entitled to the Canadian gratuity and all the rehabilitation rights to which the R.C.A.F. are entitled? That is the first question. I think they should be. Second, we had, I understand, about five thousand R.C.A.F. personnel who were radar mechanics, and they served, mostly with the R.A.F., in practically every theatre of war. They were also largely isolated. During their period of service with the R.A.F. those boys were denied promotion. The Canadian government instituted, I understand, what was known as shadow promotion. They were promoted to the ranks that they would have held ordinarily if they were with the R.C.A.F., but in the R.A.F. they were not allowed to put up their stripes, badges or insignia. During the period in which the radar personnel were with the R.A.F., when shadow promotion was granted, were they paid for their rank? I understand that this shadow promotion was discontinued in 1943. If it was, I think it was an injustice, because I do not believe there was a section of the R.C.A.F. that was under a greater handicap than the radar boys, who served largely as individuals on isolated stations with the R.A.F. groups. They should have been allowed to carry their rank and they should have been paid on that basis. If it was discontinued in 1943 it should not have been, and I suggest that the government should reinstate it and pay those boys for whatever rank they would have had ordinarily were they members of regular R.C.A.F. squadrons. I should like the minister to answer these questions because I do not see anything on the order paper whereby I might be able to relate this matter to a specific item.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): With regard to the question concerning Canadian nationals in the R.A.F., there were a large number who went over and joined the R.A.F. prior to the war, and throughout the war a large number of Canadians were serving with the R.A.F. A considerable number decided to transfer to the R.C.A.F. and they were permitted to do so up until a certain date. It was published in orders as to the date when transfers would cease.

Mr. MacNICOL: The minister will pardon me, but many of them could not be got in touch with, those far away on the Pacific ocean. Are they barred now from transferring?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): Where there were special circumstances such as those, extensions have been made. A large number

did transfer to the R.C.A.F., but that is not the point. The rehabilitation benefits provided by Canada apply to Canadian nationals, those who were citizens of this country prior to the war. I am not sure of the exact date, but I think those who left Canada from 1936 on and served in the British forces may, on returning to Canada, if they return within six months of the date when they are demobilized —I am not tying myself down to whether these terms are the date at which the individual was demobilized or the date of the ending of the war, but within a fixed period—may be entitled to the difference between the Canadian benefits and any benefits they have received while serving with that allied force. So that Canada is looking after those Canadians who have served in the allied forces.

As regards the radar men, I have the greatest sympathy for that group and I agree very largely with what the hon. member has said about them. Early in the war we enlisted in this country the finest type of young men, men with scientific training, and got them into the radar branch. They continued in that branch and were scattered all over the world, operating radar stations throughout Europe and Africa, and they had very little promotion. The work that they were doing was not work that called for promotion. The result was that brilliant young men who joined early in the war, and who, if they had waited and gone to other branches, might have received greater promotion and even commissions, remained leading aircraftmen. I realize that they have suffered a hardship. On the other hand, they have done magnificent work. While I feel that they have been unlucky, yet they certainly have done a magnificent job.

Mr. MacNICOL: They should not be allowed to be unlucky.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): The work they were doing was not work that called for the service of men of higher rank.

Mr. MacNICOL: A radar man away up on a remote island certainly deserves some consideration.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): With regard to shadow promotion, I never heard of it. It might have been brought in and discontinued in 1943. I shall be very glad to make inquiries concerning it to find out when it was brought in and when it was discontinued.

Mr. BOUCHER: I do not wish to delay the committee unduly, nor do I wish to open up a discussion on the war expenditures committee. The Minister of Public Works said that the only complaint against the war expenditures committee was that of secrecy. We should have the record cleared up in that regard. I do not mean to say that the war expenditures committee did not do good work, but I do mean to say that there were many objectionable features in connection with it. The members of the opposition who sat on that committee did object to sitting in secrecy. While we had that objection, we did sit on it and we were very glad to do the best we could in the circumstances. But the objections were more than the mere matter of secrecy. The objections were that in the war expenditures committee matters were dealt with in secret that did not warrant any secrecy whatsoever. I give as an illustration wartime housing and the operation of government corporations. They were dealt with. If the enemy heard all that went on in connection with these matters they would not have heard anything of value. Then there was the inquiry into the price of boots and the purchase price of property and land. The evidence was given in secret before the committee. Even some of the evidence in connection with those inquiries was guarded by the departmental officials and was sometimes refused to members of the committee. I might also mention that members of the committee complained in the house that copies of the evidence were not supplied to members for their own personal use while they were sitting on the committee. Oh, there were many difficulties.

The Minister of National Defence for Air and the Minister of Public Works have gone farther than the promises made by the Prime Minister a few days ago in saying that the committee that will be set up will not sit in secret. I hope that they will take the matters I have mentioned into consideration too, and that when the committee is set up, not only will it not sit in secret but it will give the evidence untrammeled and unhampered by department officials. I urge that at this time.

I could go into a long discussion on this matter, but I do not wish to delay the committee. However, I believe that the people of Canada want a much closer scrutiny of and much more information on war expenditures than they have had in the past. I believe that the people of Canada feel that in the war expenditures committee many things were discussed in secrecy that had no right to be so discussed or investigated. The people want more information than was given to them in the past because of the secrecy.

When the new committee is set up to investigate war expenditures I hope no attempt will be made to have it sit in

secret. There were other objections to the war expenditures committee of the past three or four years. I sat as a member of that committee for a year. I enjoyed it. I appreciated the energy and the efforts of the members of the committee, but I did not appreciate the little attention that parliament was allowed to give to their findings or to the total absence of discussion of the committee reports in the house. When this new committee is set up I hope that these objections will be kept in mind.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): I hope that the members will now agree to take up the items connected with the department.

Mr. MacNICOL: Show me the item on which I can ask further questions about the radar boys and I shall be quite satisfied to deal with the items.

Mr. HARKNESS: Before proceeding with the items I should like a little better understanding of what this money will be used for. What proportion of these estimates will be regarded as demobilization expenses and what proportion will be used for the interim force? Can the minister answer that question?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): Some of the items can be broken down in the manner suggested. What is being spent on demobilization can be broken down, but what is being spent on the interim force cannot be broken down into that force entirely. The interim force will consist partly of the occupational force in Germany and the occupational force in other places. It will consist partly of the force employed in Canada.

Mr. HARKNESS: When will demobilization be considered completed? What time will the interim force come into effect?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): I cannot give the committee the date on which demobilization will be completed. According to the plan it will not be completed by March 31, 1946.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I have listened with a good deal of attention to the discussion and the questions ever since the war appropriation measure first came before us. One thing has impressed me as being singular, namely, that no member of the opposition has commended the government for the effort which apparently it is making to maintain a considerable force of fighting men and equipment in Canada in case of an emergency.

I should like to draw the attention of the hon. members of the Progressive Conservative party to the fact that it was their attitude between 1930 and 1935 which reduced the meagre defence of Canada to an intolerably and dangerously low level. This cheese-paring attitude, this worrying about the dollar, will start a similar attitude again in Canada.

I do not wish to be an alarmist; I wish to be a realist. Will any hon. member in this committee, if he asks himself the question honestly and sincerely, dare to say that the era we are now entering is an eara in which we can feel that we are safe? This is an exceedingly serious matter. I am not saying for a moment that all the money has always been spent wisely. I would say this, however, not desiring to commend the government over much, that all things being considered the government in going through this war is to be strongly commended for the high degree of efficiency and effectiveness which it attained at the price that had to be paid for it. When we want defence in this country we want it badly. We are likely to want it again, and that before very long; but whether or not that should be so it is a right, good, safe principle to keep your powder dry and be sure you have plenty of it.

I should like to encourage the ministers who are in charge of the exceedingly difficult departments of defence to do everything that lies within their power to keep the defences of this country at the very highest possible standard consistent with the conditions of the times through which we are passing. The money will be found. I notice plenty of evidence that our Conservative friends are still suffering from a money mentality. How long is it going to take them to realize that the power of the nation to fight, or to prepare to fight, or to do anything else, depends upon the productive power of the nation, the amount of goods and services it can produce? Money is merely a bookkeeping system to represent the capacity of the nation to produce and use goods and services. Does anyone in Canada think for a moment that we are less able to produce goods and services to-day than we were a year ago, or two years ago, or three years ago? Then the degree of defence of which we are capable in this country certainly must depend upon the degree of production of which we are capable. As soon as we look at this whole matter from that angle we begin to see how unwise it is to emphasize dollars when the very existence of this nation and this empire of which we form a part might be threatened at any time; when all we have won

and saved through the centuries of our history, including what we have won and saved in this war and the last one, might be lost because we have been indiscreet in the matter of taking precautions against eventualities.

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MACKENZIE: On Tuesday we shall take up first the interim supply mentioned this afternoon by the Minister of Finance. Then we will take up bill No. 14, in the name of the Minister of Agriculture, the resolution preceding which was passed by the house yesterday. If we conclude with that we will continue with this appropriation bill, with the Minister of National Defence completing his statement on the naval estimates first and then going on with the army estimates.

Mr. BRACKEN: We will pass over the air estimates entirely?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Yes, until after the navy and army estimates are disposed of.

At six o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Tuesday, October 9, 1945.

The house met at three o'clock.

STANDING COMMITTEES

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs) presented the report of the special committee appointed to prepare and report lists of members to compose the standing committees of the house, as follows:

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

Messrs:

Baker
Benidickson
Brooks
Brunelle
Casselman
Coldwell
Cote (Verdun)
Cote (Matapedia-Matane)
Cruickshank
Diefenbaker
Fair
Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Graydon
Green
Harris (Grey-Bruce)
Jaenicke
Knowles
MacNicol
Manross
Marquis
Martin
McDonald (Pontiac)
Mutch
Pouliot
Raymond (Wright)
Richard (Ottawa East)
Richard (Gloucester)
Smith (Calgary West)
Winters—29.

(Quorum 10)

MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS

Messrs:

Black (Yukon)
Bonnier
Boucher
Bowerman
Brooks
Brown
Charlton
Cleaver
Cloutier
Cote (Verdun)
Croll
Dechene
Dubois
Ferguson
Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Gariepy
Gladstone
Grant
Halle
Hamel
Hazen
Healy
Hlynka
Laurendeau
Lennard
Little
Lockhart
Macdonald (Halifax)
MacLean
Matthews (Brandon)
Matthews (Kootenay East)
Maybank
Mayhew
McGregor
Murphy
Nixon
Parent
Picard
Probe
Richard (Gloucester)
Rose
Ross (St. Paul's)
Sinclair (Ontario)
Sinnott
Stokes
Townley-Smith
Webb
Whitman
Wylie
Zaplitny—50.

(Quorum 15)

BANKING AND COMMERCE

Messrs:

Arsenault
Beaudry
Belzile
Black (Cumberland)
Blackmore
Bradette
Breithaupt
Cleaver
Coldwell
Coté (St. Johns-Iberville-Napierville)
Dechene
Dionne
Dorion
Fleming
Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Fraser
Fulton
Gour
Hackett
Harkness
Harris (Danforth)
Hazen
Ilsley
Irvine
Isnor
Jackman
Jaenicke
Jutras
Lafontaine
Low
Macdonnell
MacNaught
Manross
Marier
Marquis
Maybank
Mayhew
McIlraith
Michaud
Murphy
Nixon
Picard
Pinard
Quelch
Rinfret
Ross (Souris)
Sinclair (Ontario)
Stewart (Winnipeg North)
Thatcher
Tucker—50.

(Quorum 15)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Messrs:

Argue
Arsenault
Baker
Beaudry
Black (Yukon)
Boucher
Bradette
Burton
Case
Cleaver
Cockeram
Cote (Verdun)
Cote (St. Johns-Iberville-Napierville)
Cruickshank
Dechene
Denis
Diefenbaker
Emmerson
Ferguson

Fournier (Hull)
Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Fraser
Gibson (Comox Alberni)
Gladstone
Golding
Grant
Green
Hamel
Harris (Danforth)
Homuth
Howe
Isnor
Jackman
Jaenicke
Johnston
Marshall
Maybank
McCubbin
McDonald (Pontiac)
Picard
Pinard
Raymond (Wright)
Rinfret
Rowe
Smith (Calgary West)
Stewart (Winnipeg North)
Stuart (Charlotte)
Thatcher
Warren
Winkler—50.

(Quorum 15)

RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES

Messrs:

Adamson
Archibald
Ashby
Aylesworth
Beaudoin
Beaudry
Belzile
Bentley
Bertrand (Terrebonne)
Black (Cumberland)
Blair
Bonnier
Bourget
Breithaupt
Brooks
Campbell
Chevrier
Church
Cloutier
Drope
Emmerson
Eudes
Farquhar
Gagnon
Gauthier (Portneuf)
Gauthier (Nipissing)
Gourd
Grant
Harris (Danforth)
Hatfield
Herridge
Hodgson
Irvine
Johnston
Knight
Lesage
Little
Maybank
Mayhew
McIvor
McCulloch
McKay
Michaud
Mullins
Mutch
Pearkes
Picard
Pouliot
Robinson (Simoe East)
Robinson (Bruce)
Ross (Souris)
Ross (Hamilton East)
Shaw
Smith (York North)
Stephenson
Viau
White (Hastings-Peterborough)
White (Middlesex East)
Whitman
Winters—60.

(Quorum 20)

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION

Messrs:

Argue
Arsenault
Barrett
Beaudoin
Belzile
Bentley
Bertrand (Prescott)
Black (Cumberland)
Black (Huntingdon)
Bryce
Burton
Cardiff
Charlton
Clark
Cloutier
Cote (Matapedia-Matane)
Coyle
Cruickshank
Dechene
Desmond
Diefenbaker
Douglas
Drope
Dubois
Fair
Farquhar
Fontaine
Gagnon
Gardiner
Gibson (Comox-Alberni)
Golding
Gour
Hackett
Halle
Harkness
Harris (Grey-Bruce)
Hatfield
Jutras
Kirk
Lapalme
Laurendeau
Leader
Leger
Lesage
Matthews (Brandon)
McCubbin
McGarry
McLure
Menary
Michaud
Quelch
Ross (Souris)
Senn
Townley-Smith
Tucker
Warren
Webb
Whitman
Wright
Wylie—60.

(Quorum 20)

STANDING ORDERS

Messrs:

Bertrand (Prescott)
Bowerman
Brunelle
Cardiff
Daniel
Denis
Hamel
Jaques
Knowles
Lapalme
MacLean
Marier
Murphy
Pinard
Robinson (Simcoe East)
Sinnott
Smith (York North)
Stokes
Stuart
Tustin—20.

(Quorum 8)

MARINE AND FISHERIES

Messrs:

Archibald
Arsenault
Ashby
Baker
Belzile
Benidickson
Blair
Bridges
Brooks
Bryce
Coté (Matapedia-Matane)
Cruickshank
Gauthier (Nipissing)
Gibson (Comox-Alberni)
Gillis
Hazen
Kirk
Kuhl
Langlois
Leger
Lennard
Little
MacNaught
McDonald (Parry Sound)
McLure
Merritt
Reid
Sinclair (Vancouver North)
Sinnott
Stanfield
Stirling
Stuart (Charlotte)
Tustin
Winters
Zaplitny—35.

(Quorum 15)

MINES, FORESTS AND WATERS

Messrs:

Adamson
Black (Yukon)
Blackmore
Cockeram
Dion (Lake St. John-Roberval)
Gagnon
Gariepy
Gibson (Hamilton West)
Gour
Gourd
Hodgson
Kuhl
Lafontaine
McCann
Lalonde
Lapalme
MacNicol
Maloney
Matthews (Kootenay East)
McCuaig
McCulloch (Pictou)
McCullough (Assiniboia)
McDonald (Parry Sound)
McDonald (Pontiac)
McGarry

McMaster
Moore
Raymond (Wright)
Ross (Hamilton East)
Ross (Souris)
Sinclair (Ontario)
Sinnott
Viau
Webb
White (Hastings-Peterborough)—35.

(Quorum 10)

DEBATES

Messrs:

Barrett
Brown
Desmond
Dubois
Hlynka
Knowles
Matthews (Brandon)
Pouliot
Richard (Gloucester)
Richard (Ottawa East)
Rinfret
Rowe—12.

(Quorum 7)

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

Messrs:

Archibald
Baker
Black (Cumberland)
Blackmore
Beaudoin
Belzile
Brown
Case
Coté (Verdun)
Croll
Daniels
Dechene
Ferguson
Gillis
Gingues
Homuth
Johnston
Lalonde
Lapalme
Lockhart
MacNicol
Maloney
Maybank
Merritt
McInnis
McIvor
Mitchell
Moore
Pouliot
Raymond
Ross (Hamilton East)
Reid
Sinclair (Vancouver North)
Smith (Calgary West)
Viau—35.

(Quorum 10)

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Messrs:

Beaudry
Benidickson
Blanchette
Boucher
Bradette
Claxton
Coldwell
Croll
Diefenbaker
Fleming
Fraser
Graydon
Green
Hackett
Isnor
Jackman
Jaques
Kidd
Knowles
Lapointe
Leger
Low
Macdonald (Halifax)
MacInnis
Marquis
Hayhew
McIlraith
Mutch
Picard
Raymond (Beauharnois-Laprairie)
Reid
Sinclair (Ontario)
Strum, Mrs.
Tremblay
Winkler

PRINTING

Messrs:

Adamson
Arsenault
Aylesworth
Baker
Beaudry
Bertrand (Prescott)
Bertrand (Terrebonne)
Boivin
Bradette
Bradshaw
Brunelle
Campbell
Castleden
Church
Clark
Cote (St. Johns-Iberville-Napierville)
Dubois
Emmerson
Fontaine
Fraser
Gibson (Hamilton West)
Golding
Halle
Hansell
Healy
Henderson
Hlynka
Kidd
Kuhl
Lacombe
Lalonde
Lapalme
Lapointe
Lennard
MacLean
MacNaught
Maloney
McCuaig
McCubbin
McCullough (Assiniboia)
McDonald (Parry Sound)
McGregor
McLure
McMaster
Nicholson
Robinson (Simoe East)
Ross (St. Paul's)
Sinclair (Vancouver North)
Sinnott
Strum (Mrs.)
Tustin
Viau
White (Hastings-Peterborough)
Winters—54.

LIBRARY

Messrs:

Adamson
Aylesworth
Black (Chateauguay-Huntingdon)
Bruce
Cardiff
Castleden
Cloutier
Dion
Douglas
Eudes
Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Gauthier (Nipissing)
Gourd
Gingues
Herridge
Henderson
Howe
Jaques
Kidd
Knight
Lapalme
Leger
Marier
Marshall
Matthews (Brandon)
McGarry
McIlraith
McKay
Menary
Mitchell
Mullins
Nixon
Pearkes
Probe
Reid
Richard (Ottawa East)
Ross (St. Paul's)
Skey
Smith (York North)
Stephenson
White (Middlesex East)
Winkler
Winters
Zaplitny—44.

Mr. MACKENZIE moved that the report be concurred in.

Mr. BRACKEN: May I ask the mover whether it is important that this motion be passed to-day? I have not seen the report myself, and I am sure that the other members have not.

Mr. MACKENZIE. We will certainly let the motion stand over.

Motion stands.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

CONCURRENCE IN FIRST REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. W. A. TUCKER (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Veterans Affairs) presented the first report of the special committee on veterans affairs and moved that the report be concurred in.

He said: The main part of the report has to do with reducing the quorum from 31 to 20. It is important to get that adopted as soon as possible.

Motion agreed to.

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

CENTRAL MORTGAGE AND HOUSING CORPORATION—DISCOUNTING FACILITIES

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to present a measure to incorporate the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation for the purpose of (a) acting in the place of the Minister of Finance in the operation of the National Housing Act, 1944, and (b) providing discounting facilities for loan and mortgage companies; to provide for the appointment and salaries of the officers and staff of the corporation and the appointment and fees of the directors; to authorize the payment out of the consolidated revenue fund of sums not exceeding twenty-five million dollars ($25,000,000) for the provision of paid-up capital for the corporation; to make available for the housing functions of the corporation moneys appropriated under the National Housing Act, 1944; and to make provisions with respect to the functions and powers of the corporation.

He said: His Honour the Deputy Governor General, having been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the consideration of the house.

Motion agreed to.

INCREASE IN APPROPRIATION FOR LOANS AND GUARANTEES

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to present a measure to amend the National Housing Act, 1944, and to provide more particularly for an increase in the appropriation for loans and guarantees under Part II of the act for the payment out of unappropriated moneys in the consolidated revenue fund of loans and losses in respect of loans, not exceeding in the aggregate one hundred and fifty million dollars, and in respect of guarantees, up to an aggregate principal amount of one hundred and twenty-five million dollars of investments guaranteed.

He said: His Honour the Deputy Governor General, having been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the consideration of the house.

Motion agreed to.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

PACKING PLANTS—THREATENED DISPUTE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): I have two questions to direct to the Minister of Labour, and one to the Minister of Finance.

I should like to ask the Minister of Labour to communicate to the house any information he has in his possession regarding the threatened labour dispute in the meat packing plants. Has the minister received representations regarding this dispute from the Canadian Federation of Agriculture? If so, what is the attitude of the government with respect to such representations?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): I will answer the second question first. I have received a letter from the secretary of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture. Any decision made with respect to the purport of the letter will be made known when the government makes a decision. The answer to the first part of the question is, yes. We are in constant touch with the provincial departments of labour with respect to what some people anticipate will be a dispute or strike in the packing house industry in this country.

Mr. HOMUTH: Well, whose baby is it?

Mr. MITCHELL: You are a pretty big baby yourself.

Mr. HOMUTH: And you are not too tiny.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Answered!

Mr. MITCHELL: If my honourable and garrulous friend will just give me an opportunity to answer the question which was put by the leader of the opposition; I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that I can add much to what I have already said.

Mr. BRACKEN: No decision has yet been made?

Mr. MITCHELL: On the first part of the question.

Mr. E. D. FULTON (Kamloops): With respect to the anticipated strike in the meat packing plants, is the Minister of Agriculture in a position to make a statement which will reassure the producers of meat that their position with respect to marketing will not be prejudiced should there be such a strike?

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I think all that I can say is that if there is a strike in the packing

plants the position of the producer will be prejudiced and nothing this government can do will prevent it.

Mr. HOMUTH: Should do, or will do?

Mr. GARDINER: Nothing that they can do will prevent the producers' position from being prejudiced if these men do go out on strike.

Mr. HOWE: Nothing they have done?

STRIKE AT FORD MOTOR PLANT, WINDSOR

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): I have a second question to direct to the Minister of Labour. The long continuance of the labour dispute of the Ford Motor plant at Windsor and the failure to make any apparent progress in settlement, is, I am sure, causing concern to all members of the house and all interested in the future course of labour management relations in Canada. Would the minister indicate to the house whether any further steps to bring about a settlement have been taken? If not, would the government give consideration to having the Minister of Labour proceed to Windsor with a view to facilitating the settlement of this strike?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): I think my hon. friend knows the situation at the moment. We are working very closely with the Ontario Department of Labour. An invitation went to both the employers and the employees to meet the provincial minister of labour and myself in the city of Toronto. But may I make this remark, which is equally applicable to the ministers of labour of all the provinces, that there is a physical limit to what a minister of labour can do and where he can be. That is why we built up our machinery, with a conciliation service which is as good, I think, as can be found anywhere else, to face up to a situation of this kind. I believe it is a fair observation, Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to make it, that both the Ford Motor company and the leaders of the employee's organization are grown-up men. The company have made the decision, rightly or wrongly—and I said, when I was last asked this question, rightly, in my opinion—that until the company's officers are enabled to get into the Ford plant they will not sit down with the trade union leaders. That attitude is related to a very old principle: as I said the other day to one of the hon. members from Montreal, the Canadian's home is considered to be his castle. It seems to me that if some concession on the part of the trade union organization could be made in respect to that principle, which has been enunciated by officials of the company—and after all, there are two sides to a medal—I would be prepared, in fact I would have been prepared a week ago, to go to Toronto with my good friend the acting minister of labour of Ontario and endeavour to arrive at a settlement of this dispute.

I could speak at length on the fundamental principles involved in conciliation, and as to whether the company or the trades union want this or any other government to write a contract for them. I shall not go further into that matter at the moment, because I understand that it is an issue in the discussion, but when my estimates are up, or if it is raised by any hon. member, I shall be quite prepared to give an answer.

I say frankly and sincerely that the labour departments of both governments are anxious to bring this fight to a conclusion. We were very successful in such matters during the war. But may I say in a kindly way that this House of Commons is not the place to negotiate a trade union agreement, because of the political implications that are involved. I know that persons who hold certain points of view are anxious to see such action taken by democratic legislative bodies, but it is my belief that it would not only be physically impossible, but that it is not in the interests of democratic institutions and their proper functioning, as we understand these things.

I have to be very careful to-day, because, as no one knows better than my hon. friends opposite, in an industrial dispute what is said at a distance is sometimes misconstrued at the point where the dispute exists.

I reiterate that I would be very glad to jump in an aeroplane to-morrow morning if it were necessary. I trust the parties to the dispute will act not only in their own interests but in the interests of the community and of the dominion as a whole, to assist in the reconstruction of the national economy following the conclusion of the war in the Pacific and in Europe.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): May I ask the Minister of Labour a question supplementary to that asked by my leader? I think I can solve a lot of his difficulties for him. Why not ask the parties to this strike, instead of meeting him in Toronto, to meet him in the Ford offices in Windsor? Then the picket lines are all shot, and he may be able to get these stupid people together so that they can talk to one another.

Mr. MITCHELL: I appreciate the constructive suggestion of my hon. friend, but in my opinion, and I say it sincerely, in a

dispute of this description it is far better that we should meet on neutral territory. I am not standing on my dignity or the dignity of a minister of the province of Ontario, but I do not think it is in the best interests of labour relations in this country, looked at from the point of view of either employer or employee, for two ministers to go there and walk through a picket line when one party to the dispute are convinced in their own minds that the attitude taken, the picketing by the union in this instance, is illegal, though they do these things in the United States. That is why I thought Toronto would be the best place.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Surely we are not going to let a thing like that stand in the way of getting this matter settled.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Why not meet in the city hall?

STRAIT OF CANSO

SURVEY WITH RESPECT TO PROPOSED BRIDGE OR CAUSEWAY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. E. McGARRY (Inverness-Richmond): I wish to direct two questions to the Minister of Reconstruction. First, has a report of the survey on the strait of Canso, with regard to the proposed bridge or causeway, been submitted to his department or any other department of government? Secondly, if so, will the report be tabled?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction): The report on the strait of Canso has not been completed. It has been found so far physically impossible to complete the report by reason of the difficulty of taking borings or sounding in the strait. The water is 200 feet deep, the tide in the strait runs at five knots, and as an engineering feat, so far the problem of obtaining borings has been found impossible of solution. However, the investigation is porceeding, and I hope the report will be submitted in due course.

INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION

TABLING OF INTERIM AGREEMENT

On the orders of the day:

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction and Supply): On Thursday last, in response to an inquiry by the member for Broadview (Mr. Church), I said that I would table the interim agreement on international civil aviation. If we may revert to motions I will now table two copies of that agreement, with the consent of the house.

SURPLUS WAR ASSETS

PAMPHLET SETTING FORTH POLICY AND METHODS OF WAR ASSETS CORPORATION

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction): I wish to table copies in English and French of a pamphlet entitled "How to Buy War Surplus Materials". This pamphlet deals with the policy and methods of the War Assets Corporation. Copies have been distributed in English and French to all members of the house.

Mr. HOMUTH: It will likely be a small pamphlet. When will copies be available? There are many inquiries for them.

Mr. HOWE: They have been distributed to-day.

CALGARY NITRATE PLANT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): On Friday last during the course of the debate I drew the attention of the Minister of Reconstruction and the house to a telegram I had received from the Ontario Federation of Agriculture relating to the nitrate plant at Calgary. In view of other representations which have been coming in, I wonder if perhaps to-morrow the minister would make a statement regarding the matter.

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction): My hon. friend read the telegram, but I did not understand that he was asking a question about it.

Mr. COLDWELL: I did; that was my intention.

Mr. HOWE: The position of the ammonia plant at Calgary, the ammonia plant at Trail and the ammonia plant at Welland is the same as that of all other war plants; from time to time consideration is being given to their sale. No definite arrangements have been made to sell any of these ammonia plants, but we have under consideration advertising one or more of them for sale in due course.

Mr. COLDWELL: The particular question was: will the government defer coming to a decision until another conference has been held with the Canadian Federation of Agriculture? That was the gist of it, as I remember the question.

Mr. HOWE: I have had two or three discussions with the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, but I shall be very glad to have another. I have no intention of moving in the matter for a month or six weeks.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

INQUIRY AS TO ESTABLISHMENT OF NON-PARTISAN PARLIAMENTARY SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Cariboo): I wish to ask a question of the Acting Prime Minister. Has the government given any consideration to the appointment of a parliamentary scientific committee, to be chosen on a non-partisan basis, and similar to that appointed by the British parliament?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Acting Prime Minister): No consideration has been given to the setting up of such a committee, but the question could be considered. If the hon. gentleman will give me any information he has about the matter I shall be glad to see that it is.

Mr. IRVINE: I shall be glad to do that.

UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

DECISIONS OF PREPARATORY COMMITTEE AS TO CHOICE OF HEADQUARTERS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs): On October 4 the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon), on the orders of the day, asked me certain questions part of which had not been covered by notice he had sent in, and I stated I would get the information and make it available to the house as soon as possible. The question was:

> May I ask the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs whether the government has been advised of the decisions taken by the united nations preparatory committee regarding choice of a headquarters for the united nations organization? I ask that question because newspaper reports indicate that the headquarters of that organization is to be situated in the United States. In that connection I make one observation to the minister, namely, that I am not at all satisfied that what I regard as very strong claims for Canada have been pressed as enthusiastically as in my opinion circumstances would warrant.

The answer I wish to make is this. The government has been informed by the Canadian representative on the executive committee of the united nations preparatory commission that, at a meeting on October 3, it was decided by a majority of the executive committee to recommend to the full preparatory commission that the headquarters of the united nations organization should be in the United States of America. Other locations for the permanent site of the united nations, including more than one site in Canada, had been suggested to the executive committee. According to the reports received from the Canadian representative, it would appear that, before the recommendation of October 3 was adopted, the choice had narrowed to a selection between a site in a smaller European country, probably Geneva, on the one hand or some location in the United States on the other hand. It is understood that no recommendation has been made as yet by the executive committee as to the place in the United States at which the headquarters might be located.

MEAT

EXPORTS TO THE UNITED STATES DURING LAST SIX MONTHS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): On Thursday last the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Lennard) made the following statement and asked a question. I quote from page 758 of *Hansard:*

> Since Canadian canned meats are being advertised for sale by New York city retailers, and being sold free of points, will the government advise the house, at the earliest opportunity, what meats, fresh and canned, have been exported to the United States within the past six months?

The hon. gentleman gave me a copy of an advertisement from a New York paper upon which the question was based. This advertisement indicates that the meat referred to is veal and chicken pate; veal, ham and tongue; beef, pork and ham. These meats are all meat pastes, that is sandwich spreads, and are put up in seven-ounce tins. No permits have been issued for the export of canned meats to the United States in 1945. The figures of the bureau of statistics indicate that during the first six months of this year, 13,200 pounds of fresh beef and 200 pounds of pork were shipped to an army air field in the United States and were not for ordinary domestic use. Canned meat pastes of the type mentioned above have been exported in the amount of 595,407 pounds. There are no meat pastes being exported to the United States, to be sold free of points, which are under ration in Canada at the present time.

RATIONING—EXEMPTION OF HONG KONG REPATRIATES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. RALPH MAYBANK (Winnipeg South Centre): I desire to address a question to the Minister of Finance or to the parliamentary assistant to the minister. It is a question relating to meat rationing for repatriated Hong Kong prisoners of war. I gave notice of this question last week. I understand my

colleague from Winnipeg South (Mr. Mutch) did likewise; therefore I am speaking on his behalf and my own and am duly cognizant of the responsibility. My question, in accordance with that notice, is: will the government consider exempting these Hong Kong repatriates from the meat rationing restrictions, since there is probably a very special need among them, they having had extremely little meat for four years?

Mr. R. W. MAYHEW (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, notice of the questions of the hon. members for Winnipeg South Centre and Winnipeg South was received too late on Friday to obtain an answer. However, the minister took up with the wartime prices and trade board the question of providing increased quantities of rationed foods to released prisoners from far eastern theatres of war. I am pleased to be able to announce that after consultation with medical officers of the Department of Health and Welfare and the Department of National Defence, it has been decided to issue additional ration coupons covering a period of three months to such released prisoners of war, which will entitle them to a fifty per cent increase in butter and sugar, and one hundred per cent in meat, over the amounts available to the general public. Instructions have been issued to the various ration boards for the issuance of these extra coupons to the released prisoners of war upon application.

PROVINCIAL LEGISLATION

INQUIRY AS TO DISALLOWANCE OF CERTAIN ACTS OF SASKATCHEWAN LEGISLATURE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Justice in connection with the committee on disallowance of disputed legislation in Saskatchewan, which I believe is to be convened within the week. In view of the large number of protests which are being received by members from that province, will the Minister of Justice state why the government is taking proceedings by way of disallowance hearings instead of submitting this legislation to the courts for the determination of its validity?

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Minister of Justice): I must state first of all that the government is not taking proceedings by way of disallowance. The hon. member knows that the government considers. on reports from the Minister of Justice, all provincial legislation and before the expiry of the year from the time when the statutes are officially sent to the department a recommendation is made by the Minister of Justice to council as to whether or not the legislation should be allowed to take such effect as by law it can have. No proceedings are being taken to disallow this legislation.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: What are the hearings for?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: The time for a recommendation had not yet expired. While it was still running certain petitions for disallowance of the legislation to which I have already referred in announcements to the house, were received, and requests were made that those submitting the petitions be allowed to submit additional reasons through counsel. We are not up against the alternative suggested in the question of which the hon. member sent me notice. The validity of the legislation, if it is not disallowed, can always be tested in the courts by anyone who may contend that it is unconstitutional.

The governor in council renders no judgment on the validity of legislation; we merely act under the terms of the British North America Act in recommending whether or not it should be allowed to operate. That is all that is being done here.

There seems to have been the impression that some sort of court had been set up to try the constitutional validity of this legislation.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That is not suggested in my question.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: That impression is entirely erroneous; a report would have been made to council whether there had been any petitions or not. The law officers of the Department of Justice endeavour to take into account all that should be properly considered whether representations are made or not. Even if it were clearly demonstrated that a piece of provincial legislation was unconstitutional, that would not at all necessarily mean that the governor is council would disallow it; probably quite the contrary. These things are considered from the point of view of the national interest and not the constitutionality or otherwise of the legislation. And when there is a recommendation, as is most frequently the case, that the acts should be allowed to have such operation as they can legally have, it does not mean that their constitutional validity cannot be contested before the courts, and it does not mean that their constitutional validity is not frequently contested before the courts. Neither the

Minister of Justice nor the committee will attempt to render any judgment on the constitutional validity of this legislation.

The hon. member asks why the committee was set up.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Is that procedure regularly followed?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: To my knowledge this is the first time it has been done. I understood that I was being given the assistance of two of my colleagues to prepare a recommendation for council, and I had no objection. I would never have any objection to having the assistance of my colleagues in the preparation of any recommendation I may have to make to council.

Mr. IRVINE: I should like to ask a supplementary question to that asked by the hon. member for Lake Centre. Seeing that it is the business of the government to review all provincial legislation whether there are any protests or not, why did not the government advise the protesters to take their case to the courts instead of to the cabinet?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I am obliged to give a reason for that. We review legislation whether there are representations or not. We do not say to those who make representations, "Well, go to the courts." We just do not. I have no other reason.

HOUSING

STATEMENT AS TO PRIORITIES ON BUILDING MATERIALS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction): Mr. Speaker, in the house on Friday last the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) asked a question as to priorities on building materials, and suggested that I reply to-day. In my remarks of last Friday I find that I have rather confused the issue, and I should now like to make a statement of policy.

In replying on Friday I was anxious to reply to the suggestion by the leader of the opposition that the government should modify its policy because of alleged bottlenecks being created as a result of the priorities in favour of Wartime Housing Limited.

In my reply I was particularly anxious to clear up a popular fallacy about Wartime Housing, namely, that owing to the assistance given to it in building houses for veterans, stocks of building materials are frozen or tied up in warehouses. It is undoubtedly this fallacy which is at the root of the complaints which have been received by the leader of the opposition and others. I referred at that time to the reports regarding Calgary which on investigation were found to be quite untrue. I might have mentioned the cases of Edmonton and Winnipeg as well, and numerous others, all of which have been investigated and found to be untrue.

In my remarks I stated that there are no building material priorities at all in favour of Wartime Housing Limited. This was not correct. I should have explained that the government is, in fact, giving assistance to Wartime Housing Limited where necessary, and requires producers and distributors in certain cases to deliver to Wartime Housing Limited in priority to other users. The purpose in giving this assistance is to enable Wartime Housing Limited to maintain its building schedule and to complete at the earliest possible time its programme of building the low cost rental houses for veterans which are so urgently required.

The assistance given to Wartime Housing Limited is not a serious factor in creating shortages in materials available to private builders. As I said several days ago, Wartime Housing Limited is building only a very small proportion of the total number of houses under construction at present. To take the case of plumbing supplies, about which the greatest number of complaints have been received, the requirements of Wartime Housing Limited during the last quarter of this year would be less than twenty per cent of the estimated production. Its requirements of other building materials are even smaller, and in some cases will have no effect whatsoever on the supplies available to private builders. In the administration of priorities for Wartime Housing Limited every effort is being made to interfere as little as possible with the normal flow of materials into the building trades. As the production of building materials continues to increase, the government may be able to modify its priority policy as suggested by the leader of the opposition, but for the present it is felt that this is not feasible, since any change is likely to interfere with the building of low rental houses for veterans.

Mr. BRACKEN: If I might comment on the statement just made by the minister, I think perhaps in his own interests he should have left the situation in the confused state it was in previously, because I have a telegram from a person interested in this matter complimenting the minister on removing these wartime controls.

Mr. HOWE: He must be a dealer in building supplies.

Mr. BRACKEN: I am not sure, but that was the conclusion he drew from the statement the minister made the other day. I am sorry I shall have to advise him that in view of the statement made to-day he was wrong in that conclusion.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

INQUIRY AS TO IMPERIAL CONFERENCE WHILE PRIME MINISTER OVERSEAS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): May I inquire of the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs whether or not it is anticipated that there will be an imperial conference in Great Britain while the Prime Minister of Canada is overseas?

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs): I cannot say that that has been any such anticipation. No suggestion has been made to this government that there should be an imperial conference at this time.

SUPPLY

STRIKE AT FORD MOTOR PLANT, WINDSOR—STATEMENT OF MR. GILLIS

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee of supply.

Mr. CLARENCE GILLIS (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to occupy any of the time of the house at this stage with the matter I am about to discuss. However, I offer no apologies for doing so because a few days ago I endeavoured to have a brief discussion of this matter, and it might have been settled at that time.

My purpose in rising to-day is to discuss the labour difficulties at Windsor. From time to time the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) can make a statement that suits him in the house, without giving anyone on this side an opportunity of presenting the other side of the question as we understand it. I consider this matter to be of urgent importance; otherwise I would not take the time of the house to discuss it. A few days ago the Minister of Labour, in answer to a question here, referred to the difficulty at Windsor as a siege, and that is what it may very well develop into if steps are not taken to correct the present attitude of the employers, as I understand it. This is not a new matter either to me or to the Department of Labour. The fact is that I raised this question in the house seventeen months ago, and it is exactly the same dispute to-day as at that time, of course with the exception that it has been neglected and pushed aside in the interval, and hopes have been expressed that someone might take a reasonable attitude so that it would not develop into the situation that exists to-day.

While I am discussing this matter as an emergency issue from this side of the house I do not want it understood that I believe no one on the other side has tried to do anything about it. Personally I think some of the members from the area concerned have done everything within their power to have the matter settled in a satisfactory manner; and, as I see it, if the employers were reasonable the matter might have been settled by now.

As I understand it, the situation is this. Here we have our first post-war strike. If the present difficulty is allowed to develop, within the next few months it is likely to culminate in a general strike right across this country. Then, this reflects the inadequacy of th labour legislation we enacted during the war for the purpose of getting production and improving relations between labour and management. It definitely sets out one thing; that is, that the Ford Motor Company in Windsor and other large employers of labour across this country accepted government legislation during the war because of the pressure of war, but immediately the war was over they took advantage of the loopholes which existed in the labour legislation and cut the line. Now they are back where they were in 1939, with the major objective in mind of defeating any intention the government may have of laying down proper labour legislation which would bring democracy into industry in this country. In other words my conception of the matter is that once again the employers of labour across this country—if the attitude of the Ford Motor Company is the general attitude—have used the workers of this country as suckers in another war; then, as soon as the war is over and the emergency has passed, they are right back where they were in 1939 or 1914. It is because I believe the government should recognize that attitude that I am discussing the matter in the house to-day. It is urgent, because, as was suggested only this afternoon in the house, the packing house workers—an essential group of workers at this time, when we are attempting to feed the people of Europe—are proposing similar action. They are running into exactly the same problems in the packing houses that the Ford workers have run into at Windsor—the fact that the employers want to back up on an agreement and on understandings arrived at during the war.

Some 30,000 other workers in automobile plants across Canada have already taken strike votes, and to the extent of almost ninety per cent in most of the plants they have decided that when or if the Windsor workers want their assistance in similar action, they are prepared to give that assistance.

Windsor to-day is engaged in a little war, a war that can bring disastrous results to that section of Canada. The issues involved are simple. In 1941 workers at Windsor had signed an agreement with the Ford Motor Company. That agreement carried a clause with respect to grievance procedure, and the manner in which problems of the workers would be relayed to the management. That agreement worked out satisfactorily until May, I believe it was, of 1944, when the Ford Motor Company decided that that grievance procedure arrangement would not be carried on any longer. Because of a slight dispute on that issue the company abrogated the signed agreement and took its present stand. The real issue in Windsor is simply that the workers in that particular plant want to sign an agreement in accordance with the Dominion legislation. They want a union shop; they want some measure of union security, and the check-off for their union dues. That would not cost the Ford Motor Company anything; it is merely a general recognition on the part of the employers and the workers of the right to sit around a conference table, and bargain. That is the main issue.

The question of wages is one which I shall not discuss. As the Minister of Labour has said, that is something to be decided between employers and the union, when or if they decide to sit down together. And may I add this, that the matter of wages as it has been discussed throughout the press, particularly of this province, is most misleading. I have seen the statement in the press to the effect that the Ford workers are demanding a thirty per cent increase in wages. The natural assumption for anyone to make is that the workers are asking that this increase be made on top of their wartime wages. That is not true. We have talked this matter over with officials of the union, and we know the fact is that what they are demanding is a thirty per cent increase on their 1938 rates. The average 1938 wage paid by the Ford Motor Company was between $1,000 and $1,200 a year. The minimum paid in their plant was $600 a year. A thirty per cent increase in basic rates means that the Ford workers are at this time demanding a minimum wage in those plants of $1,800 a year.

[Mr. Gillis.]

Mr. HOMUTH: Would the hon. member tell us how long the man getting $600 a year worked in the plant of the Ford Motor Company? How many hours did he put in in a year?

Mr. GILLIS: My information is that these plants are seasonal. They work about eight months in each year. A large percentage of the employees in those plants in pre-war years were working eight months for a minimum wage of $600.

Mr. MITCHELL: Perhaps I might clarify the situation.

Mr. HOMUTH: Let us have the facts.

Mr. MITCHELL: I believe the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Homuth) is asking for the base rate. For instance, a bricklayer may get $1 or $1.25 an hour. The point he is driving at—and it is a fair one, and one which I cannot answer; perhaps the hon. member can—is as to the amount of the base rate at Windsor.

Mr. HOMUTH: Per hour.

Mr. GILLIS: I just referred to the minimum rate in those plants.

Mr. HOMUTH: Per hour.

Mr. GILLIS: I do not know what the hourly rates are, but it does not make any difference. We might suppose that you receive $10 an hour, but if you worked only one hour a year that would be your total wage at the end of the year.

Mr. HOMUTH: I know my hon. friend will not object to answering my question. If I had a man working in my garden for one hour, for which I paid him 75 cents, he would receive 75 cents for the year if he worked only that hour. Let us be fair about it.

Mr. GILLIS: That was the point I was making.

Mr. ROWE: You did not make it, though.

Mr. GILLIS: Yes I did; I said it did not make any difference what the hourly rate was, if at the end of the year the total take or the total earnings amounted to only $600. That is the thing that is important.

Mr. ROWE: But what do they get per hour?

Mr. GILLIS: Just a minute; Mr. Speaker—

Mr. HOMUTH: I do not wish to interrupt my hon. friend, but—

Mr. SPEAKER: May I call the attention of hon. members to the fact that when another hon. member has the floor no interruptions can be permitted without his consent.

Mr. HOMUTH: I asked his permission.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: And you did not get it.

Mr. GILLIS: In a few minutes I shall be told to take my seat because my time will have expired. However, this question can be discussed by every hon. member in the house after I have finished. Mind you, I am not concerned about simply raising this matter in the house; I want something done about it. Before I take my seat I am going to suggest something that should be done. Whether hon. members are prepared to go along in this matter and see that something is done about it is a test of their sincerity.

As I said a minute ago, I am not going to argue wage rates, because there are probably fifty different classifications in that plant —different groups with different rates. But I made that point simply because the press has been misleading.

In 1938 a large percentage of the employees in that plant received $600 a year.

Mr. ROWE: How much an hour?

Mr. GILLIS: They are asking a thirty per cent increase on basic rates, or a minimum of $1,800 a year.

Mr. HOMUTH: No, no.

Mr. GRAYDON: Not $1,800?

Mr. McCANN: How does the hon. member arrive at that—$600 with a thirty per cent increase amounting to $1,800?

Mr. GILLIS: It is $600 to $1,800.

Mr. McCANN: But that is not thirty per cent.

Mr. GILLIS: A thirty per cent increase in the basic hourly rate would bring them up to that figure per year, as a minimum.

Mr. ROWE: How do you know, if you do not know what they get per hour?

Mr. GILLIS: There are many classifications in the Ford plant, as there are everywhere else.

Mr. ROWE: You do not know them, though.

Mr. GILLIS: If I had time I could tell you a lot, if you would take a trip to my office some time.

Mr. ROWE: I would prefer that you tell me here.

Mr. GILLIS: I have not time this afternoon.

Mr. ROWE: You do not know them.

Mr. GILLIS: I know them better than you do. And when I have finished you can get up and say it. Then you would be telling us something.

Mr. ROWE: I am awaiting my turn.

Mr. HOMUTH: And how!

Mr. GILLIS: As I said a minute ago, the matter of wages is not one I am concerned about. But I am concerned with the matter of establishing the collective agreement, union security and proper bargaining arrangements in the plant—the focal points in this strike.

Let me say this, that it does not reflect any great credit upon the present government in Ontario—because primarily it is their responsibility. If they were accepting that responsibility we would not be discussing the matter in this house this afternoon, and there would be no strike in Windsor.

Mr. HOMUTH: You had better talk about Nova Scotia.

Mr. GILLIS: This could not happen in Nova Scotia. We settled the matter down there thirty years ago.

Mr. ROWE: Well, in Ontario they at least know how much they are getting per hour.

Mr. GILLIS: That is the point; I have been trying to tell you. However, if what I say in the house goes over the hon. member's head, that is not my responsibility.

An hon. MEMBER: It is pretty evident what the Tory attitude, is anyway.

Mr. GILLIS: The minister pointed out that a conference had been called in Ontario, to which union officials and officials of the Ford Motor Company had been invited. If I am correctly informed, the union officials were prepared to go along with that meeting. But the Ford company took the attitude that they were not going to go into any conference with our Department of Labour or with union officials until such time as they and their office workers were permitted to go back into their offices through the picket line. The Minister of Labour in his statement the other day asserted that on that particular point he was in agreement with the Ford Motor Company. I am not going to debate the merits or demerits of the tactics of the workers in keeping out the office staff, but I am going to say this: The office workers are not stopped from going through the picket line. The fact of the matter is that the office workers are not reporting for work. That is our informa-

tion direct from the union officials, that there is no one stopping the office workers from going through the picket line.

The minister makes quite a play of Mr. Campbell being kept out of his office. The Minister of Labour is an old union man and has taken part in many strikes. A strike is a war, a war between employer and employee, and the union official has a responsibility to see that that war is conducted in the best interests of those he represents. Mr. Campbell is doing the same thing, and no one is finding fault with him for that. But why does Mr. Campbell want to get back into that office, and why are the Ford workers not much interested in allowing him back into that office? My information is this, and if it is correct, there is justification for what the men are doing. Mr. Campbell has in that plant a lot of blue-prints, a lot of dies and tools, If he could take in fifty or sixty men for a few hours he could gather those up and farm them out to other plants around this province and keep that Ford plant in Windsor closed for the next seven or eight months while he is getting his work done elsewhere, and in the meantime the skilled workers at the Ford plant would be left high and dry. I am not saying that that is a correct analysis, but that is the information we get from union officials in Windsor, and I say that if that is true the workers at Ford have complete justification in keeping Mr. Campbell out of the plant.

Do not forget that Mr. Campbell is the man who started this strike seventeen months ago by his absolutely unreasonable attitude of using the workers once again for a war, and then when the war is over his attitude is: We go back into our little shell and you workers are no longer important in this country. But Mr. Campbell is going to find out before this war is through, as will every other industrialist who takes that attitude, that unless he goes along with his workers in the post-war and establishes the objectives for which we fought this war, he is going to have a very uncomfortable country to live in for the next fifteen or twenty years.

In their efforts to find a solution for the present difficulties the workers at the Ford plant have traversed every piece of machinery that has been provided by the government, all the conciliation machinery, P.C. 1003, every order in council that has been laid down by this government. The workers at the Ford plant have complied with every one of them.

Why does Ford take that attitude in Windsor? The same company, the United States company just across the line, has provided for its employees in the United States everything that the workers in the Ford plant in Windsor are asking for. Why is there industrial democracy in the United States? Why is not the same union security set up here as there? Why is not the grievance procedure with respect to the stewards that has been provided in the United States for Ford's workers there, provided also in Windsor for Canadian workers? That is something to which the Canadian government has a right to get an answer. There is no reason why the Ford company in Canada should be tying up industry and creating friction by refusing to deal with its employees in this country as it deals with its employees in the United States.

Mr. McCANN: Have they not a million workers out on strike now?

Mr. GILLIS: Where?

Mr. McCANN: In the United States.

Mr. GILLIS: The question is wages over there. The question here is union security, and that is provided in the United States.

What is the solution? My solution is this, and you have a precedent for it. I do not expect the Minister of Labour to run around all over this country wherever there is a labour dispute; for that is not his job. But he has in his department the necessary machinery and officials that he can direct. I think that what the Minister of Labour should do immediately is to send a controller to Windsor to take over the Ford plant there. If he is prepared to do that the workers at Ford are prepared to go back to the status quo prior to their going out. The Minister of Labour then, through his controller, would try to bring the employer and the employees together to work out an agreement between employer and employee that would be in accordance with the many government pronouncements that have been made in this house on the question of collective bargaining. That is the answer, and it is not something new. This government has already done it. In the middle of the war they took over National Steel Car at Hamilton. There was a strike there, and the Minister of Labour sent in a controller. The strike was settled, and there have been no difficulties there since. The government did the same thing in Montreal in connection with the Montreal Tramways strike last year, where the situation was worse than it is at Windsor now. The Minister of Labour sent in his controller and the difficulties were settled. Just a couple of months ago the Minister of Labour again, when there was a strike in British Columbia in American Can, a company with ramifica-

tions all across this continent, sent a controller in there, in a bigger show than this Windsor set-up, and to the best of my knowledge he settled that dispute satisfactorily. The United States government at the present time are not adverse to that line of action. Just a few days ago the United States government stepped into the oil industry in the United States and took over, and is now bringing employer and employee together.

The fact of the matter is that we fought this war for something; hundreds of men left the Ford plant at Windsor to join the armed forces, and now they are coming back and are working in that plant. That is their means of livelihood. We preached to them that in fighting this war they were fighting for democracy, and now they come back to the Ford plant and find that their employer is refusing them the very rudiments of industrial democracy—the right of the employee to bargain with his employer, the right to sign an agreement, the right to say what their wage rates are to be. Now what will be the opinion of the boy who comes back from fighting this war and finds his employer taking that attitude? It is the same old game that we saw in 1914-18. We fought a war from 1939 to 1945, and now the war is over, and the war slogans are down. Personally the war is not over for me, and it is not over for the hundreds of thousands of young men who are coming back to this country after fighting a war that they really thought they were fighting for democracy.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that in a situation such as this, where there is a dispute, the first one in the post-war period that can affect labour relations clear across this country, the responsible government should step in through the Department of Labour and see to it that a sensible understanding is arrived at, based on the principles which were often enunciated by the Minister of Labour and other members of the government on the subject of labour relations during the process of fighting the war.

My hon. friend over here was much concerned about the question of wages, and I said that I was not going to go into that because it is not my business; it is the business of Ford and the employees when they come together. But let me leave this thought with you, if you think that the wage demands which the employees are making at this time are unreasonable. I understand from fairly good authority that during the years of the war the Ford Motor Company, Canadian section, made $27 million profits after all taxes were paid; they increased their reserves from $60 million to $90 million; they paid dividends to shareholders of $9 million. I understand that if two and a half million dollars were taken from that $30 million of reserves they put away during the process of fighting this war and were applied to the dispute now going on at Windsor, it would settle the whole question. The company would still have a lot of money.

Mr. HOMUTH: What does the hon. member mean, that two and a half million dollars would settle the whole question?

Mr. GILLIS: It would provide for the increases in wages.

Mr. HOMUTH: For how long?

Mr. GILLIS: For a year.

Mr. HOMUTH: And after the year was up, what then?

Mr. GILLIS: Take some more out of the $90 million reserve.

Mr. HOMUTH: That is all right, but explain that.

Mr. COLDWELL: We can see where their friends are.

Mr. GILLIS: Ford's friends are very obvious in this house.

Mr. HOMUTH: No, not "Ford's friends"; but we are not going to be deluded by a one-sided argument.

Mr. GILLIS: I shall not detain the house any longer. I feel very strongly on this matter, and I seriously suggest to the Minister of Labour and every hon. member that action should be taken by the department immediately to head off what I consider to be the initial stages of a general industrial upheaval in this country if the dispute is not handled at once and in a reasonable manner.

Mr. ALISTAIR STEWART (Winnipeg North): I believe the workers of this country are puzzled, dismayed and discouraged at the lack of a positive labour policy on the part of the government. We can remember that up to June 11 they had a policy—jobs, work for all, security for all. Where is that policy now? The workers at Windsor are without protection, and surely the most elementary protection for the workers in a democracy is the right to join the union of their own choice, the protection of union security, the closed shop, and the check-off. Yet these are being denied to them, and apparently the government does nothing about it. Well, I believe either the government's promises are going to be ful-

filled, or their bluff is going to be called, because the insecurity of labour is becoming more and more obvious.

All across this country to-day men are being laid off; plants all over Canada are reducing their staffs. I draw to the attention of the house the fact that when a man is laid off or when he is on strike it is a very serious matter for that individual. There are few scourges worse than unemployment. When a man is unemployed he has no income. It is true that to-day he gets this miserly pittance of unemployment insurance, but that is far from adequate to pay his rent, it is far from adequate to provide food, including the dairy products which are so necessary to keep his children in health; it is far from adequate to provide medical services if they are needed; it is far from adequate in these days of approaching winter to see that the house is kept properly warm and that the children do not suffer. Always under strikes or mass unemployment it is the children who suffer most. Therefore I suggest that there is much validity to our case and to the union case that when the worker is being transferred from war-time to peace-time employment, during the period of transition he should be given a minimum of $25 a week. He and his family cannot expect to live on less.

Under capitalism as we have known it the lot of the worker has been unemployment, then work for a little time, then unemployment again. There is no security. In our lifetime we have gone through two wars and two major depressions, and the mass of the people have always suffered the worst. There are young men coming back to this country whose only chance in the nineteen thirties was the chance in 1939 to fight and die for Canada. These boys are coming back expecting something better than when they went away. They want a Canada wherein there is work for them, and some sort of union security, but apparently the government is unwilling to provide that type of security. In Winnipeg we have the case of MacDonald Brothers Aircraft plant, which at the peak of employment had 4,500 men employed. The number is now down to 400. What has happened to those 4,100 people? Some, though only a few, have got other jobs; some have left the province; the great majority are unemployed.

I want again to emphasize the fact that unemployment is a personal tragedy for those who suffer from it, and therefore it is the duty of the government and this house to do everything within their power to ease conditions for these people and see that the pledges are kept that there shall be work for all in Canada.

We are told that there are a million new jobs in sight. Where are they, and at what rates of pay? I believe that the "million new jobs" is a mirage. It does not delude the workers of this country. It is true that there may be a million new jobs, but if there are, they are at twenty-five cents an hour, and we are not going to take them at that wage.

The trade unions of Canada are far in advance of the government with plans for reconversion. The trades and labour congress have already presented their recommendations to this government. They have asked:

(1) That all citizens who have been engaged in essential civilian industry be immediately allowed "reconversion pay" during this period of dislocation on a basis of one month's pay for each year's service up to three years;

(2) To spread available employment, a maximum forty-hour work week be put into effect, with no reduction in wages;

(3) To create confidence and maintain buying power, that general reductions of pay be prohibited;

(4) That restrictions be lifted from building materials and that the construction of homes be carried on with the same effort, ingenuity and dispatch as was displayed in the production of urgently needed war materials;

(5) That necessary public works be immediately commenced; and

(6) That the reconversion of all war plants suitable to peace-time production be speeded to the utmost.

There, Mr. Speaker, is a programme. The workers of Canada have a programme. Where, then, is that of the government? In Winnipeg we have signs of another strike, a national strike, in the packing house industry. I was at a conference of packing house workers a few days ago. These men appreciate the problems of industry and the problems of the national economy; they only hope that the government appreciates them in exactly the same way. The question of income tax was discussed by these workers. They had no objection to high rates of income tax provided they were sure that their fellow workers were getting jobs. They discussed rationing. They had no objection to rationing; they encouraged it in order to feed the starving people of Europe, though they disagreed in many respects with the way the government was handling it, but that is another matter. If the government are to be sure of getting the support of the working people of this country, they have to support—

Mr. CASE: Will the hon. member permit a question? Does the hon. member mean to imply that there is lack of employment in the

Ford Motor Company, that there is no employment there? He is speaking about unemployment.

Mr. STEWART: I implied nothing of the sort. What I said is that there is lack of employment in Canada.

An hon. MEMBER: Where?

Mr. STEWART: It is very obvious. Go to any employment exchange and you will see evidences of it. Talk to the workers, and they will tell you. You can get jobs at thirty-five or forty cents an hour, but nobody can afford to work at that.

An hon. MEMBER: How much do you want?

Mr. STEWART: I want to see the workers of Canada get a living wage and some security. We will not stop until we get that. That should be the policy of the government, because it is one of the promises which was held out to the workers. The workers in the packing houses are asking for a forty-hour week and thirty per cent increase in pay, so that they would get the same wage for a forty-hour week as they are now getting for a forty-eight hour week. Wages in the packing houses are not high, and the conditions in some departments are dreadful. I do not know whether hon. members have been through the packing houses and have seen the conditions under which these men work, often wading through blood and dirt. Have they seen the workers in these shops travelling from sub-zero to almost tropical temperatures in different rooms, day after day? Here is an industry that seriously impairs the health of the worker. It is all very well thinking in terms of an hourly wage, but after all that is not the way to think of those engaged in these jobs. You must think of them in terms of an annual wage, and then ask how long such men will be able to carry on in the packing house industry. As a matter of fact, a man of fifty is pretty well through because the severity of the work in the packing plant is such that he cannot carry on after that age.

These men are asking for some improvement in conditions, some hope of security from the government, and they are not holding anybody up. I may tell the government now, and they know it as well as I do, that there is going to be a strike in this industry unless they get busy and bring down a policy which will suit the workers throughout the country. The workers do not want very much. They want union security and reduced hours of work, they want decent working conditions and incomes on which they and their families can live in comfort. These are the minimum demands of those who have been producing to win the war, of those whose sons died to win the war. They are the minimum demands of the workers of Canada, and the workers are going to get them, or they and their brothers who are coming out of the services are going to know the reason why.

Mr. FRED ROSE (Cartier): I was surprised at the easy manner in which hon. members approached the question raised by the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis). I should have thought there would be more interest in the matter in this house. It is not for labour alone, it is not for the unions alone, it is for Canada that the Ford workers are striking to-day. They want to make sure that we do not go back to pre-war wage levels and insecurity. They are not there fighting merely for the Ford employees but for the men who are coming back from overseas and who will not be satisfied to go back to pre-war conditions.

The strike is not something that these workers have brought about because they wanted to strike. It is not that. Workers in various plants and industries have felt for the past year a change in the attitude of employers. Before V-E day, when war materials were necessary, employers were willing to collaborate, but once they felt that the war was coming to an end they started to provoke trouble in the shops. They laid off active unionists and fired certain workers and rehired at lower wages. All these methods were resorted to in order to prepare for the post-war period. The workers to-day on strike are saying that this is not going to happen. If their income is insufficient it will not be merely the Ford workers who will suffer. What about the storekeeper, the dentist, the doctor, and everyone else?

We have been speaking in government documents about high income; that is mentioned in most government documents. But how will anyone obtain a high income unless the government gives the lead by encouraging an increase in wages? I should like to know what sort of increase has there been in the productivity of labour in industry. According to certain figures I have seen, it appears that there has been an increase of thirty per cent in industrial efficiency in the United States. I do not know what the corresponding increase in productivity in Canada has been, but I believe there has been a similar increase. Thus an increase in wages for Canadian labour will not affect profits. In fact, I have no doubt that when it comes to profits

there will be more than a slight cut in excess profits taxes when we hear about it on Friday night. The employers will be looked after.

What about the workers? The Ford strikers want union security. They are not asking for anything new. The Canadian congress of labour and the trades and labour congress have asked for union security, but the government has done nothing. There were no changes in P.C. 1003. In this house we see orders in council often enough, but in regard to labour legislation there has been no change. I suggest that the government can still pass the necessary order in council amending 1003 so as to give the workers union security. Union security to the worker would mean that he could go into the shop feeling that he was a human being and that the boss could not manipulate wages and working conditions to his detriment.

I was very much disappointed in the replies I received last week from the Minister of Labour regarding steps to settle the Ford strike. I was told about a home being one's castle. I did not know that the office was Mr. Campbell's home, although I understand he has built up very elaborate offices in the plant. Campbell can sit back and say, "I don't care a hoot what happens to the country; I don't care if we reconvert in a hurry so as to give employment; I will wait until I break them." But the workers cannot wait. And their only weapon is organization, union security and the picket line.

I should have liked to hear some word of encouragement from the Minister of Labour rather than the statement that he thought the other party was right. In my opinion P.C. 1003 should be amended, and it should be amended in such a way that Campbell will know that he must meet with the union; that union security is the law of the land. If Campbell still does not wish to negotiate, I fully concur in the request of the member for Cape Breton South to take over the plant. This is a time to give leadership. If nothing happens now, if greedy employers are encouraged to-day, a very bad beginning will be made in reconversion.

I have met many boys who have come back from overseas. What do they say? They have been flying officers, flight-lieutenants, lieutenants in the army and so on. They have got used to a new standard of living, and they will insist upon a decent standard when they get back.

The union is fighting for these boys just as much as for the small storekeeper. These people are fighting for every worker in the country and they should get the support of this government. It is not enough for the

government to say: We will try to do our best. When the government wants to try, it generally finds better methods than those now employed with regard to the Ford strike. It is the duty of the government to act, and I hope we shall get action in a hurry.

Mr. J. S. SINNOTT (Springfield): Being a member of parliament I am much interested in this labour movement. I do not take an unkindly attitude towards the working man, because I have done much hard work myself and I know he is entitled to a day's pay. But I believe during the past few weeks there has been an attempt to incite these workers to what they are doing. I have in my hand a letter in which it is stated that ten thousand citizens of Toronto met on October 3 and passed a resolution which reads in part:

> This public rally for a labour programme on reconversion, and in support of the Ford and Guelph strikers, urge you to regard these matters as of national urgency; and that you move for their immediate discussion in the House of Commons demanding government intervention at once, (1) to grant union security in the Ford and Guelph plants, (2) to take action for the maintenance of purchasing power of the working people of Canada, and (3) to guarantee operation by government control, if necessary, of war plants now closed, or closing.
>
> We would appreciate your answer as to what action you intend taking in this matter.

I think this is the improper place to discuss this; I think it is improper to waste the time of 245 members of parliament to discuss the situation.

Mr. COLDWELL: Will the hon. member say what it is right to discuss here?

Mr. IRVINE: What is the place?

Mr. SINNOTT: I have the letter here which I wrote in reply, and I shall read it to the house. It is as follows:

> Ottawa, Ontario,
> October 9, 1945.
>
> Mr. Malcolm Murdock,
> AFL-CIO Delegate Reconversion Committee,
> 617 Yonge street,
> Toronto, Ontario.
>
> Dear Sir:
>
> Your letter received this morning, re Toronto, Ford and Guelph, Kitchener, Hamilton, Oshawa towns, etc., Ford strike.
>
> Please notify immediately as to the wages and conditions offered you by the Ford Company. Without this information, I would not be in a position to place your urgency before the house.

Mr. ROSE: Would the hon. member permit a question? Was the hon. member present when the strike question was explained?

Mr. SINNOTT: I continue with the letter:

> I would also give you to understand there is a Minister of Labour appointed to look after this matter, and I do not see any reason why

the time of the House of Commons should be taken up regarding this matter. In my opinion, if the Minister of Labour is not attending to his position in the manner he should, others should be placed in his position.

At this time I would not be able to place your complaints before the house until I had all the information from both sides.

Hoping at an early date to have such information as is necessary so I may be able to use my influence to help settle this very important matter.

In saying what I have in this letter, I have every regard for the Minister of Labour. I think he is endeavouring to settle this question. This is his baby; he is Minister of Labour. He should deal with it, and we should not take up the time of the house in discussing it.

Mr. A. L. SMITH (Calgary West): I had not intended until quite some time from now occupying the time of this house, but inasmuch as I had occasion recently to see these men from Windsor, and also Mr. Burt, the president of the union organization in this country, and Mr. MacIntyre, their international representative, and had some frank talks with them, I think perhaps I should at least declare myself in this picture in no uncertain terms. In doing so I intend to confine myself entirely to the events at Windsor. I am much inclined to agree with my friend from Nova Scotia that they may be simmering in many other places. But may I say immediately that if we want a general strike in Canada, as these men are talking about, inflammatory speeches of the kind they are making is the best way to bring it about.

This dispute at Windsor involves a number of things, and they cannot be discussed here because we have only one side of the picture. But I am going to say this: it involves union security. I stand up in this house and I say publicly that I am in favour of union security. That is one of the big things they are talking about. I will go even further. I will go with them in the way they are going to get union security. They have it across the river from the Windsor plant. You can hit one plant from the other with a rock. Why they cannot have equal conditions with the same ownership is something with respect to which I cannot agree with my hon. friend.

In meeting these men I said this to them: "You are picketing this office building, and you are wrong. You are just so wrong—" I cannot use the language here that I used there to state exactly what I said at the time. I know a little about this business. I am no new convert to unionism. I believe in organized labour. I have been a solicitor for the biggest union in western Canada for a great many years. They are on strike right now, the United Mine Workers of America, without the consent of their bosses. I may lose a job by having made that remark; nevertheless I have made it. Of course, money does not matter to us down here; our indemnity covers all our troubles, therefore we do not need to worry about things like that. But I say I speak from conviction with respect to organized labour—and I do not mean little unions, I mean strong unions.

What is the object of talking about collective bargaining if unions sit in on the picture with no money, and the bosses have all the money? It is not a bargain unless these unions are strong. I repeat, I believe in strong unions.

These men are completely wrong in picketing the Ford office building, and I will tell you why. They have an office workers' union which is composed of 870 members. They have not declared a strike. If they want to get within the law, let them call them out on strike, and then there would be no illegality in Windsor. But they are having the plant people picket the office. They say the office people are not coming down. That is perfectly true. I would not come down if I were working in that office. But aside from that one thing I am very much in favour of the attitude of the men there.

I now make this suggestion to the Minister of Labour. I greatly fear that there is much truth in what I have heard from my hon. friends just over here. We have the packing house situation in Winnipeg, where something seems to be going on. We have the mining situation in the west. You hear rumbles here and there. I give the leaders of the U.A.W.-C.I.O. credit for this, keeping the people at work in the other plants at Windsor. I have gone into it to some extent and I want to give Burt and MacIntyre in Ford and their colleagues all the marks I can for doing that at the present time—in other words, to stop this prairie fire spreading. I make this suggestion to the minister. The conditions which exist now existed when he invited the parties to meet him and the Minister of Labour for Ontario; in other words, the illegality was there; the offices were being picketed. There has been no change from the time of his invitation until now. The owners of this company, Mr. Campbell and others, refused the invitation given by the two ministers. When I say "ministers," please remember that I am including the Minister of Labour for Ontario. When that invitation was given, conditions in that place were exactly the same as at the time the invitation was refused. I say this: when the Minister of Labour for Canada and the Minister of Labour for Ontario invite Mr.

Campbell for a conference, it is up to Mr. Campbell to come. Nobody ever lost anything by chatting about a dispute, by getting together about it.

Suppose you have a row with your wife. You cannot lay down a condition that she has to wear number ten shoes or something of that kind before you speak to her again. You may be wrong, she may be wrong, but the only way you ever straighten out these things is to talk them over across a table. Therefore it does seem to me, even if it is necessary to go to the length suggested over here, that if these people will not meet, the minister must use drastic methods. He should put the pressure on Mr. Campbell and say: Here, let us stop this nonsense. Let us say to the men: Pull out your union, if you want a legitimate strike. But in the name of God let us get together, stop this shadow-boxing and prevent a labour conflagration the like of which this country never witnessed before.

Mr. J. O. PROBE (Regina City): Mr. Speaker, when I listened in this house some weeks ago to a discussion as to whether this august assembly should declare the war at an end or whether we should wait some months before the Canadian government put its stamp of approval on the fact that peace had come to this land, even though our armed forces had ceased fighting the enemy, I was at a loss to know why we should be debating that problem. Hon. gentlemen to my immediate right kept insisting that the war should be declared over, because then the process of removing controls might get under way, which would give certain interested persons an opportunity to get back into free enterprise on a proper and unrestricted scale. First I suspected that possibly the war controls instituted by the government during the last five years were being retained to bring about an orderly transition from war to peace, as was indicated by a number of hon. members on the other side of the house. Then in reading various press reports relating to strikes in British Columbia, at Toronto, at Guelph and at Windsor, with the rumblings of a strike at Winnipeg; seeing the football being thrown from the provincial government to the Minister of Labour at Ottawa and back; seeing the Minister of Labour here step into a reportedly provincial matter and settle the American Can strike in British Columbia by forcing a board of conciliation on the two disputants; seeing that when the packing house employees all across Canada were on strike or in process of going on strike the Ontario Minister of Labour took up the cudgel and was able to settle a dominion dispute, as a novice in this house I was left definitely at sea as to who had jurisdiction in any given field of labour legislation.

Mr. MITCHELL: Might I say to my hon. friend that he is still at sea, though I regret having to say so.

Mr. COLDWELL: Just a minute, now.

Mr. MITCHELL: All right; an attack is being made on myself and on the Ontario Minister of Labour, who is not here.

Mr. PROBE: I made no attack on the Minister of Labour of Ontario. I said he settled a strike which was of dominion-wide proportions.

Mr. MITCHELL: That is a different thing. First you said it was a dominion affair.

Mr. PROBE: I did not make a deliberate attack on the Ontario Minister of Labour. I am quite happy that he settled the dispute in question, though I did not say so.

Coming back to the point I was trying to make when the Minister of Labour corrected me on my way of expressing my opinions in this matter, we have certain wartime labour controls. As I see it, if we had to have those controls at all they should have been all-inclusive. Apparently some government, whether it be the Tory government at Toronto or our own government here at Ottawa, is able under certain conditions to step in and either by conciliation or by an enforced arbitration, as happened in the two cases I mentioned, settle a labour dispute, under powers vested in the government by certain war measures and orders in council. I have come to the conclusion that the power of the government of this country is being used not to force reasonable conciliation in these disputes but to keep wages frozen, to keep overtime pay frozen, to keep minimum hours of labour frozen at a maximum figure. In my own province of Saskatchewan, where the provincial government authorized two weeks' vacation with pay for all employees, the power of the federal government was invoked to prevent those employees from receiving the holidays to which they were justly entitled. Only this afternoon I was reading in the *Labour Gazette* something relating to P.C. 9384, which is the wartime wages control order, in which various judgments of regional labour boards were given to this effect: "the primary function of war labour boards is to stabilize the wage structure in Canada, and that purpose cannot be achieved by equalizing wages across the various economic regions of Canada."

So we have restrictive measures still in operation and being skilfully used by employers who request their application by the government because otherwise there will be an upward revision of the wage structure as a result of which the prices of commodities will go up. These restrictions are in effect in spite of the fact that the workers of this country are in a fatigued condition as the result of long hours with little if any overtime pay. This situation was emphasized to me two years ago at Dagenham, Essex, when I happened to be the luncheon guest of the managing director for England of the Ford Motor Company. I did not discuss politics on that occasion, or I might not have been given this reply to a question I asked with respect to worker fatigue. Mr. Cooper, managing director of Ford at Dagenham, said that in the plants of his company, owing to the excessive hours workers were employed because of the need for producing all available munitions of war, and because of the extra hours that were entailed in roof watching, home guard duties and so on, the incidence of accidents was increasing and the precision of the work being done was decreasing. This being so, if employers are interested in the efficiency of their plants it would seem to me that from that point of view, if for nothing else, they would accede to the demands of their employees without having to be threatened with a strike. I will say to the credit of most employers of labour in this country that in spite of the restrictions on giving two weeks' holidays with pay each year, many of them have voluntarily recognized the necessity of their people having these holidays.

The Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) sent out a small pamphlet entitled "Employment and Income, With Special Reference to the Initial Period of Reconstruction." In this pamphlet I noted the following paragraph which seems to me apropos of this discussion:

> The transition period . . . with the demand for civilian goods, will require, taking the country as a whole, all the labour and materials which can be made available. High employment and nation-wide skill will continue.
>
> There will, however, be unavoidable dislocations and delays in some localities where war-time demands have necessitated heavy concentration of war orders and an abnormal war-time population.
>
> The government, working in the first instance through the Department of Reconstruction, is making plans to meet these local situations. These plans include the speedy reestablishment and development of civilian industry in these areas. They will be supplemented, to the extent necessary and desirable by special attention to the field of housing and public works.

In other words, following up the election promises by all political parties, the Minister of Reconstruction simply reiterates that there will be a more or less continuously high rate of employment, high income for the workers, social security and, I had hoped, collective bargaining. I could go on ad infinitum—or possibly I should say ad nauseam.

In my home city of Regina the problem of reconversion of our major industrial plant, Regina Industries, was settled rapidly. No more than a week after election day, quit slips were being handed out to the employees at the rate of roughly 150 per week. This was done to a point where, to-day, the one large industrial plant in our city is operating only on a skeleton-staff basis. The potentialities of the plant for any form of industrial production are going to be lost to western Canada, and therefore to the country as a whole because, as I understand from the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Abbott), the building is to be turned over for use as an ordnance depot.

The people in that plant who had developed certain skills did not go on strike, nor did they have the opportunity to do so. They were simply eased out because there was no work for them. The manufacture of Bren gun tripods for the Chinese government, which has been proceeding in the plant since June, is one of the outstanding jokes in our war production—simply because those tripods are obsolete. At any rate, the men and women who were working in that plant now have the option of either accepting work offered them at points outside Regina, or accepting unemployment insurance—and ultimately, of course, relief. It is not a simple matter to root up an entire family in one of the prairie provinces and move it either to eastern Canada or to British Columbia for the work obtainable in those areas. Selective service assured our workers in Regina that work was available at those points.

The acceptance of unemployment insurance offers no great incentive to the average citizen. In my view the Unemployment Insurance Act passed in 1940 is an iniquitous piece of legislation. We find that out of approximately 5,000,000 persons gainfully employed, 2,500,000 are covered by the terms of this legislation. The act is full of loopholes. Contributions must be made to the fund for 180 days by an employee in the two years immediately preceding an application for unemployment insurance benefits. To receive those benefits the individual concerned must be capable of and available for work, and must be unable to obtain suitable employment. In other words, he must be capable of earning. But if, through no fault of his own, a man

becomes sick, the act is not worth the snap of a finger, because under this legislation sickness is a bar to the receipt of benefits.

I did not like the implication of the hon. member who immediately preceded me in the debate, when he said that those of us in this group who are drawing attention to the seriousness of the situation are thereby aggravating its seriousness. But may I point out that those who are now on strike, by the terms of the Unemployment Insurance Act are ineligible for receipt of benefits, because strikers are barred from participation.

Moreover, no insurance benefits are available for the first nine days of unemployment in any benefit year. I know the employees of this country are not Mahatma Ghandis; they cannot enter upon nine-day hunger strikes, when conditions develop which would cause those strikes. This is another principle which deters our working people from making the final and serious move of taking strike action. The very fact that the workers at Windsor are on strike, after seventeen months of negotiation, and after exploring every available channel to secure redress for what they considered to be their grievances signifies clearly to me that their action is definitely that of a last resort.

Another serious defect in the Unemployment Insurance Act, to which I would draw the attention of the house, is that section of the Act which states that if a worker leaves employment without just cause, or is discharged for cause, he is not eligible for benefits.

The solvency of the fund, as set out in section 79, is something which will have to have the attention of hon. members in the very near future. Figures I have, show that in 1942 there were 26,900 applications filed for benefits under the act. In 1943 that number had risen to 36,600 and in 1944 to 90,897. In the first six months of this year the number of applications was 76,821, almost equal that of the whole of 1944. These were the applications for benefits which paid to married men with dependents, if acceptable under the Unemployment Insurance Act, a minimum of $4.80 and up to a maximum of $14.40 per week. These are the figures regardless of the number of dependents.

From the point of view of solvency, the defect in the fund as it is set up under section 79 is that no provision is made for continuity of payments to the fund. I do not wish to indulge in carping criticism, because as a matter of fact I think the government should be congratulated upon having instituted the semblance of an unemployment insurance fund, even though it follows belatedly the example of other enlightened countries throughout the world. But there are so many loopholes in the Unemployment Insurance Act that either when the workers call upon its benefits they cannot get them, or the $300 million at present in the fund will soon be exhausted.

I have one more reference to make before sitting down. While our friends in the labour movement are being held at bay, so to speak, because they have infringed upon the law in a minor point in preventing a certain Mr. Campbell from entering his business premises, I notice that provision is being made to keep certain other people off the relief roll. A friend drew my attention to the dominion government telephone directory for the month of May, and in that directory I find listed under various departments of government, 1,582 telephone numbers of army officers: 9 lieutenant-generals or major-generals; 23 brigadiers; 75 colonels; 175 lieutenant-colonels; 335 majors; 613 captains; only 352 lieutenants, or second-lieutenants. That makes a grand total of 1,582 brass hats, shall we say. I was in service, Mr. Speaker; I was an officer wearing His Majesty's uniform; but when I think of the intricate mess in which the business of this country becomes entangled because scattered around various government buildings in the city of Ottawa there are enough officers to staff adequately three fighting Canadian divisions overseas, I am appalled. I do not think that all these brass hats so-called are from the province of Saskatchewan either. Even that might require some closer checking up. I have an idea also that the air force and the navy are adequately represented.

We are looking after certain people in this transition period. Certain parts of the army, as I say, are well represented. I have an idea, without knowing the actual facts, that these 1,582 telephone numbers of army officers in the May directory of the government cannot be matched by an equal number of telephones for privates and non-commissioned officers. But certain people are being provided for in this rehabilitation period while the workers of this country, who also did their bit, get the run-around. I would urge upon the Minister of Labour, for the sake of peace, order and good government in this fair Dominion of Canada, that he step into this strike at Windsor just as he stepped in to settle the labour dispute in the American Can Company in British Columbia.

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Cariboo): Mr. Speaker, this question to me is of far greater importance than merely the strike at Windsor

which happens to be the reason why the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis) brings this matter to the attention of the house. Its significance is that that strike is just the beginning of a process which, if labour does not hinder it, will go on until wages have dropped to the point at which they were before the war, and it is because labour is determined to resist that and because they recognize that the power of their union, which implies collective bargaining, is the only weapon they can use to resist it, that you have the strike at Windsor. That, sir, is why there will be many more strikes in the next five years if something is not done about it. So, while some hon. members think this is not the time and not the place to bring this matter up—I have heard that said for many years in this house—I do not know of any better time and I know of no better place to talk about this matter than here and now. True, we tried to talk about it at some other time, but we were not given the opportunity. This is the only other chance afforded by the rules of the house for us to present something at least of the case of the workers at the Ford plant at Windsor.

I am not going to offer any sharp criticism of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell). I recognize that his job, if I may call it such, is a very difficult one, not only in this but in all similar disputes. His department, unfortunately for him, happens to be that point at which both the employers and employees meet in their conflict, and as such he has the most difficult task of perhaps any minister of the crown. I would suggest that the government should give him greater assistance by putting behind him a better policy, a policy which he can carry out with his whole heart, and which will be in line with what we might expect in a country that has fought for and won democracy.

I would, however, suggest to the Minister of Labour that it does seem to me to be almost bringing this matter to an absurdity to say that action cannot be taken because Mr. Campbell cannot get into his office. I am not going to attempt any defence of the action which prevents him, other than to say that in my view, according to my information, the keeping of the workers out of their offices has now become a point of importance to the strikers. That is a factor in the case, but I do not believe that action on the strike by the minister should be delayed because of a minor point of that kind.

I agree most heatily with the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Smith) that the minister should exercise whatever power he has and call the important leaders together, both of the industry concerned and of the striking men, and try to settle the difficulty—and forget about Mr. Campbell's office.

The government, I insist, must do something about this. Not only is the strike at Windsor the beginning of a struggle which, as I have said, will go on until wages drop to a point where the greatest possible profits can be made in peace time—that is the tendency—but it must not be forgotten that an essential industry, no matter which it is, has vital contacts with the whole industrial system of the nation. I would say to the Minister of Labour and to the government that it is just as important for the well-being of the nation and for the people involved in this strike that industry should be kept going in peace time as it was kept going in war. That is something the government will have to learn. True, it endeavoured to maintain full production during the war, and although it may not always have completely reached that objective it made a very creditable job. I suggest that the responsibility still rests on the government to perform that function.

It is being argued by influential people in Canada to-day that we cannot maintain war-time wages and war-time prices. It has been suggested by some of our influential newspapers that the time has come for this parliament and for the government to face up to that issue. One editorial remarks that, "what does seem to be suggested is a matter of common sense, and it is that either prices should be adjusted to wages or wages to prices." But mark this: "To leave the matter to a scuffle in the dark between labour and capital hardly seems sensible." That is precisely what this government is doing, in the case not only of Windsor but of the entire industrial system. They are leaving wage workers to scuffle with their employers in the dark in an attempt to maintain their wages at a living standard. The figures with respect to the wages of the striking workers in Windsor have been given by the hon. member who introduced this discussion. I need not repeat them, beyond laying emphasis upon the lowest figure he quoted, that of $600 a year as an income for the head of a family, which was included in an average wage which reached from $1,000 to $1,200 a year. Every hon. member knows that even $1,200 is not sufficient for a full life in Canada to-day, and we ought to be prepared to do something about it. Further, every one of us knows, if we know anything

about this situation or any similar one, that collective bargaining is the only instrument which labour so far has been able to use effectively in raising its wages when wages began to go down.

I add my voice in support of the suggestion already made by the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis) that the government should send in a controller to keep this industry going while the processes of reaching agreements are continued. That would be a good way to get into Mr. Campbell's office; let a government controller go there and I am quite sure that he will be admitted through the picket lines. That will remove the difficulty, and the minister can then proceed to his heart's content to settle the strike.

I have said that the Minister of Labour should have a government policy behind him in a matter of this kind. Of course he has, but I imagine it is a policy he cannot like very well. I cannot imagine, from his background, his knowledge, and his fights for labour, that he is particularly happy there. I cannot imagine any labour man being particularly happy as a labour minister in any government which stands for the status quo, and I know the present minister must have his difficulties in that environment.

This government stands for free private enterprise. Now free private enterprise is manifesting its capacity to meet the industrial requirements of this nation from one coast to the other at the present moment. It has entirely failed to prevent vast numbers of men from being laid off without any income except the $14 a week which they may get if and when they receive their unemployment insurance. Free private enterprise has failed to meet the situation in Windsor. Free private enterprise is dabbling away with the problem in the packing plants until the first thing we know we shall have a strike at Winnipeg, Vancouver and other points, tying up the whole live stock industry. Free private enterprise has failed so badly that in the last two weeks we have had, to my knowledge, at least three deputations from various parts of Canada interviewing or seeking to interview the government with respect to the failures of free private enterprise to meet their immediate requirements. We had, for instance, a delegation of 300 in this building a short time ago. They had a specific programme, and their whole plea was that free private enterprise was failing to meet the situation. We had a delegation from Prince Rupert and other parts of British Columbia having to do particularly with rehabilitation and the transition period from war to peace-time industry.

We had another deputation from greater British Columbia centring, I believe, in Vancouver and Victoria. These three different deputations inside of the last two weeks, along with threatened strikes which I have mentioned and the strike of which we are now speaking, indicate that in so short a time after the cessation of hostilities free private enterprise is on its knees. But it is part of the business of free private enterprise to allow the lag to come so that wages may be forced down, in order that greater profits may be assured for it in the future.

Therefore I am very sorry indeed that the minister has not a policy which would enable him to meet, and meet satisfactorily, a situation of this kind, a policy which would guarantee every possible assistance to industry in order that it might function as a service to all the people of Canada.

I know pretty well what the government policy about industry is, as I have gathered it from its own published statements. I believe its policy is to allow free private enterprise to have free play until it becomes absolutely imperative for the government to do something, and this means that we shall have perhaps hundreds of thousands of people unemployed and perhaps riots here and there. Then the government is supposed to do something, and what it will do then is to increase public expenditures on public works to take up the slack. According to my information, that is the government's policy. Let free private enterprise carry on until it sticks, as the government is quite sure it will; when it actually does stick, then the government will make expenditures, and those expenditures are to be made from borrowed money, with interest to be paid on the borrowed money, so that the people have to pay higher taxes in order to pay the higher interest to the money-lenders. And so goes our system, like a snake that starts to eat its own tail, until it gets to the back of its neck and cannot go farther. That is the kind of economic system we now have in this country. The snake is busy eating its tail now and it will not be long coming up through the body.

I want to suggest one or two things to the government, knowing of course—well, at least hopeful that they will act immediately on them.

An hon. MEMBER: You should have fired the first barrel. I think I know what you were going to say.

Mr. IRVINE: I want to point out first of all that we have fought for democracy, but I wonder whether as a parliament we have ever made any effort to say what this means, to

say whether a wage of $600 a year is fit for anyone in a democracy for which young men died. I wonder if we have ever tried to visualize what this thing means for which our men have given their lives. A country that cannot provide homes for its people calling itself a democracy! A country that can find neither jobs for its people nor sufficient income to maintain a standard of decent living calling itself a democracy! I feel about this, as I am quite sure many hon. members feel, that these young men have made a tremendous sacrifice for democracy, and I am damned if I am going to stand here and watch it made a fool of by this government or any other government.

I want to see the people of Canada get democracy. I want to see them get democracy in industry; I want to see them get democracy in ownership of the means by which they live; I want to see them get democracy in the ruling of their industrial lives and pursuits; I want to see the workers have a share in the policies of industry, in what they are making, how it is to be made, and all the conditions of labour. I want to see democracy in reality.

That is the fight which is beginning. The fight for democracy has been fought on the military field. The fight now swings into the political and industrial field; as it swings in there I swing in behind it, and so do all of us in this group. And these men are merely the first to make a protest.

I want the government then to guarantee first of all—a very small thing—a minimum income of $25 a week or $100 a month to every worker in Canada between his employment as a war worker and the time he is engaged in similar occupation in peace pursuits, and I want to see at the same time that that becomes a basic wage below which no worker in Canada will be permitted to work in the days that are to come. That is the first thing.

I know the question of money will be raised as usual. I have listened for days to the discussion of a money bill in this house and hon. members, particularly to my right, have laid stress on the enormous amounts of money we hav been spending, how much more we are spending now than we spent twenty years ago. Who cares whether we are spending more now? If we were not spending more now than twenty years ago we would be fit only for a lunatic asylum. The point is, can we produce the goods? That is the first point, and the second point is, can the people of this country consume them? You may say, no; they cannot consume them all. All right; let us fill them up anyhow. Let us fill them up once; let us put something on their backs once; let us give them a home once; let us see to it that all the people of Canada have all they can eat of wholesome food, that they have homes in which to live, homes that are comfortable, beautiful and worthy of a democracy. Let us see that their children have a chance at education and that they have an opportunity to maintain a free life. Let us do these things; then what is left over we can use for foreign trade, and I imagine there will be quite a bit left over. But let us make sure that our people are not going to be deprived of anything that can be produced in Canada while machinery and workers are idle and material is going to waste. That is the business of government. That is the responsibility of this administration; the administration is going to be held to that responsibility, and this strike is the first sign of its task.

I suggest to the minister, therefore, that he do two things: first, that he call the leaders together and, if he cannot effect a settlement immediately, he put a controller in there in the interests of government until the matter is settled. I advocate this not particularly for the strikers of Windsor but as an industrial policy for the future. We cannot afford to tie up any great industry in a country in which the people need goods, and it is the business of government to see that our industries are kept going and that those who labour in them receive sufficient for their labours to make it possible for them to live democratically; that is, to live in accordance with a standard of living for which they would not be ashamed that their fighting men overseas had died.

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): We all agree, I believe, with the objectives which have been expressed by our C.C.F. friends. I believe we all agree with the fine sentiments expressed by the previous speaker (Mr. Irvine). I am quite sure that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) agrees with all that. I rather suspect that ninety-five per cent of the Liberal party agrees with it. But the big problem which confronts them is, where is the money coming from to do all this?

Mr. IRVINE: You tell us.

Mr. BLACKMORE: That is what I rose to do. During the ten years I have been in this house I think I have never found fault with a difficulty without offering a possible solution, and I propose to make no exceptions to that rule. Whether the people who listen to me will have vision and understanding sufficient to be able to appreciate the solution I offer is a matter for their concern, not for mine.

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): We shall try.

Mr. BLACKMORE: May I point out to all hon. members something of the problem which confronts the labouring man not only in the Ford plant at Windsor but throughout the length and breadth of this country. In a few minutes I am going to read a statement from the bureau of statistics which conveys a doleful picture of the wage situation which prevailed in Canada in 1941. First of all, let me give a summary of that finding. During the twelve months period which ended on June 2, 1941, of the Canadian wage-earners 32·9 per cent received less than $450 a year. How many of my Conservative friends want to see the boys come home from overseas and go into jobs where they get as little as that? How many of my Liberal friends want to see that? The next question is, what are you ready to do about it? Do you not realize that the system you are operating to-day, against which these Ford workers are striking, is the very same system that in four years will force the labour people of Canada back into that wage structure? What about it? Do you want that? What are you going to do about it?

In the year ended June 2, 1941, 28·7 per cent of the wage-earners of Canada received between $450 and $949 a year. Now, my Conservative friends, how many of you want to see your boys return from overseas and take that wage? How many of you Liberals want to see your boys take that wage? Yes, but suppose it is your boy; that is a different matter altogether. Suppose it is you, then what? How would you like to try to support a wife and three or four children on a wage like that?

These men in this Ford plant realize that those conditions actually did prevail; they actually lived through them. The members of this house sat and twiddled their idle, useless thumbs while it went on, and the Liberal government under the charge of William Lyon Mackenzie King sat there and allowed them to do it. These are extremely serious matters.

Furthermore, 29·9 per cent of all the wage-earners in Canada received in that same year between $950 and $1,949 a year. I should like to ask how many members of this house want to see the boys they raised and saw go overseas come back and take that wage? This adds up to the following impressive total: In the year ending June 2, 1941, a war year, 91·5 per cent of the wage-earners of Canada were receiving under $1,950 a year. Before we can fully appreciate the ardour and the fervour and determination with which these men in the Ford plant are waging their battle with every means at their command, we must understand the gloom of the picture which they see, and get their point of view. And when we understand it, let us get our newspaper supporters all over this country to give that picture so that everybody understands it. I have the idea that the members of this house can have considerable influence on the newspapers, especially where these members happen to be Liberals and Conservatives.

It is of the first importance that the Canadian people be informed as to the true facts which obtain in this country. Let us take a look at the case of the Ford Motor company owners. We must understand both sides. Let us see what confronts them. But before we do have a discussion on their problem, let us ask ourselves this question. Why did those wage rates prevail in Canada? Tell me, am I right when I say that those wage rates prevailed in Canada because of a foreign trade complex which exists in the minds of the Canadian people? If I am wrong I shall welcome being corrected by any Liberal or Conservative who will produce evidence to prove his point.

When we are labouring under the foreign trade complex we naturally assume, if we are employers, that wages must come down because prices must come down, because we must be able to sell our goods in competition with other producers, first of all in our own country, and second, in other countries, producing goods that will compete with our goods in foreign markets. That is argued by producers. That puts the employers, perhaps not the Ford motor people to so great an extent, but certainly the packing people and most other producers, in an almost impossible position. Their backs, too, are to the wall. Each side in this struggle finds itself with its back to the wall; each feels that it must fight to protect its very existence; each adopts whatever weapons and tactics it considers essential to success. Thus we see the struggle in Windsor to-day threatening our very national peace, order and good government, if not ultimately our very national existence.

Our C.C.F. friends will say, well, it is an evidence that private enterprise has failed. I say that is pure piffle. It is not evidence that private enterprise has failed. It is evidence that private enterprise is thoroughly alert, thoroughly familiar with the situation confronting it, and is fighting to subsist. If it is unable to make a success of the situation it is not an evidence that private enterprise is failing; it is an evidence that government policy in this country is failing; it is an evidence that we are endeavouring to make work a system which cannot possibly work.

The thing that nearly everyone in the debate thus far has condemned in the government is this attitude which I, too, condemn, namely, that the government seems to take the position that the government is merely a referee in the situation; that the government must not participate in this quarrel between these little boys; that it is not responsible in the situation. I will not say that the minister has taken the attitude that he is not responsible, but thus far his attitude has been such that he appears to take the view that somebody else must take the responsibility before he can assume his.

Now may I say this once more. The government will simply have to change its financial system or this kind of thing will go on to the ultimate utter destruction of the country. Already we can see what may happen. The government never will be able to solve the problems under the present system. When I say we must change the system, I do not mean that we must change to government ownership, and I will discuss that for a moment or two shortly. I do not want to quarrel with my C.C.F. friends, but I wish to tell them that in my judgment they are barking up the wrong tree; they are going up a blind alley. If they were to apply their policies in this country they would not succeed any better than the present system is succeeding, because they would not be putting their finger on the main cause of the trouble.

The present system distributes too little purchasing power, and it cannot do otherwise. Let us for a moment refer to the figures I used a short time ago. If enterprise, whether government or private, in this country were obliged to compete in the foreign market, certainly it would have to bring down the prices of its goods in order to go on that foreign market. What would it do? That is a matter which has to be considered very carefully. Let us look again at the figures I gave. It will be noticed that I pointed out that 91·5 per cent of all the wage-earners of Canada were receiving less than $1,950, and 32·9 per cent of them were receiving less than $450. In a country where the wage-earners are getting such meagre incomes as those, how in the world can the Ford Motor Company or Canada Packers or any other organization sell its goods? That is the first difficulty. There just is not the purchasing power going into the hands of the people to enable them to buy the goods. And if all the industries in the country were taken over by the government and run as government concerns, that fact would not necessarily change the wage structure one dollar. If the wage structure were raised, then unquestionably the prices of goods would rise and the problem of selling the goods would be accentuated and intensified. The fact that under our present system insufficient purchasing power is consistently going into the hands of the people puts private enterprise under an impossible handicap; and to blame private enterprise for inability to deal with the situation confronting us is as bad as to tie a man hand and foot, weigh him down with a hundred pound weight, and blame him because he is not able to run. Under the present financial system private enterprise has not the ghost of a chance. There must be a means of obtaining purchasing power which can be distributed among the people, which can increase the incomes of those people whose wages we have had under review.

Even if the government owned the plants the same thing would be true. I believe the average run of our C.C.F. people and a great many of the socialistically inclined people in the Liberal party, the Conservative party and elsewhere, as well as throughout the country, have in mind an idea with regard to the profits people are making that is altogether fallacious. There are big profits in some cases, yes; but any man who has ever taken over even a farm and tried to make a go of it—

An hon. MEMBER: Or a brick yard.

Mr. BLACKMORE: —yes, or a brickyard, and tried to make a go of it, or any kind of concern, knows how hard it is to make profits. As I look over my C.C.F. friends, I do not know how many of them have ever tried to do that. It is hard to make profits and easy to lose them in just a few bad years. By way of example, in a perfectly kindly way, may I suggest that for a moment we consider what would happen if the C.C.F. were in power in Canada and took over the Ford plant. I should like to ask three or four questions. Let us ask them in a perfectly straightforward way, because we must have the truth. Would they pay all the workers a living wage?

Mr. COLDWELL: Yes.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I imagine all the members of the C.C.F. would chorus yes, as their leader has done. Would that living wage be less than $1,800 a year? I do not think any member of the C.C.F. would dare say no.

Mr. COLDWELL: I would say it could not be less.

Mr. BLACKMORE: You would not say it could be less, would you?

Mr. COLDWELL: No.

Mr. BLACKMORE: You would not consider for a moment having a wage of less than $1,800 a year?

Mr. COLDWELL: I do not think a man can live decently on less than that if he is married.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I quite agree. You see, social crediters and the C.C.F. do not disagree very much with respect to objectives; it is when we come to techniques that we disagree. Now, this is the question the C.C.F. would have to answer immediately. Where would the money come from with which to give those workers $1,800 a year? They would say, out of profits.

Mr. COLDWELL: Out of production, not out of profits.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Well, you could not possibly get it out of production without taking it out of profits.

Mr. IRVINE: Would you let me answer that question for you?

Mr. BLACKMORE: Yes, gladly.

Mr. IRVINE: My answer is that we would not hesitate to create just as much money as was necessary to equal the goods we were competent to produce.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I am very glad to hear that answer, and I presume it meets with the approval of the leader of the party; is that right?

Mr. COLDWELL: That is right.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Then I am going to ask the C.C.F. why they have been so busy for years now trying to destroy the social credit movement in Canada, which is the one movement which has gone on record as favouring that very thing. Now let them explain that.

Mr. COLDWELL: No; you have the cart before the horse.

Mr. BLACKMORE: That is a pretty weak answer.

Mr. IRVINE: Maybe we are getting together now.

Mr. BLACKMORE: If we do it is the C.C.F. who will have to do the getting together, because they are wrong. If they agree with what the hon. member for Cariboo has just said, then no member of the C.C.F. has any right whatever to oppose any social crediter in this country; he could not in honour do so, because that is precisely the attitude the social credit people have taken.

[Mr. Blackmore.]

Mr. COLDWELL: Then why did the social crediters disapprove the hon. member for Cariboo in 1935?

Mr. BLACKMORE: If I remember correctly the hon. member for Cariboo had a rather bad record when he got out to Alberta in 1935. He did most excellent work in the House of Commons; he made some speeches of which any social crediter would be proud, but when he went to Alberta later he rather spoiled it all. But we will discuss that later on; I think we have the goods on my hon. friend which will be quite sufficient if we have to use them.

If the C.C.F. favour the creation of money to equal the goods produced, that is fine. Why have they not advocated it in this house up to this time? They have never done so. Probably now they are beginning to favour that idea. I think you will find, Mr. Speaker, as the days go by in this country, that all parties, perhaps the C.C.F. first, will come to realize that the one group which was right in this matter in 1935 was the Social Credit group. They will find that the social crediters were right in their monetary views; that they were right in their price views; that they were right in their dividend views. Why, the C.C.F. even advocate a dividend of $25 a week; that was done by the hon. member who just preceded me. Other parties will find that the social crediters were right in their war ideas and in every single thing upon which they made a public pronouncement.

Mr. FAIR: And will be right in days to come.

Mr. BLACKMORE: And you will find that the members of the other groups gradually will come to that point of view. If the Canadian people could only know that this would happen quickly enough to save us from disasters which threaten, such as the Ford dispute, then the people could breathe a sigh of relief.

There just is no possible way of solving this problem except the way I suggest. I ask this: Where would the money come from? If the C.C.F. would use the method that the social crediters suggest, use the price system they suggest, use the wage system they suggest and use the dividend system they suggest; in other words, if the C.C.F. would become social crediters, they would solve the problem. And they would find that if they did that they would not need to own the plants. All they would have to do with the Ford Motor Company is this—and I hope the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) will not make any silly mis-

takes because he has made many in this House of Commons. He had better not laugh a foolish laugh until he realizes that if the Ford Motor Company knew its prices would be guaranteed by social credit technique: if it knew positively that its workers would be guaranteed their incomes by social credit technique, and if the workers knew that their incomes would be guaranteed by that technique, and that markets for their goods would be guaranteed by that same social credit technique, they would end the strike to-night. There would be no further argument at all. There would be no need for any government to take over the plant.

Where could one find an organization more efficient in the building of motor cars than is the Ford Motor Company? For what do hon. members suppose the company is operating its plant? Is it just for fun? Does anyone imagine for a split second they would not sell their goods, all the goods they can possibly manage to make, if they could sell them at remunerative prices? To imagine that is to accuse them of being stupid—and they are not stupid, or they would not be where they are. It would not be necessary to have the government take over the plant. All you have to do is to guarantee wages and prices, and put purchasing power into the hands of the people so that they may buy. Do that, and the trouble will clear up immediately.

Mr. LESAGE: And in six months they like to buy more—and it will start all over again.

Mr. BLACKMORE: If the hon. member will come to my office I will talk to him. Obviously I cannot conduct him through a full course in economics right here on the floor of the house. But if he will come to my office—

Mr. LESAGE: I will.

Mr. BLACKMORE: —I will answer his questions so that he will not be able to say a word.

Mr. LESAGE: Is it a challenge?

Mr. BLACKMORE: In fact, I will offer him this challenge: If he will bring five of his friends who are not prejudiced one way or another and set them down in my office, I will undertake to answer every one of his questions so fully that his five friends will declare they are answered. There can be no question about it at all.

Mr. LESAGE: I take the challenge.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I am not afraid of it, because I have done it before.

Under the C.C.F., or under any socialistic technique through which we would have government ownership, where would a plant sell its goods? How would it sell those goods on the world markets? One can readily understand how it could sell its goods on the world markets if the government were prepared to use a social credit technique, that of subsidizing exports where necessary to sell exports abroad. I can understand that. Under that system I could see where they would sell their goods abroad. I believe the Ford Motor Company could do it, as a private organization. But may I hasten to say that social credit would not bother subsidizing goods to be sold abroad in competition with goods from factories within a given nation. That is, we would not undertake to force our goods into the world markets. If a nation wanted our goods, well and good. But if it were a matter of putting our goods into the hands of another nation to displace its industry, we would be against it. I thought it was necessary to say that, because some people might misunderstand.

I believe I have said enough at this time. Hon. members in this group are entirely in sympathy with the struggle being made by the Ford Motor Company employees. We realize they are doing things which they feel they would not like to do but which the government, because of the attitude it has taken, is forcing them to do. And the Ford plant is taking measures it is not justified in taking. Once more, by persisting in the present financial system, the government is forcing them into that position.

All I would say is simply this: Let the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell), get permission from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley), who seems to be the one who runs the whole show, to go to the Ford plant and say to them, Look here, gentlemen; this problem must be solved, and it must be solved right away. I am not going to suggest to him the measures he should take. But I will say that it can be done, and I will say further that it must be done, if Canada's economic and social structure is to be preserved. If the minister cannot solve it under the present system, then I urge upon him that with all possible speed he adopt a system under which he can solve it.

When I read the figures I have in my hand possibly some hon. members will wonder just to what extent they are in accordance with those supplied by the bureau of statistics. For those who wish to have the information authentically may I read this letter dated

September 25, 1945, from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, and addressed to me in the following words:

Further to our telephone conversation of this morning regarding the percentage of wage-earners receiving various amounts of income.

The percentage of wage-earners earning less than $450 for the 12 months' period prior to the date of the census, June 2, 1941, was 32·9 per cent. 28·7 per cent of the wage-earners reported earnings between $450 and $949; 29·9 per cent earned between $950 and $1,949 and 6·8 per cent earned $1,950 and over. 1·7 per cent of the wage-earners did not state the amount of earnings for the year.

For your information I am enclosing herewith census bulletins showing the earnings of wage-earners by occupation and the earnings and employment of wage-earners for the various census divisions or counties as well as a number of urban centres in Canada. The above statistics are taken from these bulletins.

Yours very truly,
J. L. Forsyth,
Statistician.

So that hon. members may see these bulletins, I am holding them up in my hand. I think this will serve as a basis upon which to do our future thinking.

We shall have more discussion along these lines by and by.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

OLD AGE PENSIONS

AGE AND INCOME REQUIREMENTS—PROPOSED INCREASE IN AMOUNTS PAYABLE

The house resumed from Wednesday, October 3, consideration of the motion of Mr. MacInnis:

That, in the opinion of this house, the time has arrived when consideration should be given to amending the Old Age Pension Act by lowering the pensionable age to sixty years, by increasing the amount of the pension so as to enable the recipients to live in health and self-respect, and by deleting the income requirements for eligibility.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to-night to speak to this resolution, but my colleague who was to resume the debate to-night has been unavoidably detained and so I am going to say a few words in support of the resolution pending his arrival.

The resolution speaks for itself. The time has come when in the interests not only of humanity but of our whole economic structure the old age pension should be raised so that people who have approached the eventide of life may be able to live in comfort and decency. I do not think anyone in this house will contend to-day that an old age pension of $30 a month even at the age of seventy is sufficient in the kind of economy in which we are living. From time to time figures are produced by the bureau of statistics to show that more than twice that amount is required to meet the bare necessities of living in this country; and to expect our people to live at a rate of $30 a month or $1 a day is, I think, altogether wrong at this time. We have just concluded a great war, and our industrial equipment is now many times as large as it was before the war. We are now engaged in reconverting war industry to peace-time needs. Hence it is right not only to maintain but to extend the purchasing power of the people in order that they may buy the goods which can be manufactured with our largely improved machinery and skills.

This afternoon we were discussing, for example, the rates of wages that should be paid in industry. One could discuss in the same vein the prices which must be paid for agricultural products in order that the producer might have his purchasing power largely increased. And now here in the old age pensioners we have a group of citizens getting on in years who should be retiring at sixty and enjoying the rest of their days, but who are now at seventy kept at a level far below that of a decent subsistence. Hence we believe that every consideration should be given by the government to this resolution.

There should be no means test. The means test can be readily eliminated, and if the pension is paid to all those who attain a certain age, then through our income tax structure the amount in excess of what is needed to maintain the standard of living to which the individual has been more or less used can be withdrawn by taxation as not being required to maintain the standards to which I have referred.

We therefore believe that the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis) in moving this resolution has placed before the house something which deserves the support of every member on all sides of this chamber. I do not intend to say more except that I am, of course, in thorough accord with the resolution, which I hope will be recommended to the government for its consideration and early action.

Mr. J. A. BRADETTE (Cochrane): Mr. Speaker, before I proceed with my remarks on the resolution, I wish first of all to compliment you, as I did when you received your appointment, upon your elevation to the

Speakership of the House of Commons. In extending my congratulations to you in my letter I stated that I fully realized you were thoroughly qualified to hold the position. Also I told you that I was hoping that I might get the position myself. This was an absolutely legitimate hope, I think in view of my experience as Deputy Speaker and as one of the old-time members of the House of Commons. I am now, I believe, the senior Liberal member for the province of Ontario, and, like you, I myself have come up the hard way fighting every inch of the way to make my mark in the section of Ontario where I went as a pioneer nearly forty-five years ago. It was a hard thing to see the prize escape my grasp. However, we must take these things in our stride. I know that the position of Speaker is in absolutely capable and responsible hands, and I am sure that you will enjoy the cooperation of every section of the House of Commons, just as I did in the two years that I was Deputy Speaker of the house.

I should like to take this first opportunity I have had of speaking to this body and thanking every member of the House of Commons from 1943 to the last general election for the wonderful cooperation that I received from every hon. member.

It is not necessary for me to say that I am in agreement with the resolution which has been brought forward by the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis). It must strike particularly the new members of parliament when they see what we call private members' day function in this House of Commons. It is practically the only opportunity open to every private member during the session to give expression to his sentiments and to bring forcefully before the house the matters in which he and his constituents are interested. I vividly recollect when I was first elected member of the House of Commons. I sat in the farther corner of the house and for three or four days I listened to the debate on the speech from the throne and was puzzling why there was so much deliberation. At first it seemed futile. But after a few days it dawned upon me that I was hearing the voice of the maritimes, the voice of central Canada, Quebec and Ontario, the voice of the prairie provinces and of British Columbia. Here I heard discussed all the problems of every part of Canada, and I should like to say to the premiers of the different provinces in the Canadian confederation: Do not worry too much over provincial prerogatives and initiative because every federal member of the House of Commons is primarily a municipalist, then a provincialist, and then a federalist. So that there are all the necessary safeguards so far as provincial government activities and autonomy are concerned.

No one has ever doubted the sincerity of the mover of the resolution now before us. I for one during my first years of association with the hon. member for Vancouver East in parliament and in committees was inclined to be a little impatient with him. Of course, I shall never be a socialist. But after I had had an opportunity of sitting with the hon. member for Vancouver East and listening to him from time to time I was convinced of his sincerity of purpose, just as I was when he made his presentation the other day in moving this resolution.

If the Chair wanted to rigidly follow the rules of the house the resolution might have been held to be out of order, because the subject of old age pensions is on the agenda of the next dominion-provincial conference. However, I believe it was a fine thing to allow the discussion of old age pensions by every section of the house. The hon. member, in speaking of finance, said he did not know very much about it, and I believe he remarked that he was not well informed on problems of money. But he said also, in the statistics he gave the house, that to implement the scheme contemplated in his resolution would mean the expenditure of $800 million. That is interesting, for the party to which he belongs is definitely opposed to either inflation or deflation. They will never allow anything which in their opinion would inflate or deflate the earnings of the workers and farmers of this country. When I make that statement I have in mind a resolution which I believe was brought forward a year or two ago by the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Wright), who was worrying about what would happen to the bonds belonging to the Canadian people, fearing that they might lose some of their value. We had a good discussion. I know that as far as the house was concerned there was no demagogy about it.

But I could go farther on the same lines if I wanted to. To this resolution I could present an amendment asking, for instance, that old age pensions be paid to people at fifty or fifty-five years of age, and that they should receive $75 or $100 a month. But we must remain within the limits of realism. After all, here we are in the federal forum looking after the affairs of this country, and this should be done in a national way. I believe that without exception every hon. member is progressive-minded. We fully realize that the days of the common man have

been ushered in, and that there will be no retreat. The New Deal spirit must carry on. It is absolutely impossible to reverse our direction, and nobody would want it. At the same time in our discussions we must keep away from demagogy, for eventually the people will analyse and pass judgment upon our actions.

As I have said, it would be easy for me this evening to go much farther than the hon. member for Vancouver East, but I do not belive it would be fair to my constituents, to parliament, or to the country. Let me refer to one statement he made which I do not fully understand. In quoting statistics of persons of certain age groups he said that there were 610,000 employed, the remainder being nearly 700,000, and he created the impression that these latter were unemployed. I well remember a few years ago that an hon. member, when speaking on a matter of that kind, made the statement, relating to one phase of modern life, that every farmer should have at least two wives. As far as I was concerned as a single man, I was highly scandalized, but when I came to analyse his statement I thought there was some realism about it. In any event, to my mind the hon. member for Vancouver East created the impression that nearly 700,000 of these people were unemployed. It occurs to me that probably these people, or most of them, were unemployable. They may have been housewives or engaged in some similar occupation. Therefore the statistics he gave did not entirely convince me. When we discuss matters of this kind we must see the whole picture; we must survey the entire social programme of parliament; otherwise our judgments may be unfair. It is very easy, for instance, to single out and emphasize one item. Take health insurance: the implementing of that reform must be considered in relation to other reforms; you cannot single out one and leave the others out of account. Therefore I say that I have been pleased at the nature of the deliberation which has taken place so far upon this matter. We cannot afford to be backward; we are now going forward. I was greatly pleased at the fine cooperation which was shown last summer at the dominion-provincial conference between the federal administration and the premiers of the nine provinces. There were no "poor relations" there; we were all Canadians; all seemed to be equal. I hope as an Ontarian that the premier of the banner province will find it possible to maintain the same constructive attitude all the way through. The same should apply to Quebec and British Columbia, and, indeed, to all the provinces. They are in the same position as far as this country nationally is concerned as Canada is in the international sphere. If people are suffering in Europe, if there is a depressed Asia, one feels no sense of security. The same applies to Canada; if some sections of this country are prosperous while others are depressed we shall not have unity and prosperity. I must give the highest praise to the premier of every province for the fine spirit of cooperation which was shown last summer when they met in Ottawa to discuss dominion-provincial questions. I hope most sincerely that that spirit will be maintained one hundred per cent. We come from different provinces, but there is one great unifying power, which is Canada, our only country.

I wish to touch briefly on pensions and insurance, and I should like the house to make a clear distinction between the two. As far as I am concerned I shall always be in favour of pensions for the blind, the invalids, the infirm, and the veterans. On the other hand there are those who in my opinion are not entitled to pensions. During the last election I told the people of my constituency that I was in favour of a scheme of old age insurance whereby a person who reached the age of nineteen or twenty-one should pay a nominal sum per month—for example, eight or ten or twelve cents—and that he would receive at the age of sixty or sixty-five the sum of $50 a month. I believe that is the best approach as far as old age pension is concerned. I do not believe in hand-outs to people who are able to look after themselves. Under the present system I have seen many injustices. How glad I was when I heard that under the new scheme, which I believe will be accepted by all the provinces, because it will be paid for out of the federal treasury, the sum of $30 a month will be paid without a means test. That, in my opinion, is a step in the right direction. I have never favoured the means test, because I believe it created many injustices to people who had a small nest-egg.

It is often contended at the present time that the government should be the mother and father and protector of the Canadian people. I still believe in individualism. I still think people should try to work for themselves. I repeat that for the moment there is no better scheme than the old age pension, but I hope the day is not far distant when there will be inaugurated a fine scheme of old age insurance. The thing is possible. We

are going to adopt health insurance, and I know of no person in Canada who expects to receive health benefits without paying a certain amount for them.

After all, the government cannot accomplish miracles. I should not like to be in the position of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) at the present time. He is in a different position from that of the hon. member for Vancouver East, who in speaking on his resolution said he was not worried because the cost of old age pensions under his scheme would be $800 million. While sitting as chairman of a committee of the house, I tabulated the requests made one evening on the different government departments, and they made a total of $2,300 million—in one night alone! It is easy to make demands on governments, but one must cut his sail according to his cloth. We all sympathize with the Minister of Finance, for we know that, although he would like to implement all the logical requests which are made to the treasury, it is absolutely impossible for him to do so.

I do not believe in decrying my own country, nor do I think it behooves any member of parliament to speak in large terms of other countries and to suggest that they are better off than we are. We shall always have problems to solve but they can be solved and we should not be ashamed of our country. Far from it, we should be proud of our achievements not only during the war but in peace time. We must look forward, and our actions should be guided in one direction, namely, to work for the common man, to see that no one suffers and that everyone is given a chance to make a full, prosperous and comfortable living.

We have been forward-looking in all our legislation. Take the old province of Ontario, for example. In this province we have the mothers' allowance, which was a progressive piece of legislation, whereby a maximum of $80 a month has been paid to widowed mothers; and now we have family allowances. No one will say that this legislation is beyond criticism. I will not say to-night that the family allowance provisions are absolutely perfect, but the measure has certainly been a marvellous thing for our people. I can assure you, sir, that many people in my section of the country, farmers, settlers who have worked hard all summer trying to put in a crop under difficult climatic conditions, have found the family allowance a blessing. It will enable them to remain the year round on their farms, so that they can look after their stock. I believe it has been a blessing.

I have made a special study of the manner in which the family allowance has been handled and the distribution of the money, and I can say that out of 100 cases I do not know of a single instance in which the parents, mother or father, will fail to husband every last dollar of that money. And for what purpose? To provide better food and clothing and in many cases better education for their children. On that score alone, I believe that this parliament, which was unanimous in the passing of that great social reform, should be complimented.

I repeat, a great deal of credit should be given the hon. member for Vancouver East for introducing this resolution, and those hon. members who have spoken on the subject also deserve our congratulations. At the same time, we must remain realistic. When I say that, I have in mind what has taken place in other countries, and let me say here that I do not intend to digress into a discussion of the political situation anywhere else. But during the election in Great Britain I received the London *Times* and there I read that the parties in opposition were making great promises. I am not worrying, of course, but I know the promises then made by one party in opposition, to-day the Socialist government, will not be implemented. They will not be able to carry out all the things they promised the British people. Only a few days ago they intimated that the coal situation will be no better than it was a year ago.

In other words, the moment you are harnessed with the responsibility of government you find what a sobering effect that responsibility has. I have been told by some gentlemen, married friends of mine, that before they got married they made fine promises to their brides-to-be. They were going to provide a grand piano, a fine house, a fine car, and so on. But the moment they got married they discovered that it could not be done because they had not the means. The same applies to governments. Governments would like to comply with the various requests that are made of them, but that is absolutely impossible.

Even to-day, now that we have peace, we shall have a budget of $4 billion, which will be raised in this way: $2,500 million by way of taxation and $1,500 million through borrowing. No matter what we say about gearing our financial structure to take care of our peace requirements as we did for war purposes, it will not be possible. However, I have never taken a disproportionate view of the so-called depression and I am puzzled sometimes by the socialist party when they bring up that topic. They had no infallible

remedy for the depression from 1930 to 1939. They had no formula by which to bring about better conditions. The then Prime Minister of Canada may have made mistakes, but he tried to do his best. But what was the spectacle we saw in the great republic to the south of us? Could they solve the depression there? Could the people in Europe solve the depression over there? No, because all the great nations were caught in it. However, we have learned some lessons, and for my part I will never tolerate a depression of the same depth and breadth as that which we had twelve years ago. I do not think it is fair for the socialist party on every single occasion to talk about the depression. One would think it was their wish that we should have another depression. Experience has shown, and the progressiveness of parliament gives us some reassurance in this regard, that we shall never have another depression such as we had before. It is unthinkable that we should have had a bath of blood, so to speak, slaughter for the last six years throughout the world, only to end in that way.

Personally, I think it is my duty as a member of parliament to go to my people and tell them to sacrifice in a matter of meat rationing, to make other sacrifices, short of bloodshed, comparable with those which they made during the war, so that we may be able to solve the problems of peace. But I will not make any appeal to their passions.

This afternoon I listened attentively to the debate and I thought it was on a high level. No one can doubt the sincerity of the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis) when he speaks on labour matters. At the same time I believe that every other member of parliament has at heart as much as he has, the welfare of our workers and of our farmers as well. The same remarks apply to the question now before the house.

Before concluding, may I express the hope that when the premiers of the different provinces come here again they will be imbued with the same spirit of unity, the same spirit of Canadianism that animated them this summer. Old age pensions must be discussed again and the legislation perhaps amended. Perhaps the monthly payment should be higher. At the same time we must be practical and logical. I fervently hope that health insurance will be implemented in every section of Canada because we are all united on that question. I hope also that the deputations, every time they speak, will think of the country as a whole and not of their own individual interests. If they do, it will be all the easier for me to inspire my own people. I could go to the people in the lumbering section of my constituency and say, "You do not have enough butter or sufficient sugar or meat". but it is not my duty to do so and I do not believe that other hon. members wish to do that.

I hope that Ontario, Quebec and British Columbia, the provinces which are supposed to be more privileged than the others by reason of geographical, industrial and financial considerations, will think of the country as a whole and not merely of their own particular localities. Although I am a Liberal I wish to pay tribute to Mr. George Drew, Premier of Ontario, for the fine spirit he showed at the conference, and also to Mr. Duplessis. I am not talking politics; I am speaking as a Canadian, and he realized that the whole is greater than any of its parts. He realized that we must work in unison if we are to reach our goal of nationhood and prosperity and comfort for every citizen of Canada.

Mr. RALPH MAYBANK (Winnipeg South Centre): I say at the outset that I have a feeling of much sadness for my hon. friend (Mr. Bradette) who has just concluded such a fine speech. I had not known until to-night that it was anything more than just ordinary bad luck that had caused him to remain single. I now understand from what he has said that the real fact is that he did not get married because of his own intellectual honesty; he could not bring himself to make those vast pre-marital promises which resulted in success for nearly all of the hon. members of this house. I should like to say to him that even yet he may succeed, and he need not be concerned about such promises, because, as every married man comes to find out, he does not really become successful by those lies that he tells. He finds out, after somewhere between two, ten or maybe fifteen years, that he was not believed anyway. Underneath her breath the lady is probably always saying, you are lying, I know, but it is pleasant. No real attention is paid to the lies; therefore, if the hon. gentleman still desires to get married he can just let himself go and make any promise he likes; it will not be held against him at all.

In speaking on this subject, Mr. Speaker, for just a few minutes may I say that there are two or three remarks which have been made in the course of this debate and in similar debates to which I should like to address myself. People say, what we can

do in wartime, we can do in peace time. That is unquestionably true. I could never understand why there had to be so much emphasis put upon that statement as though there were some chance of argument in it, as though it were not self-evident. It seems to me it is self-evident that what you can do in war time you can do in peace time. It does, however, require certain conditions to be the same; it requires a psychological condition to be the same as in war time; it requires the very general agreement in the country that you have under the urge of patriotism.

One then has to examine just how it is that certain things have been done in war time, and just what will be necessary to be done in peace time in order to carry on in substantially the same way, that is, in the way of raising and spending money. If we disregard, for example, the method of producing money by printing it or by some other such means and decide that we are talking about the raising of money for the payment of social services in the same way we have hitherto done, then all that is necessary in order to pay the bill which is asked for in the resolution is to continue the same level of taxation that we have now, the same regimentation that we have now, and all that sort of thing.

Substantially what happened in 1939 and the years afterwards is something like this. In 1939 the Minister of Finance, speaking for the Canadian people, said, We will arrange that all people in the country who are working will work a little less for themselves, out of every hour's earnings a certain part will be used for the purpose of being handed to the Minister of Defence and the Minister of Munitions; they will take it and give it to other people who will do certain things to earn it. I recall that the first sum of money about which the Minister of Finance talked in that way was $100 million. It was not very long before it was also arranged that in addition to any contribution made by the people of Canada in that manner they would dig under their mattresses and would find money, purchasing power as it is sometimes called, and they would hand that over to the Minister of Finance in order that he might, in turn, pass it on to the other spending ministers, to be used by them in the manner that I have indicated. It was not very long after that before the Minister of Finance, in the name of the Canadian people, made a similar request, the only difference being that the second or third time he spoke he was not talking about any dribs and drabs and jots and tittles like $100 million; he went far beyond that. By this time it was not the case that a person had to work about one-twenty-fifth of his time for the purpose of supplying spending money to the Minister of Munitions and the defence ministers; it had reached the point in the case of the wealthy people where the contribution was half-time at least, and in the case of the less wealthy a somewhat lower proportion, but in the case of all a very considerable percentage of their time was to be devoted to raising the wherewithal for the spending ministers of the government to spend in the name of the Canadian people.

Substantially that is the way the money has been obtained. There is no question about that. There is no magic about it. It just meant that kind of hard work for all of the Canadian people; therefore, it is absolutely correct to say that what has been done in war time can be done in peace time, granted the will to do it. But you must have among the Canadian people an equal willingness to do this that you had under the urge of patriotism in war.

The hon. member who has just taken his seat spoke two or three times about the need of being realistic. Surely, Mr. Speaker, if we ask ourselves whether the Canadian people, any section of them, will be willing to continue to work that amount of time for the purpose of supplying spending money to the ministers of this government who will be charged with the distribution of such moneys as are dealt with in this resolution, we are bound to come to a negative answer. All across the country and in all classes of society at the present time there is a demand for the lowering of taxation. I do not know what the Minister of Finance is going to do on Friday, but it is perfectly certain we can say now, that large sections of the public will not be satisfied with the reductions in taxation which he will make. That dissatisfaction we shall find in the farming community; we shall find it in the section of the public which is made up of what we commonly call the white-collar workers; we shall find it among those to whom we sometimes refer as manual workers; we shall find it among those who are well to do, and we shall find it in the wealthy classes. There is no doubt in the world that the public of Canada will not continue to pay the taxation that they have been paying.

Such being the case, is it being realistic; is it cutting the coat according to the cloth when demands amounting to something between $700,000,000 and $850,000,000 are made in a resolution of this kind? I do not know the right figure; sometimes I have heard $700,000,000 and sometimes $850,000,000, but when one gets into figures as nearly astro-

nomical as those probably it does not make any difference. In order to demonstrate that people will not continue to pay these taxes, no matter if the taxes are imposed, it is only necessary to look at what has already happened. Many men will not go to work on Saturday mornings because it does not pay them. Plenty of my friends have told me they do not see any sense in going to work on Saturday morning because they get such a very small amount of money for it. I have known men in the professional class who have refused certain commissions which were brought to them because their fee would be hardly worth while, since they were in an income bracket in which too large a percentage went, as they would say, to Mr. Ilsley. That sort of thing, to defeat taxation, grows apace once it gets started; and if people will do that, certainly they will much more easily defeat the loans which will be necessary for some time in order to carry on the business of the country. Apparently we have made up our minds that we shall carry on what is called deficit financing for a certain length of time; I do not know how long. We shall be raising considerable sums of money by taxation and endeavouring to raise further considerable sums by loans. Well, if people will not continue to pay taxes, much more strongly can it be asserted that they will not contribute to loans to keep up expenditures unless these expenditures are favourably viewed by one hundred per cent of the people, and there is nothing like that unanimity behind a proposition such as this. In the prosecution of a war which we could all say was indeed a war for liberty and, as the Prime Minister so frequently remarked, a crusade of righteousness, you could get unanimity, but that is not the case with a social measure of this kind. To go farther than the people of the country would desire at any given time is only to endanger other things.

Mr. BURTON: If the hon. gentleman will permit a question, is he of opinion that any great number of people in Canada would oppose giving the aged people a pension such as that suggested in the resolution?

Mr. MAYBANK: Unfortunately I did not get all the question, but I think I have the sense of it. I believe my hon. friend asked if I was of opinion that any considerable number of people would oppose giving a larger pension and giving it to people at the age of sixty without any means test, as set forth in the resolution. Oh, yes, I am very strongly of that opinion. I have had many letters from people saying, "I am sixty years of age, Maybank, and by gad I don't need any pension; I don't think it is necessary yet." I have had that told me by a good many people, and I have had a great number of people write and say that unless taxes were reduced there just would not be any government in this country at all. I wonder that some of the writers who are penning these letters to me do not burn the paper with their words. I could not think of reading their letters in this house, because I am quite sure I should be ruled out for using blasphemous language. That is my opinion, at any rate; of course if I am wrong about that there is a way of finding out.

My remarks come down to this. At the present time I do not think this is a feasible proposition in the light of the present taxation; in the light of the attitude of most of the people in reference to taxation; in the light of the fact that a large social welfare programme is already envisaged which will involve the expenditure of a large sum of money, and in view of the fact that this proposal is non-contributory. That last remark leads me to say this. I am very much in favour of any kind of scheme that will be contributory. There are some features of the proposals which have been brought before the dominion-provincial conference which I do not like. The outstanding improvement that has been suggested is the payment to everybody after the age of seventy, although I think that age is too great, and the payment of the pension from sixty-five to seventy years on somewhat the present basis. The matter of divided responsibility is a feature I do not like, but I feel that no person can deny that the present proposal of the government is an improvement over the existing practice. At the same time I do not like it as well as I would like some plan purely contributory in nature, something to which my honourable friend who preceded me referred as insurance. It seems to me that old age pension payments constitute the type of social law that lends itself particularly and peculiarly to the insurance principle. I think it would be very much better, even at the present stage of the dominion-provincial conference, if everything could be dropped in favour of a straight insurance proposition. I know there are difficulties in the way. I know, for example, that already some people are under insurance schemes, such as civil servants and people who work on railroads and in a large number of industries. Even so, I believe it would be better to treat this particular branch of our social welfare legislation in a different way and put it under a straight insurance principle, make it an insurance scheme.

Some years ago I read in the *Labour Gazette* that at that time four per cent of our

people were over seventy years of age, and of those four per cent, fifty per cent received the old age pension, which was $240 a year at that time. Just playing with the idea of insurance, I made some mental calculations. Upon the presumption, which would not hold good at all times, that money would yield five per cent interest, I soon realized that the payment of $1 by a child the minute after it was born, if that could be done, would actually provide for its old age pension. I will tell honourable members how it worked out. At five per cent, in fourteen years that $1 would become $2. In another fourteen years it would become $4. By the time that child reached the age of seventy the $1 would become $32. From what I already said we see that one hundred people would pay into the fund. That is $3,200. Of that number, two people would draw pension, and a fund of $1,600 is more than enough for the average old age pension of $240 after the age of seventy.

I mention that only to illustrate what can be done. I do not claim complete accuracy in that example, but I mention it for this reason. It shows what can be done under a contributory scheme, as against this other type of old age pension.

Hon. members from the other side of the house have said that what I am really doing is simply taking up time, and their suggestion is that I am talking the case out. I wish to deny as sharply and as emphatically as I can any such allegation. Those hon. members who speak in that way remind me very much of an old deaf and dumb gentleman who was a cooper, and whom I knew at one time. This gentleman used to have arguments and, as mutes must, he expressed himself with his fingers. After he had spoken, if I may use that word, he turned his head away which was the only way he could prevent anyone else from saying anything. He feared an answer.

That, of course, is typical of those hon. members. They do not want anybody else to have a word on any subject which, they think, is their own. Well, of course, such people cannot stop a man from talking quite as easily as the mute could, although I imagine if they wished to they could.

However, there is one thing that cannot be done by the C.C.F. party.

Mr. COLDWELL: One thing?

Mr. MAYBANK: Just one, at the moment, although there are many; they cannot come to the House of Commons and bring along their silencing storm-troopers. They might as well learn that now as at any other time. When any hon. member—and I do not care on which side he sits—undertakes to practice upon me any unfairness in connection with a speech I make he will find out, when he is finished, that it would have been just as well for him not to have started it because, to hold strictly to parliamentary language, it will not be efficacious.

Some have spoken in opposition to the means test. In my opinion it has always been objectionable. I had a good deal to do with it in those days when, because of the circumstances of the post I held, I was forced to administer relief. It is just about as disheartening an experience as anyone can have thrust upon him. Yet we have to admit that in every country where there is an old age pension system, and where it is not contributory, there is a means test.

Again, being realistic, I do not believe it will ever for long be wiped out, while old age pensions are paid out of general taxation. This is another reason, in my opinion, for old age pensions being placed on an insurance principle, and not coming out of general taxation, because, depend upon it, whether you like it or not the time will come, every once in a while, when either the means test will be placed upon people who are receiving from taxation, or the circumstances of payment will be changed, or something of that sort will be done.

I suppose it would be right to say that any such remark as that is made in sadness. But that is the truth of the matter, and those are the facts of human nature. Just as long as pensions are paid out of taxation there will be problems of that sort. And the only way to have pensions paid is, as a matter of right, resulting from insurance. As a matter of fact, the means test in this country is more severe than it is in New Zealand; at least I would think so, from my reading of the law. I realize, of course, that one can never tell for certain, until he actually gets down to administration. But those hon. members who extol New Zealand—it being the most distant country in the world, and therefore the greenest—should remember that down there they first exact an insurance premium from the citizen, and following that they give him the means test. They do both.

But we never hear hon. members say that. First of all, in New Zealand they exact a certain sum of money by way of insurance, part of which goes to old age pensions; and then they pay the old age pension only according to the means test. It is a somewhat more generous means test than the one in this country, but at least it does not come anywhere near giving a free pension to all.

Mr. IRVINE: May I ask a question? Would the hon. member kindly point to that section of the resolution which would preclude the use of a contributory system?

Mr. MAYBANK: The hon. member is quite right, and I thank him for his question, because it leads me to say that this resolution does not preclude the idea of a contributory system. But there is a general principle which most people follow in rhetoric, in logic and, indeed, in law, namely, that when something is not included in the words spoken it is generally thought to have been excluded. Everybody knows that. But, mind you, Mr. Speaker, that must not be taken as final and definite. Evidently the hon. member thinks that from the wording of the resolution a contributory system could be meant. Well, if that is what is meant, then of course I can only say that the mover of the resolution and those various persons who have spoken 100 per cent in favour of it might have been a little more clear. If they had, it would have put the debate on an entirely different plane. Of course there would not be any means test if you were first paying for it. The reference in the resolution to relinquishing means test is in the words which seem to me to preclude any idea of contribution. It would not have occurred to me—perhaps I am just a little dumb—that a person would propound a resolution which would be condemnatory of the means test when, all the time, he had in his mind that a contribution not referred to in the resolution would first be exacted from the beneficiary of the scheme.

I have given the hon. member that much explanation of the reason why I have spoken as though there were to be no contribution. However, that is about as far as I can go at the present time, because I see my time has expired.

SUPPLY

LABOUR CONDITIONS—STRIKE AT FORD MOTOR PLANT, WINDSOR

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Ilsley for committee of supply.

Mr. IRVINE: Mr. Speaker, when the house rose at six o'clock I was about to ask the hon. member who then occupied the floor, the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore) a question. My question is this: During the course of his speech he made a remark to the effect that I had done very well here, but when I went back to Alberta I had done something more or less terrible, which ruled me out. It seems to me that what the hon. member said cast reflection upon my character. I would now ask him if that was what he intended.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Mr. Speaker, I should like to read the words I used with respect to the hon. member, and then make such explanation as will make it clear that there is no reflection upon his personal character. The words were:

> If I remember correctly the hon. member for Cariboo had a rather bad record when he got out to Alberta in 1935. He did most excellent work in the House of Commons; he made some speeches of which any social crediter would be proud, but then when he went to Alberta later he rather spoiled it all. But we will discuss that later on; I think we have the goods on my hon. friend which will be quite sufficient if we have to use them.

I can readily see, Mr. Speaker, that without knowing the background which caused me to use those words, any person casually reading the record would form a wrong opinion of the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Irvine). Therefore it is only fitting that I should offer an explanation that will set the whole matter in its right light.

May I point out that the hon. member for Cariboo—and he will correct me if my memory is in any way at fault—was part of the Ginger group elected in 1921 by Alberta as representatives of the United Farmers of Alberta movement.

Mr. IRVINE: That is correct.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Secondly, he continued as the United Farmers of Alberta representative right down to 1935. That is, he was always U.F.A.

Mr. IRVINE: That is correct.

Mr. BLACKMORE: It might be argued that they ceased to be U.F.A. members and became identified with Mr. Woodsworth in the C.C.F. organization, but I hardly think that is correct.

Mr. IRVINE: Yes, that is true. That was endorsed by the annual convention of the U.F.A.

Mr. BLACKMORE: That automatically made the hon. member a C.C.F. member. That is a matter which has quite an important bearing on what happened in Alberta afterwards. Meanwhile Mr. Aberhart—this is rather old history to some—had been working steadily for about two and a half years popularizing and explaining social credit to the people of Alberta, as a result of all of which the people of Alberta formed what is known as the Alberta Social Credit League. Mr.

Aberhart, after the league had become very strong, offered the Liberals an opportunity of expousing the cause of social credit and they refused to accept it. Then he offered it to the United Farmers of Alberta in convention assembled, and they rejected it. Now, so far as I recall, the hon. member for Cariboo, who was present at that convention, if I recall aright, did not disassociate himself from the U.F.A. convention when it refused to accept social credit.

Mr. MACKENZIE: May I ask Your Honour if this is a question of urgent national importance?

Mr. BLACKMORE: I was not able to catch what my hon. friend said. I think it will be seen to be quite clear under these circumstances that that put the hon. member for Cariboo in a very uncertain light with respect to the social credit movement in Alberta. It is quite obvious that the social credit league would not know just exactly where the hon. member stood.

On April 2, 1935, in the House of Commons the hon. member for Cariboo moved an amendment to the budget amendment, and the following words appear in *Hansard* as identified with the hon. member:

> That the amendment be amended by striking out all the words after the word "Canada" and adding thereto the following:
>
> "and would appear to be based upon the assumption that poverty and debt are inevitable conditions within the country;
>
> and whereas the real and potential wealth of the nation, based upon our natural resources and our capacity to produce, is such as to make possible an abundant provision for all the requirements of our people;
>
> Therefore, this house is of the opinion that the government should take immediate action to insure the fullest and most equitable distribution possible of our socially-created wealth and that, as a first step in this direction, the measures which may be necessary to meet the pressing needs of the farmers and the unemployed should be financed by the social credit of Canada, thus avoiding a further increase in the debt burden of the country."

He went on to say:

> I submit at the outset that that remedy is one which will very soon have to be accepted not only by this government but by all governments in the world. I make that prediction—

Mr. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, our friend of the C.C.F. party moved an amendment on going into supply to discuss a matter of urgent national importance. I do not think a private disagreement between the hon. member for Cariboo and the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore) stands above the dispute at the Ford Motor Company plant. The private dispute between the two hon. members can be aired when we have more leisure. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we get on with the business of the house and discuss the question of urgent national importance which has been raised, namely, the strike at Windsor. I submit that that should take precedence.

Mr. BLACKMORE: The minister has just delayed the house one and a half minutes by his interruption. I would have finished in another fifty words. If I can conclude the quotation it will save the hon. member for Cariboo from rising on a question of privilege to-morrow, which he would have a perfect right to do if I did not put this matter right. He went on to say:

> I make that prediction because in my opinion there is only one alternative to that, and that is to witness the complete collapse of civilization itself.

Now, Mr. Speaker, bearing in mind that the hon. member had supported social credit in the house and then took a stand at the U.F.A. convention refusing to accept social credit, the social credit league could hardly be expected to accept him as a candidate at the election.

An hon. MEMBER: So what!

Mr. P. E. WRIGHT (Melfort): Mr. Speaker, it is not very often that I rise in the house to take part in a labour dispute. I represent, as most hon. members know, an agricultural constituency. But I believe that this particular strike is of vital importance not only to the locality in which it is taking place but to the whole of our Canadian economy.

The strikers at Windsor, as has been said to-day, are coming out fighting for a certain principle, and that principle is that their take-home pay shall not be reduced during the period following this war. The farmers in my part of the country regard this strike as their first line of defence. They are vitally interested in seeing that the take-home pay of the workers in the Ford plant is maintained because they have had a demonstration in this war of what it means to agriculture to have spending power in the hands of the workers of Canada, and any attempt by this government or by private enterprise in Canada to reduce the wages of the worker would have a repercussion on agriculture generally throughout the country. Agriculture recognizes that if the take-home pay of the worker is reduced, it will mean within one year less money for what agriculture has to sell. The farmers will sell less butter, less eggs, less milk, less fruit, and less of all those other farm products which the worker buys. So that agricuture is vitally interested in seeing that the standards of living in Canada are maintained.

Certain people speaking in agricultural communities have tried to create an entirely wrong impression in the farmer's mind with respect to the pay the worker in industry actually receives. Only to-day in the house certain hon. members wanted to know what these automobile workers received per hour. I have heard speakers in country districts say: Yes, workers in the automobile industry receive $1 an hour. Immediately the impression is created in the farmer's mind who works fourteen hours a day: That means $14 a day. The farmer works thirty days in the month, for he has to milk his cows and feed his stock every day, so that he figures that the automobile worker receives thirty times $14, or $420 a month, or about $5,000 a year, and naturally he thinks these fellows are getting fairly well paid. But that is not what happened. Statistics show that the average take-home pay of the workers in the automotive industry before the war was a little better than $1,200 a year. They want to advance that by thirty per cent to have take-home pay of approximately $1,800 a year. Every farmer in Canada realizes that $1,800 a year is not an excessive salary, that it will do no more than permit the average working man to have a reasonable standard of living. Therefore I tell the government that I believe agriculture in this country is behind the workers at this time in their efforts to maintain the rates of pay which they have been receiving during the war, and I think the government will find that out before this is over.

Another point. It is the government that are paying for this strike. If I understand correctly, the Ford Motor Company of Canada have made sufficient profits this year; any further profits would go into the excess profits tax, and the government get over ninety per cent of those additional profits, so that the company are not interested in whether the plant opens or not. But I say that the government should be interested because they are paying for this strike; they are the people who are actually maintaining the Ford Motor Company's position in keeping these people locked out of the plant. The people of Canada, not the Ford Motor Company, are paying for it. I bring that point to the attention of the minister and to the government, so that the people in the country will know what the position is.

I believe that other hon. members representing agricultural districts should rise and express their opinions and what they believe to be the opinions of the people they represent with respect to these strikes. It is a serious situation which we are facing in Canada. It is a serious situation which we are facing on the North American continent. We in this house cannot afford to remain quiet about it.

Mr. E. G. McCULLOUGH (Assiniboia): I rise at this time as a farmer member to add my voice to what our group, including the hon. member who has just taken his seat, has said on this subject. It is our group, the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation group, which has tried to bring before the people the important fact that to-day Canadians are interdependent. To-day they have come to realize that it makes no difference whether you are a worker in industry or a farmer, you are entitled to a decent standard of living. I rise to-day recognizing this truth, that if we are to win the peace we must win this fundamental fight to establish a minimum wage scale in industry.

As a practical farmer I say that farmers recognize that the Canadian industrial worker is our best customer, and we are interested in seeing that he gets a decent wage. Now that the nations of the world have gathered, as they did at Hot Springs, Virginia, and recognized the duty of setting a minimum standard for the world, we as Canadian people have a first and domestic responsibility of establishing that standard for our own people. The leader of our group, the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) asked earlier in the session that $25 a week be set as a floor for wages. That is a very good beginning, but we realize that we must have a wage scale in harmony with the cost of living, and similar treatment in respect of the things which agriculture produces. This is a fight in which all members of the house have to take part. The good things which we can produce in Canada should be made available to the Canadian people. In the past the enemies of the common people, in the form of established big business, tried to divide and rule. To-day we must recognize as a Christian nation the dignity of labour and the right of the people who work to have decent homes and decent conditions of employment.

In conclusion, I will say only this, that two things are necessary, namely, the establishment of unions and the provision of security. As a practical farmer I say that we recognize at this time the need for action on the part of this government.

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): I am sure we have listened with rapt attention to the various points raised by hon. members since early this afternoon. But let me emphasise that important principle, first things first. The hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Wright) has said that this dispute was over the question of

take-home pay. That is not the case; the dispute is over the closed shop, maintenance of membership, and check-off. Let us be frank about that.

Mr. GILLIS: Not closed shop.

Mr. MITCHELL: Just a minute. The hon. member had his say this afternoon.

Mr. GILLIS: The minister is not correct when he says they are asking for the closed shop.

Mr. MITCHELL: I am telling hon. members what they asked for. The hon. member can call it "union shop" or "closed shop".

Mr. GILLIS: There is quite a difference.

Mr. MITCHELL: Oh no, there is not. You and I know that. We are talking the same kind of language.

Mr. GILLIS: The rest of them may not understand.

Mr. MITCHELL: Wait a minute. I did not interrupt the hon. member this afternoon. May I remind him that the kind of language he used to-day, when used in Great Britain in 1926, created a condition from which British trade unionists have not fully recovered to this day. It took people with their feet on the ground to bring things back, although slowly, from the condition to which they fell after the general strike to the position which they held, as a result of much struggle, prior to that strike.

My hon. friend talks of war. Any fool can talk of war; that is a simple thing to do. My hon. friend used language to this effect, that "we are not going back to 1939". Who suggested that we were?

Mr. GILLIS: The Ford Motor Company.

Mr. MITCHELL: Just a minute. Who suggested that the people of this nation, whether they be farmers or industrial workers, are being asked to go back to 1939? Let us be rational and sensible in discussing this subject. I hold no brief for the Ford company; they are quite capable of taking care of themselves; but all the angels are not on one side. If my hon. friend by good luck or bad management should ever sit where I am sitting at the moment—

An hon. MEMBER: It might be bad management.

Another hon. MEMBER: On your part.

Mr. MITCHELL: My hon. friend knows something about bad management. As a minister of the crown, one must try to be fair. I have no objection to my hon. friend swinging completely to the left. This is still a free country. The right to express opinions is with us almost an article of religion. It is rather nice to know that to-morrow morning, after my hon. friend has made a speech such as he made this afternoon, when there is a knock at the door it will be the milkman and not an agent of the gestapo.

I repeat that all the angels are not on one side. All the employers in Canada are not grinding down the workers. There are many good employers in this country. Many employers need education in industrial relations, and there are many trade union leaders who, it may be said, need some education in industrial relations.

My mind goes back to the railroad organizations of this country which have had agreements with their employees almost uninterruptedly, with some slight exceptions, for the last fifty years. Take the paper industry and many others in this dominion. Why should the hon. member for Cape Breton South rise in his place and blame all employers as he did, or why should someone more to the right blame all the trade unions? The hon. member this afternoon said something about being suckers in this war.

Mr. GILLIS: Right.

Mr. MITCHELL: I do not believe that. I do not believe that anyone, whether he be on the extreme left—and my hon. friend will understand what I am talking about when I speak of the extreme left—or on the extreme right really thinks he can push back the growth of the trade union organization. If he does he is fooling himself. It is like trying to push back the ocean. My hon. friend knows something about the agitation from the extreme left—leave out the right—in the trade union organization of the country. May I say this to the hon. gentleman as a democrat and, I believe, a sincere democrat: Moving as we are in these troublesome times, let us hang on to the only advance that man has made since the dawn of history, and that is the right to express himself and be a free man.

My hon. friend talks of union security. He and I, and some others with less knowledge of the fundamentals of the movement, have discussed the question, and I will say without fear of successful contradiction that this government has done more for social progress in the life of this nation than any government since confederation.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MITCHELL: I remember the hungry thirties. That is all right.

Mr. ROWE: You did not want to go behind 1939 a few minutes ago and now you are going to 1930.

Mr. MITCHELL: But there is this to be said. There is a conflict in basic thinking, but the fact remains that this government set in motion a labour code wherein for the first time in the history of the nation the right of trade unions to organize by law was made effective. My hon. friends talk about union security. Well, the next step is trade union negotiations shall to all intents and purposes be fashioned and consumated on the floor of this House of Commons.

Mr. GILLIS: No, no.

Mr. MITCHELL: My hon. friend says, "No, no", but I am reading into his language, which I have a perfect right to do—

Mr. GILLIS: I did not say that.

Mr. MITCHELL: —the implication which is there. What is the position that we are in at the moment? My hon. friends, for political reasons—and that is quite an honest reason, notwithstanding opinions to the contrary—feel that governments should by law collect the union dues. In my day and in my hon. friend's day, we always felt that to make a good trade unionist you brought him back to the union hall; that is where trade unionists were made. But the new idea today is that the government should by law insist that men shall belong to a particular organization and shall pay their dues into that organization by law. That is the effect of the suggestions made by my hon. friends.

Mr. GILLIS: You get your income tax in that way; what is wrong with getting union dues that way?

Mr. MITCHELL: I do not need to tell my hon. friend that there are four dominant labour organizations in this country, and on the basis of pure, practical administration, any government that sets out to collect dues by law is going to get into trouble.

Mr. GILLIS: No, no.

Mr. MITCHELL: I go deeper than that. We have just had a war predicated on the belief that the human being as a spark of the divine and that freedom is fundamental. You have to carry the question to its logical conclusion. This might be said truthfully, that prior to the outbreak of the last war, in 1914, the most powerful trade union movement in the world, numerically, was the German trade union movement. What happened in that country? May I say to my good Conservative friends that business went to the state, trade unions went to the state, insurance went to the state, banks went to the state; and when Hitler came along these people thought they were free individuals, whereas actually they were servants of the state. And what happened? It is a matter of history that when he got his fingers on the ammunition he said, "This is the way you are going or else", and within twenty-four hours there was a dictatorship supplanting democracy in Germany and no trade unions. To use the simple language of the man in the street, any fool can govern the country with a bayonet in his hand as long as he does not stick it into himself. That is simple.

An hon. MEMBER: Or his fist.

Mr. MITCHELL: Yes, or his fist. My hon. friends are always talking about taking over industry. What they want to do is to accomplish socialism by the instrumentality of the trade union organization.

Mr. COLDWELL: Who said so?

Mr. MITCHELL: I am taking the implication. My hon. friend the member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) says, "Who said so?" That is what good solid German socialists all said, "Who said so?" When they got to the end of the road and saw what the implication of their sentimentality really meant they wound up with Hitler.

Mr. COLDWELL: They wound up in concentration camps under Hitler.

Mr. MITCHELL: I saw that, too. I was in Germany when the revolution happened and that is why I am so sincere about this. Therefore I say this to my hon. friends. Just as the destiny of a nation or a civilization swings backwards and forwards as regularly as the pendulum of the clock hanging over this House of Commons, so political thought swings likewise. If, my hon. friends, were in power for one session, the reflection of their attitude toward the nation would be in the opposite direction the same as it was in Germany, where you had the development of a powerful communist party which reflected itself in the Hitler movement.

Mr. COLDWELL: You are not mixing us up with the communist party, surely?

Mr. MITCHELL: I am talking about the swing of the pendulum. My hon. friends are so clever that they do not see much farther than the next election. What I am pointing out to my hon. friends is this. Things move along from one stage to another until freedom has disappeared—freedom as we understand it.

I am going to go briefly over the steps that led to this dispute, and I speak quite sincerely and without bias toward one side or the other. I do not think all the faults are on one side. I do not believe that in any dispute, whether family, industrial or business dispute, the faults are all on one side. One hon. member in the opposition said to-day that this dispute had been in existence for seventeen months—

Mr. GILLIS: Right.

Mr. MITCHELL: —that it had been pushed around for seventeen months. That is hardly fair. We have used the best negotiators and conciliators there are in this dominion to compose the dispute. The basic policy of the government made possible the organization of the men who work in the Ford plant and Chrysler and General Motors at Oshawa and Windsor. We went through all the machinery that was established, machinery that has been approved by the trades union organizations of this country, machinery that is administered equally by the workers and the employers in industry, with a judge or minister of labour as chairman of the respective boards. We sent Mr. Justice Richards, I think it is fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Justice Richards is one of the ablest conciliators in the dominion. We sent him into the dispute in Windsor; he was unsuccessful.

A board of conciliation was established within twenty-four hours under the chairmanship of Mr. Justice O'Connor, another able conciliator from Edmonton, in an effort to pull the dispute out of the fire. What was the finding of that board? The majority finding was for a check-off, a limited check-off, it is true. They discarded the closed shop idea. I think, if my memory serves me correctly, Mr. Speaker, even the representative of the employees did not approve the arguments put forward in that dispute for the closed shop. I think that representative's name was Bora Laskin.

These are the words of Mr. Justice O'Connor, the chairman of the board:

> We are none of us prepared to recommend a provision for a union shop but the chairman and Mr. Laskin are prepared to recommend that the parties agree to a voluntary check-off irrevocable during the term of the contract as a solution of the present difficulty.

May I go a step farther and say this also. This is a tribute paid by the chairman of that board to the departments of labour in the dominion and in the province of Ontario:

> We also wish to record our belief that you, sir, the Minister of Labour of Canada, as well as the ministers of labour of Ontario from time to time have exhausted every possible governmental effort to compromise the differences between the parties and to keep the vital Ford plant in operation.

This is the decision or the recommendation arrived at freely by the impartial tribunal set up by the Department of Labour of the Dominion of Canada. Let me say this freely and frankly. I think the hon. member for Calgary West, if my memory serves me rightly—I may be mistaken in this—talked about what was being done in the United States. In the United States the contracts are arrived at freely, without basic law behind them. In the United States there is no law to say that you must have a closed shop, the check-off, or whatever the case may be, neither is there in Great Britain.

Mr. GILLIS: There is in the United States.

Mr. MITCHELL: There is not.

Mr. GILLIS: Read the Wagner act.

Mr. MITCHELL: The Wagner act does not have anything to do with the writing of the contract.

Mr. GILLIS: Certainly not; nobody suggested it.

Mr. MITCHELL: I know whereof I speak. I am frank to admit that in Saskatchewan there is an act, but they have not any industry there, so it does not mean anything.

Mr. GILLIS: There is in the United States.

Mr. MITCHELL: It is the easiest thing to do—

Mr. WRIGHT: That is because we had a labour government for thirty years.

Mr. MITCHELL: It is an easy thing to write an act of parliament for propaganda purposes. It is not true of the United States; neither is it true of Great Britain.

Mr. GILLIS: It is in the United States.

Mr. MITCHELL: I know my hon. friend must have the last word. I say it is not; he says it is. That is the position we are in to-day. I wish to say this very frankly and with all the sincerity of which I am capable.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): May I say it was not I who said that.

Mr. MITCHELL: I am sorry; I said I was speaking from memory. I thought it was my hon. friend.

An agreement is based on the principles of conciliation, give and take, because after all a trade union agreement is based on character and understanding between the parties to a

dispute; and any lasting collective agreement, whether it be in Canada, in the United States, in Great Britain or in any other free, democratic country is predicated upon that vital principle.

Mr. GILLIS: Nobody argued otherwise.

Mr. MITCHELL: My hon. friends are arguing the other way.

Mr. GILLIS: No, they do not.

Mr. MITCHELL: Yes, you are.

Mr. GILLIS: Your memory is bad to-night.

Mr. MITCHELL: If both sides are willing to meet together with myself and the acting minister of labour of Ontario I am prepared, as I say, to go to Toronto to-morrow morning or to some other city in an effort to pull this dispute out of the fire, as the trade unionists say. And I think my hon. friends have to give us credit for sincerity in that regard.

It is the easiest thing in the world to stand up in this deliberative assembly and say some of the things that have been said here this afternoon. Frankly, I believe one is playing with the destiny of the nation at this time when he does that kind of thing. I have seen it happen before. It happened in Great Britain. I saw it happen in Canada in 1919. We must have a degree of industrial statesmanship on both sides in this country, with all the give and take that one gets in industrial relations.

Some of my hon. friends seem to be pleased —they exhibited a kind of satanic humour this afternoon—with the idea that probably the packing houses will go on strike.

Mr. COLDWELL: Come now.

Mr. MITCHELL: They say, there is going to be a strike in the packing-house industry.

Mr. COLDWELL: Now.

Mr. MITCHELL: Somebody says they are hoping for it. I believe that that dispute can be settled, provided that there is the right approach from both sides, from the labour side and from the employer side. I do not think it is beyond the wit of man to compose any kind of dispute; but if you go in defeated, if you go into an industrial dispute with a negative attitude I do not think there is any possible chance of arriving at a satisfactory agreement on one side or the other.

May I say also that we have built up in this country machinery of a kind that is the equal of any other machinery in the world. I believe it is in the best interests of the trade unions and of the employers' organizations to use that machinery, and not to challenge its soundness prior to any discussions taking place.

[Mr. Mitchell.]

It has just been said that the mine workers of Alberta and British Columbia are going back to work. Nine thousand of them are going back to-morrow. That was done through the normal processes of collective bargaining. As I said this afternoon, many things might be said by myself or by some other member of this house, the import of which may be entirely different on the scene of the dispute from what it is here in the political atmosphere of the House of Commons.

I discussed this Alberta-British Columbia situation with my good friend Angus Morrison and with other officers of the organization, along with the Acting Prime Minister (Mr. Ilsley), with the result that the miners are going back to work. I believe that the Ford dispute can be composed with good will. I think I have said this before in the House of Commons. I refer now to both sides of an industrial dispute. You cannot call a man a scoundrel to-day and expect him to sit down with you to-morrow morning. I remember giving this advice—like the hon. member for Calgary West—to, I will not say which side of the dispute in Windsor. I said: "If you must say something derogatory about a person"—that was not the language I used; trade unionists do not use that kind of language, but that was the import of it—"in this dispute, for goodness' sake, say it about me; do not say it about those with whom you are dealing because you have to sit down and make an agreement. I have no objections." They could not say worse about me than they have already said.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Mr. Campbell said they were lawbreakers, criminals.

Mr. MITCHELL: That is what I had in mind.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): He should not have said that.

Mr. MITCHELL: I do not think he should, either. Whether we like it or not, this dispute at the Ford plant must come to an end. I suppose I have sat as chairman on more industrial disputes than any other man in Canada. I am convinced that if men of good will, irrespective of what their demands may be, will apply the old principles of conciliation and display willingness to trust the other fellow, we can have longstanding agreement develop in the course of time in the automobile industry of this country.

As I said this afternoon, there is a limit to what governments can do under our way of life, under the principles of freedom. The Minister of Labour, whether provincial or

federal, cannot sit down and take part in every dispute in this country. The machinery established has set up a medium for the compromise of difficulties; but in this dispute I am prepared, as I have stated already, to join with any men of good will to bring about an agreement in the difficulty in the city of Windsor. The question of wages has been discussed, and I could go into that at great length. Mention has been made of take-home pay, and all the things that are under discussion at the moment. Let us ever remember that the wealth of the nation is dependent upon the unit of production of the individual, whether he belong to management or labour. What is the problem of the automobile industry? It is the easiest thing in the world to draw up resolutions; all you need is a piece of paper and a pen or pencil. But what they have to do in that industry is build a car that the ordinary individual earning from $30 to $50 a week can buy. If they do that, there will be work; if they do not, there will not. It may be argued that people earning from $30 to $50 a week should not have automobiles, but they do, and that is the back-bone of that industry.

In this period of reconversion, with our free economy and under democratic institutions, I believe the unions and the employers must sit down and size up the economics of their industry and, if I may use crude language, see how much the traffic will bear, both sides having in mind the well-being of the nation as a whole. I believe that with the development of industrial councils we have done a great deal in the last few years. I am free to admit that this is a matter of slow and steady growth, but we can move out of this difficult period and build a nation of which every man, woman and child, whether coming from the farm or from industry, will be proud. Mine is a difficult portfolio to administer. I am not asking for any sympathy, although I would like some advice if any hon. members have the answers to these problems. But I ask hon. members at least to give us a chance in this very trying field of industrial negotiation, so that we may move ahead and make a worth-while contribution to the life of our time.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): In his reply, Mr. Speaker, I think the minister has missed the main point at issue. This afternoon the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis) spoke many times of bringing the parties together and negotiating an agreement. From the length of time this strike has been in progress it is obvious that all the usual methods of bringing the two parties together have failed. We are suggesting that the time has arrived when the government should do what under similar circumstances it has done already, in the case of the American Can company, and what was done only recently in the United States: put in a controller, carry on the business for the time being, and bring the two parties together to negotiate an agreement which so far as possible will be agreeable to both parties.

That is our suggestion. This is not a political issue. We have not raised this question because it is a political issue. We are going to raise every issue of this description whether or not we are accused of playing politics, because we believe that upon the welfare of the workers and farmers of this country and the returns they receive for their labour or their produce the future welfare of all the Canadian people ultimately depends; and we are sent here to see that these groups get a square deal. It is all very well to talk about conciliation and good will, but my hon. friend the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) forgets that behind this dispute there are many years of difficulty. He forgets that Henry Ford was the last of the great employers on the north American continent to recognize the right of the worker to organize; and only when this war became a reality and production was urgently required was Henry Ford forced to come through and negotiate with a trade union. I do not think any of us will forget that on Labour day in 1939, I think it was, a parade of union men was held in the city of Detroit. Among them was a group of men who wore masks; and they did so because they were employees of Henry Ford. They carried a banner, I am told, which read, "Next year our masks will be off."

Free men? The Minister of Labour talks about free men. What freedom did Henry Ford allow in his plants? What freedom to organize was there? Hitler? Let us not forget that Henry Ford's interests in Germany and the interests of some of our other great North American concerns, including General Motors' Opel, we now know contributed heavily to the campaign of Adolf Hitler. That has been revealed by the records which have been found in Germany by the United States army. Let us not forget this when we hear Hitler's name bandied about this chamber. As my hon. friend knows, the German labour men were not the men who built up Hitler; nor did the German socialists. The socialists were the people, with Jews and others, who went to concentration camps. They were the people who were cremated, gassed, executed. To-day few of them are left. The people who fattened under Hitler were bad employers,

who tried to destroy the trade unions and the cooperatives and the people's movements in Germany. The minister cannot deny that.

Mr. MITCHELL: How about the communists?

Mr. COLDWELL: What?

Mr. MITCHELL: How about the communists? I was there when the revolution occurred.

Mr. COLDWELL: I am not talking about the communists. I am talking about the socialists and the trade unionists. We will leave the communists out of the picture; the hon. member for Cartier (Mr. Rose) can speak for the communists. I am not speaking for them. I am speaking for the trade unions, the anti-nazi democratic socialists of Germany, if you will, and of Great Britain and other portions of the British commonwealth. The sooner we recognize that there is a great gulf between organizations which are democratic and socialist and those which believe in different methods, the sooner we shall get down to a decent discussion in this chamber.

Mr. McGARRY: Might I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. COLDWELL: Certainly.

Mr. McGARRY: If the socialists obtained power in Canada would there be any labour unions?

Mr. COLDWELL: My hon. friend asks if there would be any trade unions in Canada if the socialists obtained power. Are there any trade unions in Great Britain, where the socialists are in power? Are there any trade unions in New Zealand, where the socialists have been in power for ten years? My hon. friend should do a little reading; then he would know the answer to that question without asking.

Mr. McGARRY: I am just asking whether we would have any trade unions in Canada if the socialists obtained power?

Mr. COLDWELL: Why would the socialists in Canada be any different from the socialists in other countries?

Mr. McGARRY: Did they have any trade unions in Italy?

Mr. COLDWELL: Italy was a fascist state. My hon. friend had better do some reading. So let us keep these facts in mind when these matters are bandied across the floor of the House of Commons.

The Minister of Labour suggested that there was no difference between a union shop and a closed shop. He knows better than that. A closed shop requires that before a man obtains a job in a plant he must pass through a union, and be O.K.-ed by it. A union shop is one where a man can be freely employed by an employer, but he joins the union afterwards. They are two different things entirely. In one case the union approves the staff; in the other case the management chooses the staff. That is the fundamental difference between the closed shop and the union shop.

Mr. GARDINER: Which are you in favour of?

Mr. COLDWELL: I am in favour of the closed shop; because I believe, in spite of what the minister said about free men, that any man who takes the benefits paid for by his fellow workers ought to be compelled to contribute to the benefits which his fellow workers bring to all of them. If it is in a union shop—

Mr. GARDINER: Then you are in favour of a principle whereby a man cannot get a job unless he belongs to the union.

Mr. COLDWELL: I say that any man who takes the benefit obtained by his fellow workers ought to be a member of a union.

Mr. GARDINER: Answer the question.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is to say—and I am putting it in the minister's own words—that a man who expects to get a job ought to be a member of his union. That is clear.

Mr. GARDINER: Then you are in favour of the check-off?

Mr. COLDWELL: I am in favour of the check-off, yes. In fact my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner), who is questioning me, and his party, before or just after he left Saskatchewan—and I am not sure whether he was premier, or whether it was his successor—put into effect in that province compulsory membership in the teaching profession. And for years the government of which he was the head amended acts so that the medical profession, the legal profession and other professions in that province had closed shops. That was under my hon. friend's administration in Saskatchewan. So that what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

Mr. TUCKER: I rise to a point of order. A misstatement has been made. The hon. member, the leader of the C.C.F., has made the statement that lawyers are a closed shop.

Mr. COLDWELL: So they are.

Mr. TUCKER: I say that any person who is willing to take the training and write the examinations may enter the legal profession; and the organization cannot keep them out.

Mr. COLDWELL: My hon. friend is shouting, and I heard distinctly what he said. He has said that any lawyer who can pass the examinations may enter the legal profession. I think if he comes from Ontario that is so, provided that he can pay the fee of $1,500. I think that is correct.

But let me say this, that any worker who can take his apprenticeship and qualify in his trade or profession can join his trade union if he pays his initiation fees. I ask you: What is the difference?

Mr. GARDINER: I was just asking for information.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is what happened to every such person in Saskatchewan in the higher professions, under my hon. friend's friends.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): One question. I wonder if the hon. member has not confused the situation. He says that a person who gets a job in business should first belong to a union. I do not know that he meant to go that far. Does he mean, in short, that the union hires the people whom the boss pays?

Mr. COLDWELL: I say—

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): That is a closed shop.

Mr. COLDWELL: I say it is exactly the same as the legal profession.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): No, it is quite different.

Mr. COLDWELL: I know you lawyers will not admit it.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): We belong to the oldest union, but we are not a closed shop.

Mr. COLDWELL: The oldest union and the strongest union in the world.

Mr. TUCKER: But not a closed shop.

Mr. COLDWELL: And that means the most effective closed shop in the world. Yet you deny to the working class what you take for yourselves, and what you demand for yourselves.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Would the hon. member please answer the question? We would say that I am an employer and you have a union. But I may have a union shop, and may hire a man for a thirty-day or sixty-day period. The man may not be fit for the job. That is the kind of shop I would favour, one where I could fire him if I chose, if he is not suited for the job. I agree that if he stayed a length of time he must belong to the union. But surely my hon. friend would not want that man to join the union before the employer knows whether he is any good on the job.

Mr. COLDWELL: I think a man who joins a union has behind him the references he has obtained from qualifying and working in the particular field in which he has engaged.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. COLDWELL: Oh, well, there is another roar from the other side. But let me say this to the hon. member who has asked a perfectly straightforward, honest and fair question, that I believe it is in the interests of the workers of this country that when a man enters a plant and takes a job as a member of a trade or a craft, he ought, before he joins and before he takes that job as a competent workman, to belong to his union. That would be, in effect, a closed shop.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): In many plants they will not take a man until he can do the job.

Mr. COLDWELL: He could not become a member of a union until he could do the job; quite right.

Mr. ROWE: You have never hired many, have you?

Mr. COLDWELL: Probably I have hired as many craftsmen as my hon friend has.

Mr. ROWE: I do not think so.

Mr. COLDWELL: I mentioned craftsmen.

Mr. ROWE: Politicians, probably.

Mr. COLDWELL: Perhaps I have not taken as much out of the skins of some of the workers as have some of my hon. friends.

Mr. ROWE: And never put as much into them, either.

Mr. COLDWELL: No, nor into my own skin.

Mr. ROWE: Never got much into you, either.

Mr. COLDWELL: The Minister of Labour has said that freedom is fundamental. Yes, freedom is fundamental; but not freedom to injure one's fellows.

Mr. MITCHELL: I never suggested that.

Mr. COLDWELL: The basis of all law is the limitation of freedom to do harm to one's fellow man. And so far as this strike

at Windsor is concerned, I say it is in the interests of Canada as a whole that it be brought to a conclusion.

On several occasions the Minister of Labour has said that he is not the only minister involved. To-night's issue of the Ottawa *Journal* reports a press conference given by the premier of Ontario to-day. What does he say?

> Primary responsibility for the handling of the strike at the Ford Motor Company of Canada plant at Windsor rests with the dominion government, Premier Drew stated here to-day during a press conference.
>
> War-time orders in council passed by the dominion government with regard to wages and other matters in the field of Canadian labour had not been altered or revoked, so it was therefore the responsibility of the dominion government to deal with the Windsor strike situation, he said. The provinces had no jurisdiction in this field.

There we have the view of the premier of Ontario. I urge upon the minister to take action, in view of what has happened recently, namely, the calling of the new strike in the power plant. We are told in the press—and I do not know how correct this is—that it will take from three to four weeks after an agreement is reached to turn on the power again, and to put that plant into operation. Every day that goes by just adds that much more to the time.

Is it not time that the Minister of Labour stepped into this situation? I say it is, and I am pleading with him to-night to do just that. If necessary—and I believe it is necessary—he should put a controller in the plant. Bring the two sides together so that they may negotiate an agreement; for as the hon. member for Cape Breton South said this afternoon, this is the first of the big peace-time disputes. We do not want these disputes. We have enough difficulty now in connection with demobilization and reconversion. We have enough difficulty in keeping the economy operating, without the addition of strikes. I take it that it is in the interests of everybody in the country that the matter be settled, and I am urging the minister to get busy and, instead of bandying words around the house, give us a little action.

Mr. D. F. BROWN (Essex West): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended taking part in this debate, but since the subject is the city of Windsor and since I represent the constituency of Essex West, which comprises chiefly the city of Windsor, I think it is only proper that I should say something on its behalf. I am prompted to do so by an editorial which appeared in the Windsor *Daily Star* on Thursday, October 4, which reads in part as follows:

> This country needs propaganda, providing it is of the right sort. We have suffered seriously for the lack of it, while other nations have been making wise and effective use of this instrument. We would do well to follow their example, and there seems to be some hope that we shall now do that.

There has been considerable discussion this afternoon and evening from schoolteachers and ministers and farmers from Nova Scotia, British Columbia, Saskatchewan and other provinces, so that I think we can safely say that this is not just a matter of concern to the city of Windsor but one of national import, and I think that, as such, it is about time, since we now have heard from all the so-called specialists in the opposition, that we should hear from the patient before the operation is performed.

We have heard a great deal from the opposition of the hungry thirties, of the lack of housing—all thinking in a negative way. I believe that the time has come for less oratory from the opposition especially, and a little more action.

Mr. PROBE: From the government.

Mr. BROWN: I gather from the speakers who have taken part in this debate, aside from the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell), who has done such an excellent job, that they are not as much interested in the patient as they are in expounding their own views and theories. But this is a serious matter. It is a matter of national import. The property rights, the living conditions and the welfare of eleven million people are involved, and anyone who is trying to make political capital out of the Ford strike at Windsor is a traitor to his country.

The principles in this strike go deeper than appear on the surface. After all, democracy was not intended for efficiency. In a democratic state the individual is supreme; in a socialistic state the state is supreme and the individual is merely the tool of the state.

There was a statement made about the city of Windsor by one hon. member. I do not think he intended a slight upon the city or upon its inhabitants when he said that certain things were being done by the stupid people of Windsor. I do not think he intended his remark as a slight. But I want to raise my voice on behalf of the ordinary people, the common people of the city of Windsor. As hon. members know, the city of Windsor has contributed probably more in this war than any other city in the Dominion of Canada. I mean by that more by way of manufactured

goods, trucks, cars, tanks, chemicals, guns, foodstuffs, and besides all that, we have contributed in man-power. I think, too, it is only proper at this time I should pay a tribute to one other who has given his life on behalf of this country. I refer to the Hon. Norman A. McLarty, because it was through his trials and tribulations during his term as minister of labour that his health gave out but he carried on on behalf of his country until we now pay our respects to his memory.

The workers of the city of Windsor are just ordinary people, and as such they have common sense. As I have said, they are ordinary people, and I would ask anybody else in the Dominion of Canada if they are not ordinary people, too, because I think we are all on just about the same level. The people of Windsor are not wanting anything unusual. All they want is an opportunity to help themselves, an opportunity to educate their children and to raise their families, to clothe and feed and raise them properly. Yes, all they want is an opportunity to worship in the manner which they desire. So that their desires are no different from those of any other citizens of the Dominion of Canada.

I feel that the Ford company have many worth-while qualities. They have done things that are desirable. The union has done things that are desirable. The Department of Labour, to my knowledge, has done everything that is possible. While what appears on the surface does not indicate all that has been done by the Department of Labour, it is to my own knowledge that they have done a great deal, in keeping with democratic rights. I would urge upon the government to follow the suggestion that has been made. There are surely some common interests; and while talking sometimes gets us into trouble, on the other hand we shall never have any negotiations started or completed until after some discussion. I feel that the company and the union can be brought together at the instigation of the Department of Labour or some other body or individual and find out those things that are common, if they are honest and sincere, and I know that they are. If that is done I have no doubt that a common basis will be reached from which to work out a solution of this trouble.

Make no mistake. The people of Windsor are the stability of the city. They are not going to do anything that will bring discredit to the Dominion of Canada. It will be found when the smoke of battle has cleared away that Windsor is still one of the great industrial centres of the Dominion of Canada. We have all the facilities necessary to great industry; we have great industries and the people to work them; we shall have, I hope, conditions of labour which not only will bring unexcelled success and advancement to industry, but will bring labour the fulfilment of its quest for happiness and contentment.

Hon. PAUL MARTIN (Secretary of State): I am sure that no one is more concerned about the matter under discussion than is the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell). I know something of what the Minister of Labour during the last three weeks has been seeking to do, and I say to this house, and particularly to the hon. gentleman who introduced this discussion, as one who has spent all his life in the trade union movement, from my contacts —and they have been daily—in this matter, the Minister of Labour has at heart no less than any other man in this chamber or outside it, the welfare of the workers of this country.

This problem is not peculiar to Canada. In the period of transition which is facing the world one reads of industrial unrest, of strikes, of differences between management and labour in countries where labour governments are in office, and it will not serve the cause of industrial peace in this country to enter upon a discussion of this important matter in the spirit of the suggestion that this government alone is faced with these tremendous responsibilities. One has only to take up the morning paper to find that a government composed of men like Ernest Bevin have on their doorstep, for one reason or another, this very problem.

This problem interests me deeply because, I think I can say without fear of contradiction from any group, that no one has stood up here in the last ten years and championed more vigourously and diligently than I have done the rights of the workers. To-night I say with all sincerity, knowing that my own community, my own fellow citizens, are involved, whose welfare I have at heart, that I am deeply conscious of the importance of the implications of this matter. The hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis) paid tribute to the work of the hon. member for Essex West (Mr. Brown) and myself in this matter, and I may say that the Minister of Labour, who is so fully seized with this great problem, in connection with which at this very moment important matters are being considered, is not in the interests of the solution itself free to make full disclosure of what is being attempted. Over the week-end I myself was a party to discussions between the union and certain groups representing the management, in an effort to bring this matter to a solution, and I have refrained thus far from taking part in the debate only lest anything be said which would interfere

with the things which the Minister of Labour —as ultimately will be revealed to his everlasting credit—has been doing in the interests of the workers to try to bring about a solution.

I regret that the temper of the discussion in some instances, although, I know, unwittingly, has not been calculated to help forward what is being attempted.

The Ford Motor Company is one of the important companies in this country. I am free to say that over the period of the years its policy of industrial relations has not been such as to make easy the task of any minister of labour. Mention has been made to-day of the wages paid by the company. Hon. gentlemen who do not live in industrial districts, particularly in the automobile centres, are apt to be misled by figures of the daily wages paid to workers in the automobile industry. As one who has worked in this plant, as one who lives in the community where the automobile industry operates, I say one should not be carried away by the level of annual wages paid in these plants. The fact is that, because of the mass production basis on which the automobile plants operate, over a period of time men working in these plants have found themselves employed for as little as six months in the year, and when one calculates a total annual wage on that basis it is insignificantly low, and can no longer be justified in a country like Canada.

But that is not a matter alone for a government. Industries have some responsibility in this connection, and constantly to try to put the blame upon those whose every effort is directed to improve the situation is not, in my opinion, the highest type of statesmanship.

These industries will have to learn that they cannot treat their workers as bits of steel lying on the cement floor of the plant. Of that there can be no doubt. The automobile industry, like other large concerns, will have to realize their social responsibilities to the men in their plants. That has been enunciated, in my judgment, in no more effective way than by the right hon. gentleman who leads this group on your right, Mr. Speaker. His pronouncements and those of his ministers from time to time have indicated that industry has a growing responsibility in this connection. If industry would preserve its integrity, then industry, particularly the automotive industry, must realize its responsibilities to its men.

It is not fair to say that this government is oblivious to this situation. The Minister of Labour was fully justified in saying that no government in this country and no government in the world since the advent of war has done more than the present administration to bring about an increase in legislation which benefits the workers. Take family allowances, for example. I well remember joining with the present Minister of National Health (Mr. Claxton) and the hon. member for Cape Breton South in urging upon the house the adoption of this measure, so that in times like these we are discussing, and in a situation such as the one before us, the dependents of the workers would not be reduced to complete want. That was one of the reasons for that legislation; and while hon. members may criticize the amount of unemployment insurance benefits, the fact is that if we have to-day a fund of $300 million to cushion the shock of unemployment, it is the result of legislation brought into this house by this government.

The government believes in the right of labour to organize. The Minister of Labour, I thought, succinctly stated that to-night, and he warned any group which sought to interfere with the right of organization that it was making a tremendous error. I am afraid I should say this, as a member from the Windsor district, that there have been public pronouncements of certain important individuals in the particular plant involved in the dispute which would occasion the suspicion, at any rate, of an attempt to break the union. The Minister of Labour was quite clear on that point to-night. He said that you could not shove back the hands of time, or words to that effect. Any company that tries to break the union will find that it cannot succeed in ultimate terms. It may succeed for the moment, but if it does it will bring tremendous discredit upon itself and it cannot and will not succeed.

We believe that trade union organizations are a good thing. We believe that they are a good thing not only for themselves but for Canada, and I was particularly happy to hear what the Minister of Labour said to-night in connection with their continued growth. No, Mr. Speaker; this dispute, serious as it is, is not without being fully appraised and considered by the Minister of Labour and his department, with whom I have been in daily touch in this matter. Knowing of his intentions, knowing of everything he is trying to do, I simply want to say this. I do not want to say anything that will render his task more difficult than it is. He has stated in a broad way his belief in the right of the union to exist, in the desirability of its existence, and he has made an appeal to both parties to recognize their common interest. The time

is near at hand when they must sit across the table and he is prepared to sit in with them to help.

The hon. member for Calgary West, in, I thought, his helpful contribution to-day described that very thing. It is because I know of what the Minister of Labour has done that I suggest to the house that everything, perhaps not seemingly in the eyes of those who do not know the full picture, but everything in terms of ultimate benefits to both union and management, is, in my judgment, being done by the Minister of Labour, and I thank him for his consideration and his effort on behalf of the people so many of whom I represent in this house to-night. I say to the company; I say to the management; I say to the union, let us all recognize that in these difficult days we have a common responsibility. Let nothing be done or said that will interfere with the effort to solve this particular dispute. Let the management realize its responsibility. Let it realize that by taking the union into its confidence, in the pursuit of what the Minister of Labour mentioned to-night, the industrial council idea and the democratization of industry, no one will lose by that kind of trust.

These parties, for reasons which I know, but which I think I should not mention at this stage, have engendered suspicion and hate which is not shared alone by the men working in that plant. That must go. It must disappear, and a basis of mutual confidence and good faith in one another must be restored in that plant and in others so that they can get down to work on a democratic basis, not only in the interests of the company but in the interests of the men. I believe that in working for the interests of the men the interests of all are involved.

We are faced with a situation wherein we are trying to reconcile a difficult dispute. The discussion to-day reveals that on all sides of the house, no particular group has any monopoly of interest in the welfare of the workers or in the interests of settling this dispute. There is a common recognition that good faith must be restored between the parties and that at the earliest moment steps must be taken consistent with our ability to effect a final solution between the parties involved.

Knowing the difficulties, and particularly in the light of my experience over this very week-end, I believe that objective is being approached as well as, under the circumstances and having in mind the interests of everyone, that can be done. This discussion has served one purpose, namely, to bring the matter into bold relief. It has served to confirm once again, through the Minister of Labour, the merit of trade union organization and the desirability of the management understanding this and realizing the dire consequences, otherwise, not only for itself but for our country.

Perhaps this will not be the last discussion we shall have on matters like this, but I say to all groups in this house, no matter what our political parties may be, that there is an obligation, in the discussion of these matters, to give an example to those who find themselves involved in this dispute. It is in that frame of mind that I have entered into this discussion, and once again I affirm my belief in the right of trade union organization, and I urge the management to do everything it can to see that the purposes, the noble purposes, of the trade union effort are not needlessly disintegrated.

Mr. D. A. CROLL (Spadina): I had not intended originally to enter this debate. The house has devoted almost the whole day to speaking about my neighbours and my friends, and in fact speaking about many who were my comrades in the last five or six years, and I think it is just as well that the house should know that these men are neither dupes nor tools, nor are they stupid. For just a minute we can turn the eyes of reason rather than emotion in that direction.

I think the strike is an economic contest coolly planned and conducted as though it were a horse trade or a transaction on St. James street. The hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis) said that the issue was the grievance procedure; the minister on the other hand says that the issue is union security. Odd as it may be, they are, I believe, both right. The negotiations actually broke down on grievance procedure. They might have broken down on anything if the parties did not have good will and wanted them to break down as they did in this case. Actually the union wanted union security. In so far as I am concerned, in so far as my own personal position is concerned, if it interests the house, they know very well where I stand, and I have stood there for a very long time. I am not only a believer but a supporter of union security. But what the house has lost sight of, I think—and this is no fault of the Department of Labour, because they have provided the machinery—is that for seventeen months the negotiations have been bedevilled by hearings and boards and lawyers and politicians, or would-be politicians, with the result that the animosities have now become the ruling factor and everybody has lost sight of the principle involved and of the poor people

who are now walking the streets. The animosities have become so deep, so bitter and so unrelenting between the company and the men that any conference table that will have any chance of success now must have new faces in new places.

The hon. member said that it was a matter of grievance procedure that upset the applecart; well, it might have been anything. I have lived with this problem longer than any other hon. member. I have lived with it for many years, and it has always been a struggle for these men. It has been a very long struggle and there have been many casualties, but they have all been on one side.

If we have done anything at all here today we have certainly indicated that we are not complacent about it; we certainly do not intend to sit it out. What we need at this particular time is to get at the root of the trouble and provide some leadership. The whole country is watching. What are we to do with the Ford strike? This will be a precedent; it will be the formula.

I was gratified to hear the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) say that his approach was conciliation and peace. That is everyone's approach; but we must make sure that it does not get down to the point where it becomes a knock-'em-down and a drag-'em-out contest. Then it becomes too late. I do not think it is suggested from this side of the house or from any side of the house that we should dictate at this time to either one party or the other. But I do think that under P.C. 4020 the minister possesses authority to summon either Mr. Campbell or the union leaders.

Let the responsibility be with those who do not appear at the summons of the minister, and the people of this country will judge, and judge only too well. All that we can ask here to-day is that they be called together that they be put into a room. Let them decide; let them talk it out. Mr. Bevin, Mr. Molotov and Mr. Byrnes are having their troubles too. They are going back to try to talk it out to see what happens. These are not the only troubles in the world. We have to give them a chance.

It seems to me that the minister has been trying to do it. He is a better judge of what should be done than those of us who sit outside; but the danger is just this, and we must face up to it. If we do not give leadership at this particular time men who have different ideologies and men who have direct tactics may take over, in which case it may be too late. It is our duty in this house to see that these instincts are channelled through democratic purposes; then we can feel safe.

I was gratified to sit in this house and to hear from all sides the kind of talk that would at least tell some industrialists in this country that if they have the bugler ready to blow taps on trade unionism they had better fire that bugler because trade unionism is here to stay. So far as I am concerned I cannot picture this country without a strong and responsible trade union movement. I can well remember, and the house can well remember, that in any fascist country the trade union movement fell first, and when we liberated the countries they rose first. They are the very core of democracy and we must preserve them.

I say again we are not asking the minister to take sides: it would not be fair at this time. But the minister has prerogatives. The minister can exercise his good office in order to get these people together for the purpose of talking out their problem. That problem can and must be talked out so that these people can get back to work again.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee of supply, Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

Mr. ILSLEY moved:

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding $29,769,000.11, being one-twelfth of the amount of each of the several items to be voted, as set forth in the estimates for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1946, laid before the House of Commons at the present session of parliament, be granted to His Majesty, on account, for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1946.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in.

WAYS AND MEANS

INTERIM SUPPLY

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee of ways and means.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

Mr. ILSLEY: I move:

Resolved, that towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1946, the sum of $29,769,000.11 be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Ilsley thereupon

moved for leave to introduce bill No. 17, for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending 31st March, 1946.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first and second times and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

On section 1—Short title.

Mr. BRACKEN: Might I ask the Minister of Finance if this bill is in exactly the same form as the last interim supply bill?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman; it is in exactly the same form.

Mr. BRACKEN: Then there is no need to have any discussion. We support the bill.

Section agreed to.

Sections 2 and 3 agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

WAR AND DEMOBILIZATION

PROVISION FOR APPROPRIATION OF $1,365,000,000 FOR WAR PURPOSES, DEMOBILIZATION, PROMOTION OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY, ETC.

The house resumed from Friday, October 5, consideration in committee of a resolution to grant to His Majesty certain sums of money for the carrying out of measures deemed necessary or advisable in consequence of the war—Mr. Ilsley—Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE FOR NAVAL SERVICES

Hon. D. C. ABBOTT (Minister of National Defence for Naval Services): Mr. Chairman, a week ago when I had almost completed my opening statement with respect to the naval estimates I had just finished telling the committee that it was expected the main fleet bases on the east and west coasts would be maintained, but that most of the smaller bases would be closed. Continuing where I left off, may I add that it is hoped to continue the naval divisions throughout the country. These establishments have been most valuable assets during the war and it is believed that they can prove their worth during peace.

Our establishments abroad are to be in large measure closed down. H.M.C.S. *Niobe*, the manning and training station near the Clyde in Scotland will be closed, probably before the end of the present fiscal year and the property returned to its owners. The training base at Bermuda called Somers Isles is now being closed. In Newfoundland, our facilities are being reduced to care and maintenance or are being closed as the need dictates.

During the war the Royal Canadian Navy maintained a division for operational research. The principal members of this group were four physicists, two astrophysicists, and two mathematicians. The group was generally directed by Doctor J. H. L. Johnstone, O.B.E., and Doctor G. H. Henderson, O.B.E., both professors of physics at Dalhousie university. A close liaison was maintained with the national research council, and with the research organizations at the admiralty and in the United States navy. The section was not large but the work done was helpful. While it may be difficult to continue naval scientific research on an extensive scale during peace time, it will be generally agreed, I think, that the service should keep itself abreast of developments in the field and that an adequate organization and facilities for that purpose must be maintained.

I think perhaps I should now give the committee some precise figures on the operation of the convoy system, particularly in the north Atlantic during the war years. This was the theatre of war in which the Canadian navy played its greatest part. From 1939 until the end of May, 1945, the Canadian navy convoyed 25,859 ships eastward and 16,823 westward. The deadweight tonnage carried by these ships to the United Kingdom was 235,104,856. Of the more than forty-two thousand ships convoyed by the R.C.N., only 438 were sunk by enemy action. The greatest number of sinkings took place in 1942 when 149 merchant ships in the R.C.N. convoys were lost. In the years 1940 and 1941 ships to the number of seventy-five each year were lost. In 1943, 125 were lost. By 1944, the German U-boat threat had been mastered and the merchant ship losses in R.C.N. convoys in that year fell to the rather insignificant figure of seven.

In addition to these transatlantic convoys, the R.C.N. ran twenty-one sets of coastal convoys on our eastern seaboard in the gulf and River St. Lawrence, to Newfoundland and to some U.S. ports. The total number of merchant ships thus protected in these coastal convoys was 18,898. That record of operations is one of which Canadians may well take pride.

A word now as to the future. While, as is the case in the other services, final determination as to just what our naval establishment should be in the post-war period cannot yet be

made, and will be influenced to a large extent by the nature of our obligations under world or regional security arrangements, it is possible to state with some accuracy what our establishment will probably be.

During the war our naval role was primarily that of escort duty, carried out by lighter ships, few of which would be suitable for permanent peace-time operation, and in fact the role which it was contemplated we would play in the Pacific war was of a different character to that performed in the Atlantic and required the use of other types of ships.

It is now proposed that at the outset Canada's peace-time navy should comprise two cruisers, probably two light fleet carriers, ten to twelve destroyers, and the necessary ancillary craft, all of these of the latest and most modern type, while in reserve and for training purposes, we will continue to hold a certain number of frigates. Such an establishment will require a force of about 10,000 officers and men.

I have another announcement to make which should be of interest to the members of the naval forces who have served in the second world war. As the committee knows, there have been three varieties of stripes in the Canadian naval service—the broad straight stripes of the permanent force, the curly stripes of the Royal Canadian Naval Reserve, and the wavy stripes of the R.C.N.V.R.

It is now proposed that, in addition to the permanent force, there shall be a single reserve force known as the "Royal Canadian Navy Reserve". This force will comprise all reserves, including reserve air personnel as well as personnel of the university naval training divisions. A set of regulations will cover the reserve R.C.N. The uniform will be similar in all respects to that worn by the members of the permanent force, and for the time being, the total authorized strength of the reserve will be 18,000, exclusive of those on the retired list. In due course further announcements will be made with respect to its organization. It is unlikely, however, that it will be possible to complete this until demobilization has been further advanced.

I cannot conclude my remarks without making some reference to the Royal Canadian Sea Cadets. Many of these lads graduated from the corps into the Royal Canadian Navy during the war. From reports which have been made by officers of various ships in which these ex-sea cadets served it is clear that the training they received while in the corps was of great advantage to them in carrying out their duties. There are today between fourteen and fifteen thousand sea cadets and officers in the ninety-three corps distributed throughout Canada, and the naval service will continue to extend its full co-operation to the effort being made to keep the corps up to strength.

I am grateful to the Navy League of Canada for its sponsorship of the corps throughout the dominion, and as naval minister I take some satisfaction in the part the naval service itself has played in the training of sea cadets and in the encouragement of the development of the corps by naval officers across the country. This supervision and encouragement will be continued in peace time for it is not only expected that the Royal Canadian Navy continue in the future as it has in the past to obtain recruits from the corps, but we also realize that the training received by the boys in that corps helps to make them better Canadian citizens.

In the course of the debate a little over a week ago a number of speeches were made. I would refer particularly, however, to the helpful and constructive speech of the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green). He made some suggestions, and at this time I would refer to two of them in particular.

One suggestion was that the statement with respect to the three defence services should be made at the same time in order that the committee might have the over-all picture. The same suggestion has been made by other hon. members, and there is much to commend it.

So far as my own two departments are concerned I should like to have been able to accept the suggestion; however, it was not feasible at this session. As hon. members will realize, a large part of the estimates relate to past expenditures, and expenditures which carry over from the war period. I feel sure, however, that in future sessions that procedure should be followed, and I can see that it would be particularly helpful in considering the future—although not the past—of the three armed services.

I believe I could help to meet the wishes of the committee in this way. My colleague, the Minister of National Defence for Air (Mr. Gibson) has given his statement, and I have now completed my statement with respect to the navy. Circumstances permitting, I would be ready to make a similar statement with respect to the army on Thursday, let us say, and the committee could then decide which set of detailed estimates it might wish to consider first.

Mr. GREEN: It would be helpful if the minister could do that.

Mr. ABBOTT: So far as I am concerned, I shall be prepared to make my army statement on Thursday. We know, of course, that sometimes matters come up which must take precedence. However, I shall be ready to speak with respect to the army on Thursday.

The second suggestion made by the hon. member for Vancouver South was that a special committee should be set up to look into defence matters.

Mr. GREEN: A standing committee.

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes. May I say that personally I would welcome the establishment of such a committee, because I believe it could perform a useful service. The discussion and consideration of defence matters in my view should not be the subject of party strife, and I believe a committee of that sort could perform a useful purpose. I would hasten to say, however, that I feel it would not be feasible to set up such a committee at this session, one which is of a rather special nature. While I cannot commit the government as to policy, yet I would recommend personally that such a committee be established at the next session, when I have no doubt we shall not be quite so pressed for time as, I am afraid, we shall be at this session. That is all I have to say in my statement with respect to the navy, except that it has been customary to place upon *Hansard* the names of those who have been given operational honours and awards.

Since I last made my report in April there have been 283 such honours and awards, and with the permission of the committee I should like to place those names upon *Hansard*. They are as follows:

O.B.E.—3

Dolmage, Wilfred Gordon,
Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N.V.R.,
#107-3660-S-Cambie St.,
Vancouver, B.C.,
3 July, 1945.

Freeland, Harry, D.S.O.,
Acting Cdr., R.C.N.R.,
217 Weymouth St.,
Charlottetown, P.E.I.,
14 June, 1945.

McLarnon, Alexander McAllister,
Acting Cdr., R.C.N.R.,
Apt. 5, Scottfield Road,
Allston, Mass., U.S.A.,
14 June, 1945.

M.B.E.—8

Chenoweth, Richard Cassils,
Acting Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N.V.R.,
3 Redpath Row, Redpath St.,
Montreal, P.Q.,
14 June, 1945.

Cormack, David,
Commissioned Engineer, R.C.N.R.,
179 Kane Ave.,
Toronto, Ont.
14 June, 1945.

Dunnett, Charles William,
Elect. Lieut. (R), R.C.N.V.R.,
North Talbot Road, Box 23,
Roseland, Ont.,
7 August, 1945.

Hickey, Lester Alton,
Acting Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N.R.,
58 Hawthorne St.,
Dartmouth, N.S.,
14 June, 1945.

McIsaac, Wilfred,
Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N.V.R.,
51 Villa Ave.,
Charlottetown, P.E.I.,
14 June, 1945.

Mighton, Albert Kenneth,
Surgeon Lieut., R.C.N.V.R.,
286 Main W., Apt. 1,
Hamilton, Ont.,
26 June, 1945.

Pennie, Duff Morrison,
Warrant Engineer, R.C.N.,
Roblin, Man.,
14 June, 1945.

Young, Breen Philip,
Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N.R.,
286 North St.,
Halifax, N.S.,
14 June, 1945.

D.S.C.—28

Alcock, Ian Ernest,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
Rockland Lodge, 1249 Rockland Ave.,
Victoria, B.C.,
10 July, 1945.

Atkinson, William Henry Isaac,
Lieutenant (P), R.C.N.V.R.,
729 Wellington Ave.,
Winnipeg, Man.,
20 August, 1945.

Baker, John Robinson,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
412 Russell Hill Road,
Toronto, Ont.,
31 July, 1945.

Balfour, St. Clair,
Commander, R.C.N.V.R.,
% Balfours Ltd.,
Hamilton, Ont.,
14 June, 1945.

Boak, Eric Eversley Garratt,
Acting Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N.,
1070 Joan Crescent,
Victoria, B.C.,
19 June, 1945.

Bradley, James Richard (1st Bar),
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
Cayuga Ave.,
Port Credit, Ont.,
3 July, 1945.

Brock, John,
Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N.V.R.,
32 King St.,
Saint John, N.B.,
14 August, 1945.

Buckingham, Robert George,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
5452 Clanronald Ave.,
Montreal, P.Q.,
27 March, 1945.

Burke, Cornelius (2nd Bar),
Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N.V.R.,
3615 Cadboro, Bay Road,
Victoria, B.C.,
24 April, 1945.

Chenoweth, Ian Bryce,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
3 Redpath Row,
Montreal, P.Q.,
14 June, 1945.

Collins, John William,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
69 Woodrow Ave.,
Toronto, Ont.,
12 June, 1945.

Costain, Cecil Clifford,
A/Elect. Lieut. Cdr. (R), R.C.N.V.R.,
102 Central Park Ave.,
Surtherland, Sask.,
1 May, 1945.

Denny, Leslie Perman,
Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N.R.,
Chester, N.S.,
24 July, 1945.

Foulds, Philip Steele,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
99 Crescent Road,
Toronto 5, Ont.,
17 April, 1945.

Gray, Robert Hampton (Missing),
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
815 Baker St.,
Nelson, B.C.,
21 August, 1945.

Gregory, George Frederick T.,
Lieutenant (a/s), R.C.N.V.R.,
44 Harris St.,
Brooklyn, Mass., U.S.A.,
24 July, 1945.

Harrison, William Edward,
Acting Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N.R.,
24 Tobin St.,
Halifax, N.S.,
14 June, 1945.

Hay, James MacMurray,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
276 Rockland Road,
Saint John, N.B.,
14 June, 1945.

Hayes, Godfrey Harry,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.,
Halifax, N.S.,
Awarded when R.N.R. prior to transfer.

Knox, Malcolm Campbell,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
5135 Hingston Ave.,
Montreal, P.Q.,
12 June, 1945.

[Mr. Abbott.]

Marston, Joseph Charles,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.R.,
% Mrs. H. West,
Lunenburg, N.S.,
3 July, 1945.

Misener, John Irwin Fisher,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
286 Vidal St.,
Sarnia, Ont.,
14 August, 1945.

Nixon, Charles Patrick,
Acting Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N.
R.M.D. #3,
Victoria, B.C.,
14 June, 1945.

Pendeebury, Edward Lawrence,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
Didsbury, Alta.,
27 March, 1945.

Quinn, Howard Lee,
Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.V.R.,
523 Trutch St.,
Victoria, B.C.,
14 August, 1945.

Sheppard, Donald John,
Lieut. (P), R.C.N.V.R.,
35 Weybourne Crescent,
Toronto, Ont.,
13 March, 1945.

Sherwood, Frederick Henry (1st Bar),
Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N.V.R.,
Crescent Road, Rockcliffe Park,
Ottawa, Ont.,
10 July, 1945.

Wright, James Peter,
Acting Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
728 Parkdale Ave.,
Ottawa, Ont.,
21 August, 1945.

Bar to G.M.—1

Rundle, George Henry Olaf, G.M.,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.R.,
110 Victoria St.,
Saint John, N.B.,
14 June, 1945.

D.S.M.—20

Balcom, Douglas Elmer,
E.R.A., R.C.N.R. (A-1613),
49½ Dahlia St.,
Dartmouth, N.S.,
14 June, 1945.

Best, Bernard Alfred,
P.O. Telegraphist, R.C.N. (3531),
403 Gloucester St.,
Ottawa, Ont.,
14 June, 1945.

Branscombe, Bernard Leon,
Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R. (V-18228),
Box 790,
Picton, Ont.,
24 July, 1945.

Crotty, James Kay,
C.P.O., R.C.N. (2242),
309 Oxford St.,
Ingersoll, Ont.,
14 June, 1945.

Elsey, George Allen,
Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R. (V-36217),
West Summerland, B.C.,
24 July, 1945.

Evans, James Edwin,
C.P.O., R.C.N. (2390),
289 North St.,
Halifax, N.S.,
18 September, 1945.

Gray, David,
P.O. (H.S.D.), R.C.N.V.R. (V-23092),
459 Notre Dame St.,
Lachine, P.Q.,
14 June, 1945.

Haigh, Samuel,
Chief Stoker, R.C.N. (21231),
375 Charlotte St.,
Sydney, C.B., N.S.,
14 June, 1945.

Harrison, Herbert Leonard,
Petty Officer, R.C.N. (3193),
Orcadia, Sask.,
12 June, 1945.

Hemphill, Ralph Ambrose,
Petty Officer, R.C.N. (3341),
6 Cedar St.,
Pictou, N.S.,
12 June, 1945.

Hoffner, Norman Vernon,
A/Ldg. Smn., R.C.N.V.R. (V-50442),
Turner Valley, Alta.,
3 July, 1945.

Jackson, William Frederick,
Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R. (V-78448),
Argyle St., P.O. Box 102,
Yarmouth South, N.S.,
14 August, 1945.

Juchli, Andre Auguste,
Motor Mechanic, R.C.N.V.R. (V-58735),
8840-87 St.,
Edmonton, Alta.,
12 June, 1945.

Simpson, Thomas Joseph,
A.B., R.C.N.V.R. (V-46636),
211 Gayeau St.,
Windsor, Ont.,
14 August, 1945.

Smith, Robert William,
A.B., R.C.N.V.R. (V-37306),
2229 Riverside Ave.,
Trail, B.C.,
14 August, 1945.

Stannard, Leslie Alfred,
A/Ldg. Smn., R.C.N.V.R. (V-9850),
124 Talbot Ave.,
Winnipeg, Man.,
3 July, 1945.

Thomson, Robert,
Petty Officer, R.C.N.V.R. (V-12534),
R.R. #5, Box 18,
Edmonton, Alta.,
24 July, 1945.

Vanderhaegen, George,
C.P.O., R.C.N. (3154),
39 Fenwick St.,
Halifax, N.S.,
14 June, 1945.

Whittemore, Thomas William,
E.R.A. 2/c, R.C.N.V.R. (V-17199),
40 Cherry St.,
Stratford, Ont.,
3 July, 1945.

Wiggins, Donald William,
Petty Officer, R.C.N. (2770),
2668 Ryde St.,
Montreal, P.Q.,
19 June, 1945.

B.E.M.—14

Badams, Harry,
Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R. (V-9858),
146 Lansdowne Ave.,
Winnipeg, Man.,
14 June, 1945.

Chemist, Walter Stanley,
Stoker P.O., R.C.N.R. (A-726),
P.O. Box 33,
Liverpool, N.S.,
14 June, 1945.

Christopher, John Leonard,
C.P.O., R.C.N.R. (A-1414),
Hopewell Cape,
Albert County, N.B.,
14 June, 1945.

Fenn, George Patrick,
Acting Yeo. of Sigs, R.C.N.V.R. (V-7691),
39 Branstone Road,
Toronto 10,
14 June, 1945.

Gilchrist, Harry Allan,
E.R.A. 4/c, R.C.N.V.R. (V-57858),
1603-7th Ave.,
New Westminster, B.C.,
3 July, 1945.

Jourdin, Arthur Andrew,
Chief Stoker, R.C.N.V.R. (V-11231),
101-8th St. W.,
Saskatoon, Sask.,
14 June, 1945.

McKye, Kenneth,
Elect. Art. 4/c, R.C.N.V.R. (V-60391),
36 Coleridge Ave.,
Toronto, Ont.,
26 March, 1945.

McVeigh, Hugh Patrick,
A/C.P.O., R.C.N.R. (A-1068),
48 Allen St., Halifax, N.S.,
14 June, 1945.

Pike, Douglas William,
C.P.O. (T.C.), R.C.N.R. (A-1168),
35 Jacob St., Apt. 1,
Halifax, N.S.,
14 June, 1945.

Smith, Roy,
Chief Stoker, R.C.N.V.R. (V-9892),
1615 Aird Ave., Maisonneuve,
Montreal, P.Q.,
14 June, 1945.

Smith, William,
Stoker 1, R.C.N.V.R. (V-24429),
478 New Chester Road,
Rock Ferry, Birkenhead,
Cheshire, England,
26 March, 1945.

Smith, William Nelson,
C.M.M. 3/c, R.C.N.V.R. (V-46528),
229 - 7th St. East,
Prince Albert, Sask.,
14 June, 1945.

Treller, Herbert,
Leading S.B.A., R.C.N.V.R. (V-517),
78 Noble Ave., Elmwood,
Winnipeg, Man.,
14 June, 1945.

Wells, John William,
Leading Seaman, R.C.N.R. (A-1084),
66 Portland St.,
Dartmouth, N.S.,
14 June, 1945.

M. in D.—Officers—75

Allan, John Alfred Roberts, D.S.C.,
Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.V.R.,
121 South Park St.,
Halifax, N.S.,
14 August, 1945.

Allin, George Edgar,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
11110 - 86 Ave.,
Edmonton, Alta.,
27 March, 1945.

Atkinson, William Henry Isaac,
Lieutenant (P), R.C.N.V.R.,
729 Wellington Ave.,
Winnipeg, Man.,
31 July, 1945.

Baird, John Douglas Boyd,
Surgeon Lieut., R.C.N.V.R.,
11 Monktown Road,
St. John's, Newfoundland.
14 June, 1945.

Baker, Donald Richard,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
34 Oxlebar St.,
Charlottetown, P.E.I.,
14 June, 1945.

Barbour, Wilfred Orvin Oakley,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.R.,
18 Harris St.,
Halifax, N.S.,
14 June, 1945.

Best, Donald Patterson,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
439 Quinpoole Road,
Halifax, N.S.,
14 June, 1945.

Booth, Bruce Ford,
Lieutenant (E), R.C.N.V.R.,
91 Delaware Ave.,
Toronto, Ont.,
14 June, 1945.

Brook, Croft G. (2),
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
128 South Lake St.,
Los Angeles, 4, California, U.S.A.,
14 June, 1945.
3 July, 1945.

Brooks, Charles Edgar,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.,
10 Trivoli Road, Crouch Rd.,
London H 8, England,
27 March, 1945.

Campbell, Hugh Chisholm,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
130 Beresford Ave.,
Toronto, Ont.,
26 March, 1945.

Carmichael, John Foggo,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.R.,
379 Notre Dame Ave.,
St. Lambert, P.Q.,
14 June, 1945.

Carnell, Herbert Bruce,
Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N.V.R.,
54 Braemor Ave.,
Toronto 12, Ont.,
27 March, 1945.

Deane, John,
A/Elect. Cdr., R.C.N.V.R.,
8 Lynch St.,
Halifax, N.S.,
Awarded when R.N.V.R. prior to transfer.

Christopherson, Robert William,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
2165 Rae St.,
Regina, Sask.,
3 July, 1945.

Clarke, Donald Walter,
Elect. Lieut. (R), R.C.N.V.R.,
Box 2018,
Vermilion Alta.,
24 July, 1945.

Cook, George Douglas,
Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N.V.R.,
92 Binscarth Rd., Rosedale,
Toronto, Ont.,
10 July, 1945.

De Lotbiniere, Edmond Joli,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
Pointe Platon,
Lotbiniere County, P.Q.,
14 June, 1945.

Denny, Thomas Grant,
Acting Commander, R.C.N.V.R.,
32 Larch St.,
Halifax, N.S.,
14 June, 1945.

Dodd, Michael Thomas,
Chaplain (R.C.), R.C.N.,
34 Willingdon Blvd., Kingsway,
Toronto, Ont.,
24 July, 1945.

Edmundson, Joseph William,
Commissioned Engineer, R.C.N.R.,
5910 Cote St. Luc Rd., Apt. 11,
N.D.G., Montreal, P.Q.,
14 June, 1945.

Ellis, Frank Kinnear,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
839 Sandwich St. E.,
Windsor, Ont.,
14 June, 1945.

Fallis, Allen Thomas,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
Carberry, Man.
14 June, 1945.

Farncomb, Harold,
Acting Lieut. Cdr. R.C.N.V.R.,
268 Huron St., London, Ont.
14 June, 1945.

Garriock, Robert Norn,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
Pine Grove, P.O.,
Woodbridge, Ont.,
3 July, 1945.

Godfrey, Valentine Stuart,
Captain, R.C.N.,
1220 Transit Rd., Oak Bay,
Victoria, B.C.,
27 March, 1945.

Grant, Malcolm Seafield (deceased)
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
c/o Rt. Hon. L. P. Graham,
350 King St. W.,
Brockville, Ont.
14 June, 1945.

Hale, William Frederick (deceased),
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
187 Ash St.,
Winnipeg, Man.,
24 July, 1945.

Hardwick, James,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
1699 Graham Blvd.,
Mount Royal,
Montreal, P.Q.
14 August, 1945.

Hayes, William Prine,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.,
Drawer, 1130, Swift Current, Sask.,
10 July, 1945.

Heath, Kenneth, David,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
718 Mill St., Windsor, Ont.,
14 June, 1945.

Holland, Thomas Vincent, (deceased),
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
Souris, P.E.I.,
14 August, 1945.

Jarvis, Edward Gilbert,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
37 South Park St., Halifax, N.S.,
14 June, 1945.

Jess, Robert Edmond, D.S.C. (2),
Acting Lieut. Cdr. (O), R.C.N.V.R.,
141 Cartier Ave., Quebec, P.Q.,
31 July, 1945,-1 May, 1945.

Johnson, Kenneth Lorne,
Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.V.R.,
96 Pere Marquette St., Quebec, P.Q.,
26 March, 1945.

Kelly, Thomas Douglas,
Captain, R.C.N.R.,
1023 St. Charles St.,
Victoria, B.C.

Keys, John David,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
201 Brock Ave., North, Montreal, P.Q.,
14 June, 1945.

Larson, Bertil Frederick,
Lieutenant (E), R.C.N.V.R.,
Box 264, Hanley, B.C.,
26 March, 1945.

Leslie, William Lawrie,
Surgeon Lieut., R.C.N.V.R.,
74 River Road,
Ottawa, Ont.,
24 July, 1945.

Logie, Donald,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
Hampton, Kings Co., N.B.,
24 July, 1945.

MacLachlan, Campbell Martin,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
Maple Leaf Milling Co.,
Dominion Bank Building,
24 April, 1945.

Mavety, George Alexander,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
62 Baby Point Road,
Toronto, Ont.,
14 June, 1945.

Maynard, Murray Renouf,
Lieutenant (E), R.C.N.V.R.,
Richmond Hill,
Toronto, Ont.,
24 April, 1945.

McClelland, John Gordon,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
322 Russell Hill Road,
Toronto, Ont.,
14 June, 1945.

McEntyre, Peter Michael,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
4099 Sherbrooke St. W.,
Westmount, P.Q.,
19 June, 1945.

McIntosh, Charles George,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.R.,
757 Wilson St.,
Victoria, B.C.,
3 July, 1945.

McLernon, Leslie Raphael, DSC,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
3003 Cedar Ave.,
Montreal, P.Q.,
12 June, 1945.

Morrison, John,
A/Lieut. Cdr. (E), R.C.N.R.,
3467 Point Grey Road,
Vancouver, B.C.,
14 June, 1945.

Mylett, William George,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
7 Laurentian Ave.,
Quebec, P.Q.,
14 June, 1945.

Nash, Robert Arthur (deceased),
Sub-Lieutenant, R.C.N.,
1115-14th A. Zone, 22,
Seattle, Washington,
18 September, 1945.

Ness, George Cairns,
Lieutenant (E), R.C.N.R.,
c/o Mrs. M. L. Flick, P.O. Box 321,
Victoria, B.C.,
14 June, 1945.

Patterson, Mervyn Alexander,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
3431 Victoria Ave.,
Regina, Sask.,
14 June, 1945.

Pawson, Donald Hugh,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
31 Queen's Drive,
Weston, Ont.,
1 May, 1945.

Pottier, Charles Harris,
Sub Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
175 Haddon Ave. N.,
Hamilton, Ont.,
14 August, 1945.

Quick, Lewis Dennis,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.R.,
c/o Mr. A. Feindal,
Bridgewater, N.S.,
14 June, 1945.

Robson, Thomas Beattie,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
2131 Niagara St.,
Windsor, Ont.,
14 June, 1945.

Schreiber, J. R. G.,
Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N.V.R.,
Room 5615, Chateau Frontenac,
Quebec, P.Q.,
7 August, 1945.

Sharpe, John Winston,
Skipper Lieutenant, R.C.N.R.,
17 Seaforth St.,
Halifax, N.S.,
14 June, 1945.

Sheppard, Frank Herman,
Sub Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
1818½ Gerrard St. E.,
Toronto, Ont.,
14 June, 1945.

Smith, Robert Campbell,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
c/o Prov. Court House,
Vancouver, B.C.,
12 June, 1945.

Spershott, Walter Edgar,
Warrant Engineer, R.C.N.R.,
324 Maitland St.,
Victoria, B.C.,
14 June, 1945.

Steele, Richard Miles,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
Rothesay, N.B.,
14 June, 1945.

Steward, John Rawson Kennedy,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
Cowichan Bay,
Vancouver Island, B.C.,
14 June, 1945.

Storey, Donald William Green,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
232 Cameron St.,
Moncton, N.B.,
14 June, 1945.

Stuart, Orme Gordon,
Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.V.R.,
1395 West 12th Ave.,
Vancouver, B.C.,
14 August, 1945.

[Mr. Abbott.]

Trimble, William,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
118 Inglewood Drive,
Toronto, Ont.,
3 April, 1945.

Wallace, Matthew Howard,
Acting Lieut. Cdr. R.C.N.R.,
17 Craigmiller Ave.,
St. John's. Nfld.,
14 June, 1945.

Webb, George Fitzgerald,
Acting Lieut. Cdr. (E). R.C.N.V.R.,
20 Merith Ave., Carlisle,
Cumberland, England,
14 June, 1945.

Williams. Richard Sugden,
Acting Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N.V.R.,
22 Deer Park Crescent,
Toronto, Ont.,
14 June, 1945.

Winthrope, William James (deceased),
Surgeon Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
913 University Drive,
Saskatoon, Sask.,
11 September, 1945.

Wright. Austin Meade,
Lieutenant (E), R.C.N.V.R.,
2050 Mansfield St.,
Montreal, P.Q.,
27 March, 1945.

Young, Henry Esson,
Skipper Lieutenant, R.C.N.R.,
778 Island Road,
Victoria, B.C.,
14 June, 1945.

Zaphe, Gerald Gray,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
127 South Norah St.,
Fort William, Ont.,
14 June, 1945.

M in D. RATINGS—128

Bartram, Vincent James,
E.R.A. 3/c. R.C.N. (X-21544),
9617-109 Ave.,
Edmonton, Alta.,
3 July, 1945.

Bayford, George Charles,
Ldg. Signalman, R.C.N.V.R. (V-27292),
673 Strathmore Blvd.,
Toronto, Ont.

Becker. Allan,
A/Ldg. Smn.. R.C.N.V.R. (V-57912),
#32 Colonial Apts.,
Saskatoon, Sask.,
26 March, 1945.

Bell, Charles Edward,
Petty Officer, R.C.N.V.R. (V-10253),
737 Broadway Ave.,
Regina, Sask.,
14 June, 1945.

Bell, Clifford,
Petty Officer, R.C.N.V.R., (V-5316),
2060 Charlemagne St.,
Montreal, Que.,
14 June, 1945.

Berryman, Jack Gardner (deceased),
Leading Stoker, R.C.N.V.R. (V-16905),
31 West Ave.,
Hamilton, Ont.,
14 August, 1945.

Booth, Harry,
Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R. (V-14423),
294 E. 4 Ave..
Vancouver, B.C.,
24 July, 1945.

Bowen, John,
Ldg. Smn., R.C.N.V.R. (V-22594),
150 Fairbank Ave., Toronto, Ont.,
3 July, 1945.

Brooke, Eric,
Petty Officer, R.C.N. (4767,
216 Old Orchard Grove,
Toronto, Ont.,
14 August, 1945.

Brown, Daniel,
Stoker, P.O., R.C.N.R. (A-1761),
Dalhousie, N.B.,
14 June, 1945.

Brown, Hugh,
C.P.O., R.C.N.R. (A-1990),
Carter St., Liverpool,
Queen's County, N.S.
14 June, 1945.

Buchan, John,
C.M.M., R.C.N.V.R. (V-22930),
36 Shudell Ave.,
Toronto, Ont.,
14 June, 1945.

Chalmers, Arthur,
Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R. (V-65929),
53 Massey St., Toronto, Ont.,
10 July, 1945.

Chapman, Lawrence Elswood,
A/C. P.O., R.C.N.V.R. (V-14462),
3392 Blenheim St.,
Vancouver, B.C.,
14 June, 1945.

Cherrett, James William,
Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R. (V-64373),
728—6th Ave.,
Verdun, P.Q.,
3 July, 1945.

Clarke, Charles,
Chief M.M., R.C.N.V.R. (V-23747),
4334 St. Catharine St.,
Westmount, Que.,
14 June, 1945.

Cooper, James,
Chief Stoker, R.C.N. (21347),
1251 Pandora Ave.,
Victoria, B.C.,
14 June, 1945.

Creamer, Cecil Ernest,
Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R. (V-10842),
Seamans, Sask.,
3 July, 1945.

Cunningham, Daniel,
A/C. P.O., R.C.N.V.R. (V-5525),
8 Lepage Ave.,
Dorval, Que.,
14 June, 1945.

Dalzell, Robert Gordon,
Able Seaman, R.C.N. (4141),
R.R. #1, Sillsville, Ont.,
18 September, 1945.

Davies, John Morley,
Petty Officer, R.C.N.V.R. (V-13724),
514—9th Ave., N/E,
Calgary, Alta.,
14 June, 1945.

Davies, Thomas Ernest,
E.R.A. 4/cl. R.C.N.V.R.. (V-11402),
Duke of Kent St., Fairview,
Halifax, N.S.,
14 June, 1945.

Davis, Allan Goss,
E.R.A. 3/cl. R.C.N.R. (A-3357),
912 St. Patrick St. ,
Victoria, B.C.,
14 June, 1945.

DeCandido, Candido,
Petty Officer, R.C.N. (3523),
Box 592,
Drumheller, Alta.,
14 June, 1945.

Duncan, James Alexander,
E.R.A. 3/cl. R.C.N.V.R. (V-3585),
324 Josephine Ave.,
Windsor, Ont.,
14 June, 1945.

Dupas, Rene Norman,
A/Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R. (V-55774),
Woodridge, Man.,
26 March, 1945.

Edwards, Robert Pankhurst,
C.M.M., R.C.N.V.R. (V-30259),
600 George St.,
Victoria, B.C.,
14 June, 1945.

Elliott, Walter Alwin,
Chief Stoker, R.C.N. (21273),
525 Highland Ave.,
Highland Park, Ontario,
14 June, 1945

Feener, Francis,
C.E.R.A., R.C.N.R. (A-4028),
Milton, Queen's County, N.S.,
14 June, 1945.

Fraser, Walter Reginald,
L/S. B.A., R.C.N.V.R. (V-11946),
1143 Ave. K. South,
Saskatoon, Sask.,
24 July, 1945.

Freeborn, James Douglas,
S.B.A., R.C.N.V.R. (V-34669),
Chapleau, Ont.,
14 June, 1945.

Funnell, James Ernest,
Stoker I (M), R.C.N.V.R. (V-36559),
Lansdowne, Ont.,
27 March, 1945.

Galloway, John Ross,
P.O. Cook (S), R.C.N.V.R. (V-17106),
22 Locust St.,
St. Thomas, Ont.,
27 March, 1945.

Genova, Anthony,
Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R. (V-37029),
1582 Bloor St. W.,
Toronto, Ont.,
14 June, 1945.

Gibson, Vernon Sylvester,
Stoker 1/c, R.C.N.V.R. (V-13729),
96 Cornwallis St.,
Halifax, N.S.,
24 July, 1945.

Gilder, William Arthur,
Ldg. Sig., R.C.N.V.R. (V-14205),
270 East 19th Ave.,
Vancouver, B.C.,
14 June, 1945.

Grimes, David Lloyd,
Petty Officer, R.C.N.V.R. (V-23126),
115 Blenheim Pl.,
Westmount, P.Q.,
14 June, 1945.

Hammond, Victor Orchard,
E.R.A. III, R.C.N.V.R. (V-32358),
5672 Delorimier Ave.,
Montreal, P.Q.,
26 March, 1945.

Harnett, Jack Charles,
A/Stoker P.O., R.C.N.R. (A-3255),
5311 Sherbrooke St.,
Vancouver, B.C.,
14 June, 1945.

Hatfield, Roby Emmerson,
Ldg. Smn., R.C.N.R. (A-4522),
Parrsboro, N.S.,
14 June, 1945.

Hebert, Paul,
A/Ldg. Smn., R.C.N.V.R (V-33358),
588 St. Joseph St.,
Lachine, P.Q.,
14 June, 1945.

Hickey, Edward John,
A/Ldg. Smn., R.C.N.V.R (V-22898),
192 Scarboro Rd.,
Toronto, Ont.,
14 June, 1945.

Halloway, Kenneth Robert,
Able Smn. (SD), R.C.N.V.R. (V-50663),
266 Colborne St. W.,
Brantford, Ont.,
26 March, 1945.

Howes, Norman,
Chief Stoker, R.C.N. (X-21478),
1118 Avenue B, North,
Saskatoon, Sask.,
26 March, 1945.

Hughes, Edwin Thompson,
Petty Officer, R.C.N.V.R (V-16066),
374 E. Francis St.,
Fort William, Ont.,
14 June, 1945.

Hughes, John Harrington,
Able Seaman, R.C.N.R. (A-5920),
129 Latimer Ave.,
Toronto, Ont.,
3 July, 1945.

Irving, William Anderson,
Chief P.O., R.C.N.V.R (V-35192),
307-5th St. W.,
Calgary, Alta.,
14 June, 1945.

[Mr. Abbott.]

Irwin, Thomas Washington,
A/Ldg. Smn., R.C.N.V.R. (V-9588),
148 Sinclair St.,
Dartmouth, N.S.,
24 July, 1945.

James, Henry,
Petty Officer, R.C.N. (2846),
53 Berlin St.,
Halifax, N.S.,
14 June, 1945.

Kern, James Hollywell,
E.R.A. 3/cl., R.C.N.V.R. (V-37467),
380 Frood Rd.,
Sudbury, Ont.,
14 June, 1945.

Kimball, Warner,
Telegraphist, R.C.N.V.R. (V-58411),
1875 Robson St.,
Vancouver, B.C.,
26 March, 1945.

Kowbel, Morris (deceased),
Able Seaman A.A. II, R.C.N. (4648),
Blucher, Sask.,
14 June, 1945.

Kuhn, Gordon Wilfred,
Ldg. Cook, R.C.N.V.R. (V-26386),
Lower Sackville,
Halifax County, N.S.,
14 June, 1945.

Laine, Joseph Donat Hector,
Ldg. S. A., R.C.N.V.R. (V-3156),
3040 Desaulles St.,
St. Hyacinthe, P.Q.,
14 June, 1945.

Lavergne, Gaston Rodolph,
A/Ldg. Smn., R.C.N. (3968),
48 Daly Avenue,
Ottawa, Ont.,
27 March, 1945.

Lighthall, Augustus E. (deceased),
Chief Petty Officer, R.C.N. (2404),
Globe Hotel,
Picton, Ont.,
14 June, 1945.

Lipsit, Donald Chalmers,
Stoker P.O., R.C.N.V.R. (V-16494),
Coleman, Alta.
14 June, 1945.

Little, Charles,
E.R.A. 3/cl. R.C.N.V.R. (V-9809),
1225 June St.,
Esquimalt, B.C.,
14 June, 1945.

Lockwood, John,
Stoker P.O., R.C.N.R. (A-2866),
19 Glanton Rd., North Shields,
Northumberland, England,
14 June, 1945.

Mann, Clement Cecil Wallace,
C.P.O., R.C.N. (2609),
145 Ontario St.,
Victoria, B.C.,
10 July, 1945.

Martin, Lloyd Angus,
A/Ldg. Stoker (M) R.C.N.V.R. (V-1603),
Hopefield, P.E.I.,
14 June, 1945.

Martin, Maxwell McCready,
Petty Officer, R.C.N.V.R. (V-7694),
14 Blevins Place,
Toronto, Ont.,
26 March, 1945.

Matthews, Albert Edwin,
Petty Officer, R.C.N.R. (A-1286),
233 North St.,
Halifax, N.S.,
3 July, 1945.

McConnell, Mariner Leroy,
A/Ldg. Smn., R.C.N.V.R. (V-31289),
L'Etang, N.B.,
2 July, 1945.

McCrate, Thomas Joseph,
E.R.A. 3/cl., R.C.N.R. (A-1450),
937½ Barrington St.,
Halifax, N.S.,
14 June, 1945.

McEachern, Donald Duncan,
A/Ldg. Stoker, R.C.N.V.R. (V-26027),
Millerton, N.B.,
27 March, 1945.

McHugh, Charles Wilson,
E.R.A. 3/cl., R.C.N.V.R. (V-22019),
28 Daniels Ave.,
Etobicoke, Ont.,
14 June, 1945.

McInnes, William Stuart,
Signalman, R.C.N.V.R. (V-17594),
509 Ontario St.,
London, Ont.,
11 September, 1945.

McIntyre, Keith,
C.E.R.A., R.C.N.V.R. (V-24876),
303 Canada Bldg.,
Prince Albert, Sask.,
14 June, 1945.

McKinney, Joseph Gordon Lyle,
Chief P.O., R.C.N.V.R. (V-7353),
178 Alice St.,
Oshawa, Ont.,
26 March, 1945.

McLaren, William E.,
E.R.A. 3/cl., R.C.N.R. (A-5292),
120 Willow Ave.,
Toronto, Ont.,
14 June, 1945.

McMahon, Jack Alsenas,
Ldg. Smn., R.C.N. (3894),
11 Jail Lane,
Liverpool, N.S.,
12 June, 1945.

McPhee, Daniel Anthony,
E.R.A. 2/cl., R.C.N.V.R. (V-25562),
Reserve Mines,
Cape Breton, N.S.,
24 July, 1945.

Mears, John James Lawrence,
Stoker I, R.C.N.V.R. (V-44723),
R.R. No. 2,
Billings Bridge, Ont.,
24 July, 1945.

Miller, Murray Beasley,
C.P.O., R.C.N. (3090),
63-2nd Avenue E.,
Swift Current, Sask.,
14 June, 1945.

Miller, Robert Beverley,
Supply P.O., R.C.N.V.R. (V-17997),
462 Wellington St.,
London, Ont.,
14 June, 1945.

Mitchell, Gordon Campbell,
A/P.O., R.C.N. (4564),
140 Lewis Ave.,
Chilliwack, B.C.,
14 June, 1945.

Moe, Karl,
C.E.R.A. (Now A/Wt. Engr. R.C.N.R.),
Huvikvein, Sandefjord, Norway,
14 June, 1945.

Moore, Richard John,
Yeo. of Signals, R.C.N.V.R. (V-8314),
31 Genesse St.,
Hamilton, Ont.,
14 June, 1945.

Mosher, Stanley Burrell,
S.B.A., R.C.N.V.R. (V-26108),
19 Elm St.,
Windsor, N.S.,
26 March, 1945.

Mountain, William T. (deceased),
Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R. (V-31164),
1119-9th St. East,
Calgary, Alta.,
14 August, 1945.

Mulvaney, John Francis,
A/Ldg. Tel., R.C.N.V.R. (V-27140),
643 Glebeholme Blvd.,
Toronto, Ont.,
14 June, 1945.

Munro, George Henry,
Motor Mechanic, R.C.N.V.R. (V-63528),
210-3rd Ave., N.E.,
Dauphin, Man.,
24 July, 1945.

Newton, John,
C.P.O. Cook (S), R.C.N. (40512),
Starling Road,
Strathmore, P.Q.,
14 June, 1945.

Nikorak, Harry,
Ldg. Cook (S), R.C.N.V.R. (V-32944),
404 Aves South,
Saskatoon, Sask.,
14 August, 1945.

Oberson, Donald Warner,
Tel. (SO), R.C.N.V.R. (V-52614),
3993 West 23rd Ave.,
Vancouver, B.C.,
14 June, 1945.

Ouellette, Rodger J.,
Petty Officer, R.C.N.V.R. (V-19149),
River Canard, Ont.,
14 June, 1945.

Pardo, Thomas Alton,
Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R. (V-4745),
29 Melville St.,
Hamilton, Ont.,
12 June, 1945.

Pearce, George Henry Charles,
C.P.O., R.C.N. (2414),
671 King Edward Ave.,
Ottawa, Ont.,
14 June, 1945.

Perrett, Herbert John,
Stoker P.O., R.C.N.R. (A-2076),
Franklin St., Imperoyal P.O.,
Woodside, N.S.,
14 June, 1945.

Petrie, Willy,
Ldg. Coder, R.C.N.V.R. (V-4262),
279 Murray St.,
Ottawa, Ont.,
26 March, 1945.

Phillips, Donald Raymond,
Able Smn. (LTO), R.C.N.R. (A-2734),
12450 Notre Dame St.,
Pointe Aux Trembles, Montreal, P.Q.,
14 June, 1945.

Porter, Leslie Oliver,
C.P.O., R.C.N.R. (A-2124),
11 Weir St.,
Hamilton, Ont.,
14 June, 1945.

Porter, Robert Tait,
A/P.O., R.C.N.V.R. (V-7348),
63 Pittrodrie Place,
Aberdeen, Scotland,
14 June, 1945.

Redhead, William Owen,
Petty Officer, R.C.N.V.R. (V-10279),
2234 Elphingstone St.,
Regina, Sask.,
14 August, 1945.

Ripley, Allyn Morgan,
Ldg. Smn., R.C.N.R. (A-2852),
Perth Road Post Office,
Perth, Ont.,
14 June, 1945.

Ritchie, Andrew,
A/Stoker P.O., R.C.N.R. (A-3262),
197 Clifton Ave.,
Neward, N.J., U.S.A,
14 June, 1945.

Rutherford, Norman Reginald,
Able Smn., R.C.N.V.R. (V-11590),
622 Ave. G., South,
Saskatoon, Sask.,
14 June, 1945.

Sartain, Fred,
Elect. Art. 2/c, R.C.N.V.R. (V-37436),
3 Mareve Ave.,
Hamilton Beach, Ont.,
14 August, 1945.

Scott, Albert Ringland,
Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R. (V-27482),
43 Westmoreland Ave.,
Toronto, Ont.,
3 July, 1945.

Scott, Lawrence Duncan,
Acting Able Smn., R.C.N.V.R. (V-10747),
1202 Elliott St.,
Regina, Sask.,
14 June, 1945.

[Mr. Abbott.]

Scott, William Charles,
Stoker P.O., R.C.N.V.R. (V-36929),
P.O. Box 55,
Rawdon, Que.,
14 June, 1945.

Selzer, Charles Rupert,
Petty Officer, R.C.N.V.R. (V-10404),
Quinton, Sask..
14 June, 1945.

Seymour, Edward Philip,
Stoker P.O., R.C.N.R. (A-1254),
Purvis St.,
North Sydney, C.B., N.S.,
3 July, 1945.

Sibley, George,
Able Smn., R.C.N.R., (A-1392),
Foundry St.,
North Sydney, N.S.,
14 June, 1945.

Simon, Hugh Edward,
Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R. (V-42624),
37 Market St.,
Paris, Ont.,
14 August, 1945.

Simons, William Arthur,
Ldg. Tel., R.C.N.V.R. (V-26082),
Ritz Hotel,
Victoria, B.C.,
14 June, 1945.

Simpson, Stanley,
A/C.P.O., R.C.N.V.R. (V-23025),
717 Robie St.,
Halifax, N.S.,
14 June, 1945.

Sinclair, Peter Deas,
Ldg. Steward, R.C.N.V.R. (V-22763),
33 Hartwood Road, Southport,
Lancaster, England,
14 June, 1945.

Smith, Percy,
Petty Officer, R.C.N. (2821),
1340 Hamilton St.,
Regina, Sask.,
14 June, 1945.

Snelgrove, Donald Edward,
C.P.O., R.C.N. (3418),
34 Canon St.,
Saint John, N.B.,
14 June, 1945.

Snobelen, Samuel Baird,
Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R. (V-50344),
R.R. # 3,
Chatham, Ont.,
3 July, 1945.

Steele, Norbert Joseph,
Petty Officer, R.C.N. (3588),
Newport, P.E.I.,
26 March, 1945.

Styles, George Morley,
A/Ldg. Stoker, R.C.N.V.R. (V-33381),
Morrisburg, Ont.,
3 July, 1945.

Talbot, Roland Laurie,
C.M.M., R.C.N.V.R., (V-12593),
Suite 120, Sales Block,
Jasper Ave., Edmonton, Alta.,
14 June, 1945.

Thomas, George Henry,
Chief Stoker, R.C.N. (X-41065),
2347 Logan St.,
Montreal, Que.,
14 June, 1945.

Thomas, William Frederick,
C.E.R.A., R.C.N.V.R. (V-35628),
1810 West 36th Ave.,
Vancouver, B.C.,
14 August, 1945.

Tibert, Ray Johnson,
Acting Ldg. Smn. R.C.N.V.R. (V-41712),
Central Grove, N.S.,
14 June, 1945.

Tiner, Ralph Sydney,
Chief P.O., R.C.N.R. (A-2853),
803-2nd Ave., Verdun, Que.,
14 June, 1945.

Wagg, Frank,
C.P.O., R.C.N.R. (A-5386),
Gore Bay, Ont.,
14 June, 1945.

Warnock, Frank William,
Chief Stoker, R.C.N.R. (A-2497),
Zurich, Ont.,
14 August, 1945.

Watling, Cedric Stanley,
C.P.O. Elect., R.C.N. (X-41094),
Kapuskasing, Ont.,
14 June, 1945.

Webber, Robert,
C.P.O., R.C.N. (2914),
2817 Quebec St.,
Vancouver, B.C.,
14 June, 1945.

Whistlecraft, Donald William,
Ldg. Stores Asst., R.C.N.V.R. (V-38406),
27 Hughes St.,
St. Thomas, Ont.,
24 July, 1945.

Williams, Bruce Edward
A.B., R.C.N.V.R. (V-72477),
171 St. Clair Ave East,
Toronto, Ont.,
26 March, 1945.

Wood, Dean Nelson,
Petty Officer, R.C.N.R. (A-1074),
R.R. 6, Charlottetown, P.E.I.,
14 June, 1945.

Young, Leonard Erwin,
Stoker, R.C.N.V.R. (V-55462),
3663 Broadway West,
Vancouver, B.C.,
24 July, 1945.

Yvon, Alfred Jules,
A/E.R.A. 4/cl. R.C.N.V.R. (V-51263),
1127 Laurier St. West,
Montreal, P.Q.,
26 March, 1945.

Bronze Star Medal (U.S.A.)—1

Strina, R. L.,
Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.V.R.,
Canadian Bank of Commerce,
Robson Branch, Vancouver, B.C.,
17 April, 1945.

Croix de Guerre (France)—3

MacKay, H. D.,
Acting Commander, R.C.N.R.,
11 Merkel Place,
Halifax, N.S.,
31 August, 1945.

Schreiber, J. R. G.,
Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N.V.R.,
Room 5615,
Chateau Frontenac,
Quebec, P.Q.,
22 March, 1945.

Maitland, John Douglas (D.S.C. and Bar),
Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N.V.R.,
1264 Balfour Ave.,
Vancouver, B.C.,
11 January, 1945.

King Haakon VII's Commemoration Medal (Norwegian)—1

Connolly, William Ernest,
Signalman, R.C.N.V.R. (V-40271),
18 Locke St. N., Hamilton, Ont.,
3 August, 1942.

Order of Patriotic War First Class (U.S.S.R.)—1

Senior, Charles Arthur Robin,
Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R.,
Ottawa, Ont.,
December, 1942.

Mr. BRACKEN: Before the committee rises I should like to ask a question. At some point early in the discussion in committee will the Minister of National Defence give a break-down of expenditures under the following headings: War expenditures—these would include commitments of the past—demobilization expenditures, and what one might call expenditures for defence in the future. I should personally like to have such information.

Mr. ABBOTT: I should be very happy to do what I can to meet the wishes of the leader of the opposition on that point. As he probably knows, for the last four or five years our practice has been, in connection with these war estimates, to consider the estimates of the different services under twelve or thirteen primary headings such as civil salaries, pay and allowances, travel, transportation and freight and the like. The details have, in fact, been prepared on that basis.

I shall be ready to give any information or break-down that I can; but I am afraid that at this date it would be difficult, if not impossible, from a practical point of view completely to rearrange the estimates. However, I shall be happy to do what I can to break them down under the suggested headings. I must repeat, however, that I am

afraid it would be difficult to make a complete rearrangement of the way in which they are presented. I had more or less assumed that the committee would be ready to consider them in the form in which they were presented at the last three or four sessions. I realize, of course, that circumstances are somewhat different to-day, but they have become so quite recently, with the result that the accounting staffs have not been able to make any change in their method of presentation. I may say that these estimates I am going to bring before the house have already been revised three or four times since they were first prepared last March. Frankly I would hesitate to impose too great a burden upon our accounting staffs, which are already pretty heavily burdened. However, I shall try to meet my hon. friend in any way I can.

Mr. BRACKEN: I was asking that the Minister of National Defence or indeed the minister of any other department revise the set-up of the estimates. I am not asking that at all. But I think the government, in its own interests, ought to let the house and the country know what proportion of these total expenditures amounting to $3,650 million would be chargeable to commitments with respect to the war; what proportion would be chargeable to demobilization and what proportion to the future defence plan for the three services. If that information cannot be given, then it cannot be given. But I was wondering if at least the totals under these headings could be given for each of the three services. I am not suggesting that at this stage the minister should try to set up his estimates in a different form. I wonder if he understands what I am asking for.

Mr. ABBOTT: Probably as we go along in the consideration of the estimates we shall be able to follow what my hon. friend has in mind. I believe that under the primary headings to which he has referred I can give what amount would stand as carry-over from previous commitments. We will follow the practice of distributing to each member of the house an itemized break-down of the total, and if a further break-down of that is needed I will try to provide it.

Progress reported.

It being five minutes after eleven o'clock, the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

[Mr. Abbott.]

Wednesday, October 10, 1945.

The house met at three o'clock.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the house that I have received the following communication:

Ottawa, October 10, 1945.

Sir:—I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable Patrick Kerwin, acting as deputy of His Excellency the Administrator, will proceed to the Senate Chamber on Thursday, the 11th October, at 5.45 p.m., for the purpose of giving the royal assent to certain bills.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,
F. L. C. Pereira,
Assistant Secretary to the
Governor General.

PRIVILEGE—MR. COLDWELL

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE—PROVISION OF STANDING ORDERS RESPECTING QUORUM

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I rise to draw to the attention of the house a matter which I think affects the privileges of the house and the rules of the house.

Yesterday, the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker), parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Veterans Affairs, presented the first report of the special committee on veterans affairs and moved that the report be concurred in.

This committee consists of sixty members. I learned accidentally this morning that twenty-four members attended the meeting of the committee at which the business reported was transacted.

Standing order 65 governs the procedure of select special committees. Paragraph 3 of standing order 65 says:

A majority of the members of a special committee shall be a quorum, unless the house has otherwise ordered.

The house had not so ordered; therefore the presence of thirty-one members was required to transact business. Only twenty-four were present.

The notes on the standing order in Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, I think, are quite clear, and indicate that no valid business could be transacted under the circumstances; hence no reports should have been submitted to this house yesterday.

In this respect, Mr. Speaker, we have followed the interpretation of a similar standing order in the British House of Commons; for on July 3, 1907, Mr. A. J. Balfour raised the question of the validity of work done by a committee without a quorum. Mr. Speaker then said this, in part:

It is rather difficult to deal with hypothetical cases but on the assumption that the committee met and proceeded without a quorum, I should be of the opinion that the committee, properly speaking, was never constituted and did not meet, and that none of the work done could be accepted as being the work of that particular committee.

This is an important committee. Its need is urgent. I am not asking the house or you, Mr. Speaker, to rescind the motion of yesterday. I am merely raising the question that these rules which protect minorities in this house should be observed when organizing the work of all other special committees of this house and that care should be exercised by those submitting such reports that the rule for our protection has been complied with. I wish to draw it to your attention so that this may not occur again.

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I am quite in agreement with the point raised by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar. But over a number of years—and I have been in the house for more than fifteen years—for the purpose of organizing in our various committees we have proceeded possibly with a certain amount of disregard of some of the basic rules. It was the intention yesterday to ask the house to validate the routine proceedings of the committee, consisting, as my hon. friend rightly said, of twenty-four members. I think that, to put the matter beyond dispute, to-morrow morning, when that committee meets with, I believe, the quorum now recognized by the house, we had better repeat the proceedings which were gone over yesterday and have everything perfectly in order. I think the point raised by my hon. friend is well taken, but we were anxious to get ahead with the business of a most important committee, and I believe that if we were wrong in law we were right in equity.

Mr. COLDWELL: I did not wish to delay the committee.

STANDING COMMITTEES

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): I move that the report of the special committee appointed to prepare and report lists of members to compose the standing committees of the house, which I presented yesterday, be concurred in. The leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) asked me yesterday to hold it over until to-day.

Motion agreed to.

POWERS OF COMMITTEES

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs) moved:

That the standing committees of this house shall severally be empowered to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to them by the house and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon, with power to send for persons, papers and records.

Motion agreed to.

PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs) moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their honours that this house will unite with them in the formation of a joint committee of both houses on the subject of the printing of parliament, and that the members of the standing committee on printing, viz., Messieurs Adamson, Arsenault, Aylesworth, Baker, Beaudry, Bertrand (Prescott), Bertrand (Terrebonne), Boivin, Bradette, Bradshaw, Brunelle, Campbell, Castleden, Church, Clark, Cote (St. Johns-Iberville-Napierville), Dubois, Emmerson, Fontaine, Fraser, Gibson (Hamilton West), Golding, Halle, Hansell, Healy, Henderson, Hlynka, Kidd, Kuhl, Lacombe, Lalonde, Lapalme, Lapointe, Lennard, MacLean, MacNaught, Maloney, McCuaig, McCubbin, McCullough (Assiniboia), McDonald (Parry Sound), McGregor, McLure, McMaster, Nicholson, Robinson (Simcoe East), Ross (St. Paul's), Sinclair (Vancouver North), Sinnott, Strum (Mrs.), Tustin, Viau, White (Hastings-Peterborough), Winters, will act as members on the part of this house, on the said joint committee on the printing of parliament.

Motion agreed to.

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs) moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their honours that this house has appointed the Honourable the Speaker and Messieurs Adamson, Aylesworth, Black (Chateauguay-Huntingdon), Bruce, Cardiff, Castleden, Cloutier, Dion, Douglas, Eudes, Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont), Gauthier (Nipissing), Gourd, Gingues, Herridge, Henderson, Howe, Jaques, Kidd, Knight, Lapalme, Leger, Marrier, Marshall, Matthews (Brandon), McGarry, McIlraith, McKay, Menary, Mitchell, Mullins, Nixon, Pearkes, Probe, Reid, Richard (Ottawa East), Ross (St. Paul's), Skey, Smith (York North), Stephenson, White (Middlesex East), Winkler, Winters, Zaplitny, a committee to assist his honour the Speaker in the direction of the Library of Parliament, so far as the

interests of the House of Commons are concerned, and to act on behalf of the House of Commons as members of a joint committee of both houses on the library.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk)

RAW CANE SUGAR

Mr. BLACKMORE:

1. In purchasing raw cane sugar during this war, did the sugar administration use a brokerage firm as an agent?

2. If so, is the deputy sugar administrator connected with such firm?

3. What commission was allowed such firm?

Mr. MAYHEW:

1. No.

2 and 3. Answered by 1.

Note—The sugar administration has never used any brokerage houses. Canadian brokerage houses are, however, employed and paid by the sellers of sugar exported to Canada.

HOUSING ACT—LENDING INSTITUTIONS

Mr. MACDONALD (Halifax):

1. How many lending institutions in Nova Scotia have made application to be listed under the National Housing Act?

2. What are the names and addresses of firms, companies or corporations which have been approved?

Mr. MAYHEW:

1. Three. (Three other companies made preliminary enquiries but have not followed them up with applications for approval. One of these companies subsequently amalgamated with a company which has been approved.)

2. Eastern Canada Savings and Loan Company, Halifax, N.S.

Nova Scotia Savings, Loan and Building Society, 92-94 Granville Street, Halifax, N.S.

General Trust and Executor Corporation, Barrington at Prince, Halifax, N.S.

In addition the following companies, whose head offices are not in Nova Scotia, have made loans in that province under the National Housing Act, 1944:

Sun Life Assurance Company of Canada, Montreal, Quebec; The Canada Life Assurance Company, Toronto, Ontario.

SASKATCHEWAN IRRIGATION PROJECTS

Mr. BENTLEY:

1. What has been done with respect to proceeding with the irrigation project in the Duncairn, Swift Current, Waldeck, Rush Lake, Herbert, Morse, Hodgeville area?

2. What estimated time will be required to complete this work?

[Mr. Mackenzie.]

Mr. GARDINER:

1. Construction of irrigation works has been completed in the Duncairn, Swift Current, Waldeck and Rush Lake localities. Those of Duncairn and Swift Current were in operation in 1945. Water may be delivered to the farm lateral systems in the Waldeck and Rush Lake localities in 1946. The main supply channel has been constructed to the edge of the Herbert and Morse localities; construction of a pump station and a few miles of canal is required before water may be delivered to farm lateral systems of Herbert and Morse. The main canal supplying the Hodgeville locality is constructed as far as High Field reservoir; construction of a pump station and several miles of canal is required to supply water to farm lateral systems in the Hodgeville locality.

2. Construction in the Herbert and Morse localities would require six months for completion after commencement; that in the Hodgeville locality would require twelve months.

SHELBURNE HARBOUR NAVAL BASE

Mr. STANFIELD:

1. What was the total cost of the construction of the naval base at Shelburne Harbour, Nova Scotia?

2. Was the work done under contract or on a cost plus basis?

3. What are the, (a) names of firms employed in construction; (b) nature of work done by each; (c) amount paid to each?

4. Is the base used at present time and, if so, for what purpose?

5. Are any naval personnel stationed there at the present time, and, if so, how many?

Mr. MACDONALD (Halifax):

1. Total amount expended to 31 August, 1945, $4,029,751.10.

2. Both.

3. (a), (b), (c).

(1) Acadia Construction Co. Ltd., works and building, base generally, marine railway, drydock, $3,202,919.31.

(2) M. A. Condon & Son (through Department of Public Works), main wharf and approach boom, defence buildings, fencing, $344,424.10.

(3) James N. Kenney, wharf sub-station, heating and power lines, etc., $103,832.89.

(4) Horton Steel Works, fuel oil storage tanks, $20,002.00.

(5) National Iron Corp. Ltd., pipe and fittings for water supply, $32,656.62.

(6) Supreme Power Supplies, transformers for building No. 25, $2,192.

Note.—Work on the naval base was also done by the Departments of Public Works, Transport, National Defence for Air and Army and by the Canadian National Railways, particulars of which are as follows:

(1) The Department of Public Works, dredging and crane, grading and levelling, boom, defence grounds, $238,124.05.

(2) The Department of Transport, naval share of power, naval share reconstructing Sand Point road, $54,264.39.

(3) Department of National Defence (Air), fire alarm system, $2,265.11.

(4) Department of National Defence (Army), naval share, Diesel generator, $2,538.50.

(5) Canadian National Railways, railway sidings and spurs, $26,532.13.

Total amount, $4,029,751.10.

4. Shelburne is still in use as a refitting base and for storage of naval equipment and ammunition. Prior to the end of hostilities with Japan a number of ships allocated for service with the Royal Canadian Navy Pacific fleet were sent there for refit. These refits are being completed, and the ships are included among those which it is proposed to retain. Certain ships being declared surplus will, by arrangements with the War Assets Corporation, be sent to Shelburne to be winterized and will then be laid up in that port.

5. As at 28 September, 1945, there were 1,162 naval personnel stationed at Shelburne, Nova Scotia exclusive of naval personnel in ships based on Shelburne.

Mr. STANFIELD:

1. On whose recommendation and on what date was the site for the naval base at Shelburne Harbour, Nova Scotia, selected?

2. From what persons was the land purchased and how much was paid to each?

Mr. MACDONALD (Halifax):

1. Shelburne was originally recommended for the location of a defended harbour and small advance base by a special sub-committee of naval staff appointed to consider requirements for bases and fleet anchorages. This report was delivered to naval staff 25 June, 1940.

The war committee of the cabinet approved the establishment of a naval base at Shelburne on 17 July, 1940.

The actual site occupied on the harbour was selected following an investigation by experienced naval officers and engineers of the Department of Public Works. All possibilities were considered and the location now occupied selected as being the most suitable for naval development. The site was actually selected in September, 1940.

2. The following is a list of persons from whom land was purchased or expropriated and the amount paid to each of them:

Name	Amount
1. Howard Firth et al (Adam Firth Estate)	$2,239 50
2. Henry Ebson Goodick (Wm. Hill Estate)	161 00
3. Abigail Coffin, Ellen J. McGrath & Ralph Own McGrath et al (Penny Estate)	124 20
4. Municipality of the District of Shelburne	400 00
5. Martha S. Swansburg et al (Ellsworth Swansburg Estate)	622 50
6. Locksley & Elzear Crowe et al	900 00
7. Albert McCarthy et al (Andrew Clayton McCarthy Estate)	153 00
8. Bessie E. Ringer	150 00
9. The Colin C. King Estate	3,000 00
Total	$7,750 20

ST. CATHARINES STEEL PRODUCTS LTD.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

1. Has the government purchased or otherwise taken over the plant of the St. Catharines Steel Products Limited?

2. If so, upon what terms?

3. On what date was the transaction completed?

4. Was the equipment purchased as well?

5. If so, at what price and what terms?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. No, the plant in question was never owned by St. Catharines Steel Products Limited. The government in 1942 acquired the then existing part of the plant by expropriation, and has added to the plant from time to time since then. The whole plant has been, and still is, owned by the government. It was leased to St. Catharines Steel Products Limited for the production of munitions of war and supplies, and since this has now ceased the lease is being cancelled and the government is taking back possession of the plant.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Answered by No. 1.

4. Answered by No. 1.

5. Answered by No. 1.

MUNITIONS AND SUPPLY—PURCHASING DIVISION

Mr. CARDIFF:

1. How many branch or district offices of the purchasing division of the Department of Munitions and Supply are still being maintained?

2. What is, (a) the location of each such branch office; (b) the name, salary and qualifications of the chief of each such branch office; (c) the names and salaries of each person employed in each such branch office?

3. How many persons are employed in the purchasing division of the Department of Munitions and Supply at Ottawa?

4. Who is the chief of that division; what salary and/or other remuneration does he receive; and what were the qualifications for his appointment?

5. What salary did he receive prior to his appointment as chief of the purchasing division of the Department of Munitions and Supply?

6. What are the names, titles of positions, and salaries of each of the persons employed in the purchasing division of the Department of Munitions and Supply at Ottawa?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. Number of district offices..... 17
Number of sub-offices..... 3

Total 20

2. (a) Halifax, N.S., with one sub-office at H.M.C. Dockyard, Halifax, N.S., and one sub-office at Montcon, N.B.; Saint John, N.B.; Quebec, P.Q., Military District No. 5; Montreal, P.Q.; Quebec, P.Q., Dominion Arsenal.

Ottawa, Ont. (For Ottawa and Petawawa) with one sub-office at Canadian Signals Research and Development Establishment; Kingston, Ont.; Toronto, Ont.; Lindsay, Ont., Dominion Arsenal only; London, Ont.; Winnipeg, Man.; Regina, Sask.; Calgary, Alta.; Vancouver, B.C.; Victoria, B.C.; St. John's, Nfld.; Dayton, Ohio (U.S.A.).

(b) Sub-office, H.M.C. Dockyard—C. H. Newton, permanent civil servant, $2,820 per annum; many years experience with naval service.

Quebec, P.Q.—(Dominion Arsenal)—Under O. J. Hannon, purchasing agent grade 4, $3,420 per annum; 35 years purchasing, etc., experience in arsenal.

Sub-office, Ottawa area and Petawawa—Under R. C. Herrin, $2,820; in civil service since 1937 with five years departmental purchasing experience.

Sub-office, Ottawa area—at Canadian Signals Research and Development Establishment—Under W. N. Hodges, $2,220 per annum; four years departmental purchasing experience.

Kingston, Ont.—Under A. V. Woodruff, $2,820 per annum; six years departmental purchasing experience.

[Mr. McIlraith.]

Toronto, Ont.—Under W. J. R. Rogers, $4,320 per annum; purchasing agent, grade 6, five years departmental purchasing experience with many years suitable experience prior thereto.

Lindsay, Ont. (Dominion Arsenal)—Under W. G. D. Simpson, $2,820 per annum, purchasing agent grade 3, five years departmental purchasing experience with many years suitable experience prior thereto.

London, Ont.—Under P. G. Wyckoff, $2,820 per annum, purchasing agent grade 3; four years departmental purchasing experience with suitable experience prior thereto.

Regina, Sask.—Under A. P. Hessey, $3,420 per annum, five years departmental purchasing experience, with other useful experience prior thereto.

Dayton, Ohio (U.S.A.)—Under O. C. Graveley, purchasing agent, Grade 3, $3,000 plus living allowance $5 per diem. Four years departmental purchasing experience; other useful experience prior thereto.

(c)—Name—Grade—Salary

Sub-Office, H.M.C. Dockyard, Halifax, N.S.

C. H. Newton, Pur. Agt., $2,820; R. R. Hutton, Asst. Pur. Agt., $2,220; 1 Pur. Agt. Gr. 1, $1,740; 1 Clk. Gr. 3, $1,440; 1 Typ. Gr. 1A, $900; 1 Typ. Gr. 2, $1,080.

Quebec, P.Q. (Dominion Arsenal)

O. J. Hannon, Pur. Agt. Gr. 4, $3,420; 1 Prin. Clk., $2,020; 1 Clk. Gr. 2, $1,380; 2 Clk.-Stenos Gr. 2, $1,140; 1 Steno. Gr. 2, $1,200. Attached to M.D. 5 Purchasing Office.

Sub-Office, Ottawa Area and Petawawa

R. C. Herrin, Pur. Agt. Gr. 2, $2,820; 1 Prin. Clk., $2,040; 1 Clk. Gr. 2, $1,080; 1 Typ. Gr. 2, $1,140; 1 Steno. Gr. 1A, $900.

Sub-Office, Ottawa Area—at Canadian Signals Research and Development Establishment

W. N. Hodges, Pur. Agt. Gr. 2, $2,220; 2 Clk.-Typ. Gr. 2, $1,140.

Kingston, Ont.

A. V. Woodruff, Pur. Agt. Gr. 2, $2,280; P. A. Chamberlain, Asst. P.A. Gr. 2, $2,220; 1 Clk. Gr. 2, $1,200; 1 Steno. Gr. 2, $1,080.

Toronto, Ont.

W. J. R. Rogers, Pur. Agt. Gr. 6, $4,320; H. P. Lewis, Asst. Pur. Agt. Gr. 3, $3,300; J. A. Sutherland, Asst. Pur. Agt. Gr. 3, $3,120; V. E. Spratt, Pur. Agt. Gr. 2, $2,220; 1 Pur. Agt. Gr. 1, $1,800; 1 Pur. Agt. Gr. 1, $1,620; 2 Clks. Gr. 4, $1,740; 2 Clks. Gr. 1A, $960; 2 Stenos. Gr. 2, $1,140; 1 Steno. Gr. 2, $1,080; 1 Typ. Gr. 2, $1,320; 1 Typ. Gr. 2, $1,200; 1 Clk. Gr. 2, $1,140.

Lindsay, Ont. (Dominion Arsenal)

W. G. D. Simpson, Pur. Agt. Gr. 3, $2,820; 1 Clk.-Steno. Gr. 3, $1,440.

London, Ont.

P. G. Wyckoff, Pur. Agt. Gr. 3, $2,820; 1 Prin. Clk., $1,920; 1 Clk. Gr. 2, $1,200; 1 Steno. Gr. 2, $1,140; 1 Typ. Gr. 2, $1,080.

Regina, Sask.

A. P. Hessey, Pur. Agt. Gr. 4, $3,420; 1 Pur. Agt. Gr. 1, $1,620; 1 Clk. Gr. 3, $1,440; 1 Steno. Gr. 2, $1,200; 1 Steno. Gr. 2, $1,080.

Dayton, Ohio (U.S.A.)

O. C. Graveley, Pur. Agt. Gr. 3, $3,000; Clk. Gr. 3, $1,380 plus L.A. $3.00 per diem; 1 Steno. Gr. 2, $1,200.

The district purchasing offices at Halifax, Montreal and Winnipeg, and the sub-office at Moncton are operated on behalf of the department by the Canadian National Railways. The district purchasing offices at Saint John, N.B., Quebec, P.Q., Calgary, Alta., Vancouver and Victoria, B.C., are operated on behalf of the department by the Canadian Pacific Railway. Both railways operate the offices with railway personnel, and with the exception of the purchasing agents, staff salaries are billed to the department monthly. The services of the purchasing agents are provided by the railways without charge.

3. 324.

4. W. J. Atkinson, salary, $6,000.00 per annum. Qualifications, 20 years purchasing experience with the Canadian National Railways. Served as purchasing agent and in other executive positions with the Department of Munitions and Supply and its predecessors, the War Supply Board and the Defence Purchasing Board from August 1939, when he was seconded from the Canadian National Railways.

5. $5,400.00 per annum.

6.

	Per Annum
W. J. Atkinson, Director General	$6,000
T. F. Aspden, Assoc. Director General.	6,000
E. W. Croll, Asst. Director General	4,800
C. P. Morrison, Acting Consultant, Clothing and Textiles	4,320
E. H. Bradley, Consultant, Solid Fuels.	4,020
D. M. Erskine, Asst. Director General.	3,720
G. D. Cummings, Director, Pur. Div. #1	4,320
C. E. W. Morshead, Director, Pur. Div. #2	4,320
W. Dover, Director, Pur. Div. #4	3,720
E. A. Devitt, Director, Admin. Div.	3,720
E. H. Crawford, Sect. Head, Sect. "K"	3,720
R. A. S. Fraser, Sect. Head, Sect. "G"	3,600
E. J. Delisle, Sect. Head, Sect. "C"	3,420
J. Ginsberg, Sect. Head, Sect. "A"	3,420
J. S. Grant, Construction Engineer	3,420
F. X. Power, Sect. Head, Sect. "J"	3,420
W. C. Turnbull, Sect. Head, Sect. "R/Q"	3,420
L. K. Crabb, Director, Pur. Div. #3	3,420
H. W. Hart, Consultant, Leather	3,420
J. S. Clark, Sect. Head, Sect. "H"	3,120
F. G. Anber, Asst. Sect. Head, Sect. "A"	3,120
F. A. Palen, Inspector of Stores	3,060
W. H. Bloxham, Engineer	3,000
P. H. Hand, Asst. Sect. Head, Sect. "K"	2,820
W. D. Gamble, Food Allocation	2,820
R. C. Herrin, Pur. Agt. Gr. 3	2,820
W. T. Stanley, Food Allocation	2,700
G. T. Turley, Director, Admin. Div.	2,700
E. M. Clark, Asst. to Dir., Adm. Div.	2,700
B. R. Bruce, Asst. Sect. Head, Sect. "J"	2,700
W. G. Garden, Deptl. Acct. Grade 3	2,700
T. F. Alder, Sect. Head, Sect. "F/B"	2,520
H. Dexter, Clothing Product	2,520
P. A. Grimes, Asst. Sect. Head, Sect. "F/B"	2,520
H. D. Hoolihan, Construction Engineer also	2,520
13 Munitions and Supply Officers at	$2,400
8 Pur. Agts. Gr. 2 at	2,220
24 Principal Clerks at	1,920
12 Pur. Agts. Gr. 1 at	1,620
26 Clerks, Gr. 4 at	1,620
66 Clerks, Gr. 3 at	1,320
3 Clerks, Gr. 2A at	1,200
57 Clerks, Gr. 2 at	1,080
17 Clerks, Gr. 1A at	900
13 Clerks, Gr. 1 at	720
5 Stenographers, Gr. 3 at	1,320
23 Stenographers, Gr. 2 at	1,080
18 Typists, Gr. 2 at	1,080
1 Typist, Gr. 1A at	900
1 Typist, Gr. 1 at	720
2 Office Girls at	450

WAR ASSETS—DROP FRAME TRAILERS

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Has the War Assets Corporation been instructed to dispose of drop frame trailers owned by the crown?
2. If so, how many?
3. How many have been sold, and how many have been scrapped?
4. How many of such trailers remain to be disposed of?
5. What disposition is it proposed to make of them?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. No.
2. None.
3. None sold or scrapped.
4. None have yet been declared surplus.
5. Priorities will be filled, after which normal disposal procedure governing motor transport will be followed.

CANTEEN FUNDS

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Have all the recommendations of the special committee of the House of Commons on canteen funds been adopted and put into effect?

2. If not, what recommendations have not been adopted?

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. No.

2. (a) Recommendation of special committee that 2 per cent levy be made on all gross sales was not implemented in view of recommendation of select committee that large surpluses be not accumulated.

(b) That profits from the national organization canteens operated overseas be paid to central trust fund. All surpluses from operation of national organization canteens overseas have been frozen by Department of War Services but funds have been used as working capital and will be subject to subsequent adjustment.

PROVINCE OF QUEBEC RADIO ACT

Mr. COLDWELL:

1. Has the government referred the apparent infringement of federal jurisdiction by the province of Quebec under its recently enacted Provincial Radio Act, to the law officers of the crown?

2. If so, what is their opinion?

Mr. DORION: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw your attention to the fact that this question is not in accordance with the rules of the house. According to standing order 44:

. . . in putting any such question or in replying to the same no argument or opinion is to be offered, nor any facts stated. . . .

I think there is an opinion offered in this question, and also a fact stated, in that it mentions "the apparent infringement". Therefore I think this question should be ruled out of order.

Mr. COLDWELL: On the point of order, may I just say that I do not express any opinion in the question. I use the words "apparent infringement"; I do not express an opinion that it is an infringement.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I must say that I agree entirely with the hon. member who raised the point of order. The use of the words "apparent infringement" leaves the definite suggestion there that there has been an infringement. It is almost a statement of alleged fact. I therefore suggest it should not be part of the question.

Mr. SPEAKER: Dropped.

Mr. COLDWELL: I shall re-word it.

[Mr. McIlraith.]

Mr. MACKENZIE: Apparently you will.

Mr. COLDWELL: Apparently I will.

Question dropped.

GRANTS TO APPLE GROWERS

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie):

1. What is the total amount of grants voted by the dominion government to Canadian apple growers from September 1, 1939, to September 15, 1945?

2. What part of the total amount of grants was allotted to each province during the said period?

3. On what basis and under what conditions were such moneys granted to each of the nine provinces of Canada?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. $24 923,275.

2. Nova Scotia $20,032,735; Ontario $25,000; British Columbia $4,865,900. Not all expended.

3. Grants to Nova Scotia growers through the Nova Scotia apple marketing board and to Ontario growers through the Ontario fruit export association represented, mainly, compensation for the industrial absorption of apples rendered surplus through loss of overseas markets; grants to British Columbia growers through the British Columbia fruit board represented, mainly, partial absorption of loss in the f.o.b. price of apples for acceleration of sales in western Canada as a means of surplus absorption.

NATIONAL MEMORIAL

Mr. MACDONNELL:

Did the government consult, in connection with the plan for a national memorial mentioned in the speech from the throne, (a) with veterans' organizations of Canada to see if they approve of a national memorial taking the form proposed; (b) with representative bodies representing architecture, engineering, etc., to obtain their views?

Mr. MACKENZIE:

(a) While the decision as to the national war memorial is a responsibility of the government, it is proposed, when definite plans are available which can be placed before them, to consult the principal veterans' organizations. When the time comes for such consultation, it is expected that demobilization will have been completed or largely completed, and that the veterans' organizations will be representative of the veterans of the second as well as of the first great war; (b) the government has secured the services of Mr. Jacques Greber, architect and town planning expert of Paris, France, to advise with regard to the development of the national capital and its surrounding area. Mr. Greber was employed by the government before the war

in developing plans for the beautification of the city of Ottawa. It was considered desirable that the work already begun by Mr. Greber should be completed by him. In addition, the government is, of course, availing itself of the services of the permanent technical experts of the federal district commission and of the Department of Public Works. As the plans for the development of the national capital are worked out it is probable that additional expert assistance will be required from time to time. In this connection, the government has every intention of availing itself of the services of Canadian architects, engineers and town planners.

METLAKATLA INDIANS

Mr. ARCHIBALD:

What action has been taken by the government with respect to the application of the Metlakatla Indians of the west coast for the franchise?

Mr. GLEN: The request is now being considered and steps are being taken under the provisions of the Indian Act to appoint a board to consider the application.

CEILING PRICE ON WHEAT—OTHER EXPORT PRODUCTS

Mr. COLDWELL:

1. In view of the government's policy of preserving the present ceiling price of $1.55 for No. 1 northern wheat, basis Fort William and Vancouver, for the present crop year, are any other Canadian export products including textiles, lumber and pulp subject to similar ceilings for the same period?

2. If so, what products?

Mr. MacKINNON: I had intended speaking to the hon. member regarding this question, but I have not had an opportunity. The reason I am answering this question verbally is to bring to the attention of the house and to the country, if necessary, the mistaken premise contained therein. The announcement did not limit the ceiling price, did not give a ceiling price on wheat for this crop year. I merely stated that directions had been issued to the wheat board to offer wheat for the time being at $1.55 a bushel. The price may be higher before the end of the crop year, I do not know; but at the present time wheat is being offered at $1.55.

I have no wish to avoid answering the question, but in connection with the latter part of the question I can only say that consideration will be given to the other commodities the hon. member mentions in the light of conditions as they exist when these matters come up for discussion.

Mr. GRAYDON: That sounds like the Prime Minister.

AIR SERVICES—MARITIME PROVINCES

Mr. McCULLOCH (Pictou):

1. Have applications been received by any branch of the government for permission to operate a new network of air connections in the eastern maritime provinces?

2. If so, (a) from what company or companies; (b) where are their headquarters; (c) what are the names of places to be served; (d) location of terminals (i) Nova Scotia; (ii) New Brunswick; (iii) Prince Edward Island; (e) what type of plane will be used; (f) will it be an all year service?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. Yes. The air transport board has received applications from Maritime Central Airways Limited and Pulsifer Brothers Limited for licence to operate air services in the eastern maritime provinces.

2. (a) Answered by 1.

(b) (1) Maritime Central Airways Limited —Charlottetown, P.E.I., (2) Pulsifer Brothers Limited—Halifax, N.S.

(c) (1) Maritime Central Airways Limited: Moncton, N.B., Amherst, N.S., Truro, N.S., New Glasgow, N.S., Sydney, N.S., Greenwood, N.S., Yarmouth, N.S., Halifax, N.S., Saint John N.B., Sydney, N.S., Charlottetown, P.E.I. (2) Pulsifer Brothers Limited: Operating from bases at New Glasgow aerodrome located at Trenton, N.S., and at Waterville, N.S., to serve any point in maritimes within operating range of aircraft.

(d) (1) Maritime Central Airways Limited.

Terminals: (i) Nova Scotia, New Glasgow, Yarmouth, Greenwood, Sydney, Halifax; (ii) New Brunswick: Moncton, Saint John; (iii) P.E.I.: Charlottetown.

(2) Pulsifer Brothers Limited.

Terminals: (1) Nova Scotia: New Glasgow Aerodrome at Trenton, N.S.; Waterville; (ii) New Brunswick; (iii) P.E.I.

(e) (1) Maritime Central Airways Limited.

Type of Aircraft: Lockheed 10A, Lockheed 10B, Lockheed 12A, Rapide 89A.

(2) Pulsifer Brothers Limited.

Type of Aircraft: Tiger Moth, Cub Cruiser.

(f) Yes, for both operators.

BONDING OF TRUCKS, WINDSOR TO NIAGARA FALLS

Mr. COYLE:

1. Does the bonding of trucks from the U.S.A., travelling over highway No. 3 from Windsor to Niagara Falls still prevail?

2. If so, when will this operation cease?

Mr. McCANN:

1. Yes.

2. The privilege of trucking in bond over the route referred to was authorized following representations from the government of the

United States that it would be helpful to the war effort. Arrangements such as these involving international co-operation should not be terminated without consultation, and the only answer which can be given to this question at the moment is that the matter is receiving consideration.

VETERANS' LAND ACT—MANITOBA

Mr. JUTRAS:

1. How many veterans of this war have been settled in Manitoba under the Veterans' Land Act?

2. What is the average size farm settled on under the act and at what cost?

3. How many have settled in the electoral district of Provencher, and what are the locations of such by land description?

Mr. TUCKER:

1. Applications for financial assistance approved, as of August 31, 1945—131.

2. 201·85 acres. $4,071.10 for land and permanent improvements and $1,095.46 for livestock and equipment.

3. No veterans have been established under the act in the electoral district of Provencher.

INCOME TAX DIVISION—VANCOUVER AND VICTORIA

Mr. PEARKES:

1. In what building or buildings, in the city of Vancouver, is the divisional office of the income tax division located?

2. How many persons are employed in that office?

3. How many people are employed in the branch office located in Victoria?

Mr. McCANN:

1. Winch Building, 739 Hastings St. W.

2. Six hundred and two.

3. Twenty.

HOUSING—VANCOUVER

Mr. MERRITT:

1. Of the 1,200 houses for veterans contracted to be built in the city of Vancouver by Wartime Housing Ltd., by contract dated in or about the month of July or the early part of August, 1945, how many were under construction on, (a) the 1st September, 1945; (b) the 1st October, 1945, and how many were completed at the 1st October, 1945?

2. What is the average estimated time required for the completion of one of these houses?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. The agreement referred to was entered into with the city of Vancouver whereby Wartime Housing Limited undertook to erect 1,100 houses and the city agreed to provide improved lots for the construction of these houses. Lots are still being allocated by the city of Vancouver and as of September 27, 1945, lots for approximately 800 houses had been allocated by the city.

(a) As of September 1, 1945, the construction of 250 houses had been contracted for.

(b) As of October 1, 1945, the construction of 800 houses had been contracted for.

No houses were completed as of October 1, 1945, but it is expected—depending upon weather and other conditions—that completed houses will be delivered starting approximately December 1, 1945, at the rate of several houses per day.

2. On a contract for 250 houses, deliveries of completed houses generally start about four months after the date of letting the contract, with completion of the last house approximately ten months' time from the date of letting the contract.

SELECTIVE SERVICE—VANCOUVER

Mr. MERRITT:

1. How many, (a) male; (b) female, employment vacancies were recorded in the national selective service offices in Vancouver on 26th September, 1945?

2. How many, (a) male; (b) female, applicants for employment were so listed on said date?

3. Of the male vacancies, how many were in, (a) the logging, sawmill or other woodworking industry; (b) mining; (c) other manufacturing industry; (d) the construction industry; (e) others?

4. What were, (a) maximum; (b) minimum, rates of pay offered in each classification under question three?

5. What was the general classification of vacancies for female employment, stating particularly how many of the existing vacancies were for domestic service?

6. What were the, (a) maximum; (b) minimum, rates of pay offered for female workers?

Mr. MITCHELL:

1. The figures for September 26, 1945, are not available. Those given are for September 28, 1945—5,502 male, 1,721 female employment vacancies in Vancouver on September 28, 1945.

2. 5,673 male, 2,129 female applicants for employment, same day.

3. Of the male vacancies, there were 793 in logging, sawmill or other woodworking industry; 388 in mining; 2,148 in other manufacturing industry; 479 skilled and 149 semi-skilled in construction industry, and a total of 1,545 unskilled in all other male employment.

4. In logging, sawmill or other woodworking industry, maximum and minimum rates of pay were 60c to $1.50 per hour. In mining the rates were $4.62 to $7.55 per day. In other manufacturing industry, the rates were 50c to $1.12½ per hour. In construction industry, the rates were 50c to $1.31½ per hour; and in all others, the rates were between 50c and $1.31 per hour.

5. The general classification of vacancies in female employment were clerical workers, sales workers, household workers, waitresses, kitchen workers, textile workers, miscellaneous workers and cooks. There were 220 unfilled vacancies for domestic service.

6. The maximum and minimum rates of pay for these workers were, for clerical workers, $15 to $25 per week; sales workers, $15 to $25 per week; household workers, $20 to $60 per month, with board and room; waitresses, $15 to $18 per week, with meals; kitchen workers, $15 to $18 per week, with meals; textile workers, 36c to 65c per hour; miscellaneous workers, 30c to 62c per hour, and cooks, $22 per week.

*HOSPITALIZATION OF P.E.I. WAR VETERANS

Mr. McLURE:

What is the total number of Prince Edward Island veterans of this and the last war who are patients in hospitals in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, and other parts of Canada?

Mr. TUCKER: On being advised of the tremendous amount of work and expense entailed in obtaining an answer to this question, the hon. member who asked it was good enough to agree to have it dropped.

Question dropped.

EMPIRE PREFERENCES

Mr. THATCHER:

Has the Canadian government received any recent request from the government of the United States, asking Canada to agree to the abolition of her empire preferential tariffs?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: No.

REPRESENTATIONS AS TO NEWFOUNDLAND BECOMING PROVINCE OF CANADA

Mr. THATCHER:

Has the administration received any representations during the past year, either from the British government or from Newfoundland indicating the willingness or desire of the latter, to join the Dominion of Canada as a tenth province?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: No.

NATIONAL WAR SERVICES—POSTAL CENSORSHIP

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's):

1. How many employees are on the staff of the postal censorship branch of the Department of National War Services?

2. Are any of the employees of this staff being sent to Germany?

3. If so, how many; what are their names, addresses, ages, racial origin; what languages can they speak, and are they to be maintained by the government of Canada?

4. What is the estimated cost to Canada, (a) for each employee; (b) total?

Mr. McCANN:

1. 45.

2. None.

3 and 4. Answered by No. 2.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

RAW CANE SUGAR

Mr. BLACKMORE:

1. During each of the years 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944 and 1945 up to September 12: (a) how many pounds of raw cane sugar did the sugar administration import into Canada; (b) what was the total purchase price in Canadian currency paid for this imported raw cane sugar by the sugar administration f.o.b. seaboard; (c) what was the average price per cwt. so paid?

2. In each of the years 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944 and 1945 up to September 12: (a) how many pounds of raw cane sugar did the sugar administration sell to the Canadian cane sugar refiners; (b) what was the total price paid by the Canadian cane sugar refiners to the sugar administration for that sugar f.o.b. at the seaboard in Canadian currency; (c) what was the average price per cwt. so paid?

Mr. BLACKMORE:

1. On the raw cane sugar which the Canadian sugar administration imported in the years 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944, and up to September 12, 1945, did the sugar administration make a profit or suffer a loss in each of the above mentioned years?

2. What was the amount of profit or loss in each of the years indicated?

3. What was the average profit or loss per 100 pounds in each of the above years?

4. As a result of such purchases and sales of raw cane sugar by the sugar administration of Canada, how much money has been accumulated in the sugar stabilization fund over the operations of the whole period indicated?

CANE AND BEET SUGAR

Mr. BRYCE:

1. What quantities and from which countries did Canada import its raw cane sugar supplies in 1939?

2. What was the cost of same, f.o.b. seaboard in Canadian currency?

3. What was the value of Canada's exports to the countries which supplied Canada with raw sugar?

4. How many pounds of granulated white beet sugar is the full capacity of all six Canadian sugar beet factories?

5. What was the amount of Canada's beet sugar production in each year from 1937 to 1944 inclusive?

Mr. BRYCE:

1. Is there any difference between the ceiling price (wholesale) of cane sugar and beet sugar as allowed by the sugar administration in Canada?

2. Has the Canadian government at any time restricted by regulation or otherwise limited beet sugar production in Canada?

3. What is the total amount paid into the price stabilization fund established by the sugar administrator, June, 1940, by the beet sugar industry?

4. Has the paying to the fund increased the cost of beet sugar to the consumer? If so, by how much?

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT, 1944

Mr. FLEMING:

1. How many lending institutions have been approved under the National Housing Act, 1944, and what are they?

2. How many contracts have been entered into by the minister under part I of the act?

3. What is the total number of houses for which loans have been authorized under part I?

4. How many of such houses have been completed and are now occupied?

5. What is the total amount of the loans authorized under part I?

6. How many lending institutions have been approved under section 8 of the act, and what are they?

7. How many contracts have been entered into by the minister under part II of the act?

8. What is the total number of rental housing projects for which loans have been authorized under part II?

9. How many of such rental housing projects are low-rental housing projects?

10. How many of such rental housing projects have been completed and are now occupied, and how many of them are low-rental housing projects?

11. What is the total amount of the loans authorized under part II?

12. How many limited dividend corporations have been recognized by the minister as qualifying under the act to receive loans under section 9 of the act?

13. How many of such limited dividend housing corporations have received loans under part II?

14. How many life insurance companies have invested funds pursuant to section 11, and what companies are they?

15. (a) To how many municipalities have grants been made pursuant to section 12; (b) what are the individual amounts of such grants and what municipalities respectively have received them?

16. How many contracts have been entered into by the minister under part III?

17. (a) What is the total number of houses for which loans have been authorized under part III; (b) how many of such houses have been completed and are now occupied?

18. What is the total amount of the loans authorized under part III?

19. How many contracts have been entered into with manufacturers of plumbing or heating equipment or other component parts of houses, pursuant to section 15?

20. How many payments have been made under part IV, and what is the total thereof?

21. What regulations have been issued under part I?

22. What regulations have been issued under part II?

23. What regulations have been issued under part III?

24. What regulations have been issued under part IV?

Mr. MAYHEW: Return tabled.

ORDERS IN COUNCIL—BOARDS, COMMISSIONS AND CONTROLS

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

1. Have any orders in council been passed since the 8th of May, 1945, wherein, (a) recourse to the courts by a party aggrieved by decision of a board, commissioner or controller is specifically denied; (b) a commisisoner or investigating officer has the power in any proceeding to deny the right of a person appearing before same to be represented by counsel?

2. If so, give particulars?

AUTOMOBILE TIRES

Mr. MENARY:

1. How many automobile tires are there in Canada in the hands of the manufacturers or dealers?

2. How many tires were available in Canada in each of the years 1938 to 1942?

3. When will the present stock be released to general public?

DAFOE, SASK., BOMBING AND GUNNERY SCHOOL

Mr. BURTON:

1. What was the total acreage purchased for the bombing and gunnery school at Dafoe, Saskatchewan?

2. From what person or persons was such land purchased?

3. What was the total cost of construction of this airport, excluding the cost of land?

4. Has this airport been transferred to some other department or organization?

5. If so, under whose jurisdiction and management is it now?

6. If not, will this property be disposed of?

ENLISTMENTS FROM P.E.I.

Mr. McLURE:

What is the total number of enlistments in the armed forces during the period of the war of persons giving their domicile as Prince Edward Island?

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

BEAUTIFICATION OF OTTAWA—JACQUES GREBER

Mr. BOUCHER:

For a copy of all reports made to the government and/or the federal district commission by Jacques Greber on the beautification of Ottawa.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I have no objection to the motion passing, with the customary reservation in case there are any confidential papers—I do not think there are.

Motion agreed to.

SEMI-PERMANENT WARTIME HOUSES

Mr. FRASER:

For a copy of all letters, reports, contracts or agreements in possession of any department of the government in regard to the building of semi-permanent wartime houses.

Mr. FRASER: May I say in regard to this motion that I had a conversation with the minister's office and I would be quite satisfied if I could receive copies of contracts and agreements. I do not need the letters or reports.

Mr. HOWE: May I suggest that if my hon. friend will limit further his request it will help us considerably. There are several hundred contracts. If he could suggest any particular contracts that he would like to have, he would get the reply that much sooner.

Mr. FRASER: I shall call the minister's office on that. Subject to the reservation mentioned, I should like the motion to pass.

Mr. SPEAKER: Dropped.

Mr. FRASER: No.

Motion stands.

DISALLOWANCE OF PROVINCIAL LEGISLATION

Mr. COLDWELL:

For a copy of applications for disallowance of dominion-provincial legislation, made and refused since 1920, by years and provinces.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Mr. Speaker, I am informed that a pamphlet was published in 1938 dealing with all applications for disallowance from confederation up to that date. If it is agreeable to the house I should like to file a copy of that pamphlet as a part of the return and then comply with the terms of the motion from the date dealt with in the pamphlet to the present time.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is quite satisfactory.

PETITCODIAC RIVER POWER DEVELOPMENT

Mr. HAZEN:

For a copy of all correspondence, reports and surveys in the possession of any department of the government in connection with the proposed Petitcodiac river power development.

PRAIRIE FARM REHABILITATION—WOLVERINE CREEK, SASK., WATER PROJECT

Mr. BURTON:

For a copy of all correspondence, reports and other documents in the possession of the department, regarding the construction of a dam in Wolverine creek, approximately five miles southeast of Humboldt, Saskatchewan, under the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act, along with a statement showing, (a) who recommended this construction; (b) cost of preconstruction survey and testing; (c) cost of construction; (d) total cost; (e) amount of water impounded by the dam; (f) tests made.

HUDSON BAY ROUTE

Mr. KNIGHT:

For a copy of all reports made to the dominion government by the United States government of a survey made during the recent war by the United States government of the weather conditions of the waters and of the air over the waters of what is generally known as the Hudson's bay route.

Mr. CHEVRIER: With the understanding that none of this correspondence or reports is confidential or secret, I have no objection to the motion passing.

CANADIAN CITIZENSHIP

AVAILABILITY TO PERSONS OF CERTAIN RESIDENCE OR BIRTH QUALIFICATIONS

On the order:

Notices of motions—Mr. Castleden—the following proposed resolution—That, in the opinion of this house, it is in the best interests of Canada to establish a distinctive Canadian citizenship, which shall be available to all persons of certain residence or birth qualifications within the dominion.

Mr. G. H. CASTLEDEN (Yorkton): Mr. Speaker, this resolution proposes the establishment of a distinctive Canadian citizenship, available to all persons of certain residence or birth qualifications within the dominion. I notice on the order paper under the name of the Secretary of State (Mr. Martin) a bill which was allowed to stand to-day respecting nationality, citizenship, naturalization and the status of aliens. If I could have the assurance of the Secretary of State that the bill he is to introduce does provide such citizenship, I should be quite willing to let this motion drop.

Hon. PAUL MARTIN (Secretary of State): The hon. gentleman was kind enough to discuss this matter with me earlier. As the speech from the throne indicated, the bill standing in my name will create the status

of citizenship. It will not only meet the point the hon. gentleman has in mind; it will go much farther.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: In the circumstances I am prepared to let the motion drop.

Motion dropped.

BILL OF RIGHTS

PROTECTION OF MINORITIES, CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTIES, ETC.

On the order:

Notices of motions—Mr. Stewart (Winnipeg North)—the following proposed resolution—

That, in the opinion of this house, there should be incorporated in the constitution a bill of rights protecting minority rights, civil and religious liberties, freedom of speech and freedom of assembly; establishing equal treatment before the law of all citizens, irrespective of race, nationality or religious or political beliefs; and providing the necessary democratic powers to eliminate racial discrimination in all its forms.

Mr. ALISTAIR STEWART (Winnipeg North): I find myself in the same position as the previous speaker. My motion asks for a bill of rights dealing with certain aspects of the citizenship of the people of Canada. In view of the fact that the Secretary of State is going to introduce his bill, and I have some assurance that the things I should like to see in it will be discussed in this house, I am quite willing that this motion should be dropped.

Motion dropped.

LIVE STOCK

PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS FOR REGULATION AND CONTROL

Mr. WILLIAM BRYCE (Selkirk) moved:

That, in the opinion of this house, the government should take into immediate consideration the advisability of appointing a board of live stock commissioners in Canada, for the purpose of regulating and controlling the assembling, transporting, grading, marketing and exporting of live stock and live stock products.

He said: There is no branch of agriculture, Mr. Speaker, in which there is as much confusion as exists in connection with live stock to-day. We have a great many government appointed boards, committees, supervisors, inspectors and investigators, all of whom appear to lack the cohesion necessary for the efficient operation of this important branch of agriculture. I therefore appeal for legislation to be enacted by the federal government to make possible the creation of a board of live stock commissioners, the majority of the members of which shall be recommended by farm organizations. This board would parallel in a general way the work done by the board of grain commissioners in the regulation of the grain trade.

Might I point out to the house that this is not a political gesture but something the farmers have fought for ever since I came to Canada twenty-six years ago. Farm organizations all over the dominion have repeatedly asked for this legislation. I do not intend to take up the time of the house by reading all the resolutions which would prove my statement, but I am going to quote from the brief presented to the cabinet by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture in February, 1944:

> This federation desires to repeat its request of former years that the federal government should establish a board of live stock commissioners, with powers and duties similar to those of the board of grain commissioners. It requests that the said board be empowered to administer, under the Department of Agriculture, the Live Stock and Live Stock Products Act, and that the members of the board shall be appointed in consultation with organized agriculture. The Live Stock and Live Stock Products Act should be amended and consolidated with other legislation in order to vest in the board the power to license, regulate and control the facilities for assembling, transporting, yarding, slaughtering, processing and packing, together with the facilities for grading and selling all live stock and carcass products designed for human consumption. . . .

Their recommendation in this connection in the brief presented to the cabinet in February, 1945, was quite short, and I am going to place it on record also:

> We again wish to record our sincere conviction that many of the problems of live stock marketing as regards assembling, grading, price differentials, transportation, processing, and the regulations governing these matters, can best be solved by the appointment of a board of live stock commissioners. We therefore repeat our request, made on previous occasions, for the setting up of such a board.

This board should be empowered to administer, under the Department of Agriculture, the Live Stock and Live Stock Products Act; and the members of the board should be appointed in consultation with organized agriculture. The act should be amended and consolidated with other legislation in order to vest in the board power to license, regulate and control the facilities for assembling, transporting, yarding, slaughtering, processing and packing, together with the facilities for the grading and selling of live stock and carcass products designed for human consumption. The board should have power to make such levy on the products under its jurisdiction as may be necessary to defray the cost of its operations.

Speaking on a previous occasion in the house, I said that some of the surplus money accumulated in the condemnation fund could quite easily be put to that purpose. With such a board in operation it should be possible to deal satisfactorily with many causes of difficulty and dissatisfaction to producers, which frequently arise. It would be of particular importance in developing a system of grading live stock and live stock products under which standards of grading to consumers in Canada, or for the export trade, and to producers might be coordinated as closely as practicable.

I wish to direct the attention of the government to the disability suffered by live stock producers from time to time, when the congestion of transportation facilities, packing plants or cold storage warehouses prevents live stock in process of marketing from being disposed of or being delivered for sale at the normal plant or slaughter-house. In the past western Canada has shipped hogs over two thousand miles to have them slaughtered. This is a serious business, and we hope that sort of thing will never occur again. I am also of opinion that existing price control regulations do not provide adequate protection to cattle producers. To-day certain classes of cattle are selling at below their value. It should also be pointed out that favourable weather conditions this fall have enabled producers to maintain an orderly movement of cattle to market It is obvious that any break in weather conditions would bring a rush of cattle to market which would immediately aggravate the situation.

There has been a pronounced trend in Canada toward larger business organizations, and in many cases toward monopolistic markets. The meat packing industry, and other distributing organizations have in general followed this trend, and a large part of the purchasing of western live stock is done by three companies. The concentration of buying power in the hands of three firms is a serious situation. Concentration in the buying of live stock has been accompanied by the weakening of the position of the producer as a marketer. The protection which the producer had in the public market has now practically disappeared.

It is my view that the position with respect to the marketing of live stock is simply that buying is now concentrated in a relatively few hands, and selling is largely disorganized and ineffective. Under these conditions we cannot expect adequate provisions making for a sound live stock industry in Canada.

Since 1920 a great change has taken place in the method of marketing live stock, and particularly in that of marketing hogs. This change came in the form of direct buying by the packers, and a decreased use of public markets. In 1920 only about five per cent of Canadian hogs went direct to the plants, whereas in 1938 we find that eighty-five per cent of all hogs went direct. Whatever strength or weaknesses were involved in the public markets system, it used to perform an important function, namely that of providing a meeting place for buyers and sellers, and of registering from day to day price levels which reflected competitive bidding for the vast proportion of live stock marketed in Canada.

At the same time, with sixty-five per cent of our live stock going direct to the packing plants, and only thirty-five per cent passing through the public market it cannot be said that the public market is a proper indicator of the value of live stock, because packing houses to a very considerable extent are now independent of the supplies which come on the public market.

If, as a result of direct buying, values are not finally established in the public yards, price making for live stock is not a matter of public negotiation. Under these circumstances prices of live stock are largely determined on the basis of the prices packing houses are prepared to offer on any particular day, and not as a result of a thorough bargaining process.

It may be argued that under a system of direct buying, bargaining actually does take place between the producer or his representative or agent, and the packers, in so far as the packer must offer a price sufficient to induce the producer to sell in the desired quantities. This situation, of course, is not significant in the practical marketing of hogs because, owing to the grading regulations now laid down, the producer has little or no choice as to the time at which he will sell his product. Penalties are attached to overweight and underweight hogs, and these strict grading regulations have limited the choice which the farmer may exercise in respect of the time at which he sells his hogs. His product must be sold, no matter what the offered price may be.

The board would give continuous study to the steps necessary to make more efficient and satisfactory the services of our public central markets, and the insurance of competitive bidding in the sale of live stock.

Direct shipment to packing plants has developed very rapidly and, if increased to any marked extent, may make doubtful the continuation of our public markets. This would mean a monopoly of buying in the

hands of the packing plants. Such a development would have serious consequences to our producers.

The whole problem demands serious study. One-half of all the hogs delivered at the stockyards in 1938 arrived by truck, and in the same year one-third of the cattle came by truck. If truck shipments delivered direct to the packing plants were included, the percentage of the total shipped in this way would be considerably increased.

One thing we must remember is that the man who trucks stock to the market is a trucker; he is not a producer. He is more concerned about a full pay load than about the selling of the animals. Two complaints are brought against the method of marketing. One is that it is claimed that packers buy live stock from truckers at less than stockyard prices. A check made by investigators for the price spreads commission in the month of March, 1934, seems to support this contention. The packer has complete freedom of grading, when buying direct. In addition, direct purchases are made on an off-car basis, while in the stockyards animals are fed and watered before being sold. This may make a difference of seventy-five pounds in a 1,000-pound cow. The farmer saves the commission merchant's fee, the stockyard charges and part of the freight he would otherwise have to pay. In spite of these savings, it is probable that he obtains from direct sales a smaller net return than could be obtained from selling on the public yards.

Secondly, it is argued that the weakening of the stockyards system by a process of direct sales is deterimental to the producer. This seems a reasonable argument. The elimination of the central competitive market would probably put the producer at a considerable disadvantage in selling to two or three large buyers. If we are to establish fair economic returns, and security for primary producers, I do not believe we can ever again rely upon the automatic processes of what in the thirties was erroneously termed a free competitive market. Such automatic processes broke down hopelessly in the depression years, and are now almost completely discarded as incapable of the supreme test of war-time conditions.

In one of his speeches Mr. Donald Gordon, chairman of the war-time prices and trade board, said:

> Selfish and private interests must be ruled out completely and the competitive system must be replaced with one which is based entirely upon the criterion of maximum production.

Having failed us in these two periods, it would in all probability be disastrous to risk the return to such automatic processes in the post-war period, one which promises to be the third and not the least of a series of national emergencies. I am therefore suggesting that the live stock industry in Canada should be brought under public regulation through a board of live stock commissioners, and that that board be constituted with producer appointed representation thereon. Such a board might be composed of nine members. Of these the chairman, vice-chairman and one other member should be salaried and devote their full time to problems of the live stock industry. The others should be representative of producers, consumers, government services and the packing industry. They should attend meetings when required and serve without remuneration, except for fees and expenses for each meeting.

The powers accorded to this board should cover, among others, the following points:

1. The administration of the grading of live stock.
2. The regulation of all purchasing agencies, including country buyers.
3. The regulation of public and private live stock markets.
4. The establishment and maintenance of export standards.
5. The hearing and investigation of complaints from producers, marketers or processors with respect to any live stock problem.
6. The regulation and publication of grade discounts.
7. The supervision and auditing of condemnation insurance.
8. Continuous study of the economic basis of the live stock industry, including:

(a) Methods of stabilizing live stock prices.

(b) Methods of securing a better seasonable distribution of marketing.

(c) Methods of securing and maintaining adequate feed supplies and promoting their distribution within Canada.

(d) Methods of improving the quality of live stock.

(e) Promotional work in securing export markets.

(f) Methods of narrowing the spread between prices to the producer and prices to the consumer.

(g) Methods of extending research and statistical facilities.

(h) All other matters affecting the live stock industry.

In conclusion, I would say that farmer representation on such a live stock board should be the strongest available. It is no place for political appointments. The greatest interest in the live stock industry is the

interest of the men and women who produce the live stock, and it is a matter of prime importance that they be fully and adequately represented on such a body. I hope the government will do something about this matter without any further delay.

Mr. MARK C. SENN (Haldimand): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a good deal of attention to the arguments which have been advanced by the hon. member who introduced this motion. I think this motion is of extreme importance to the farmers of Canada. For many years the production of live stock has been an important branch of agriculture, not only in this country but I believe in every country of any consequence in the world.

If the fertility of our soil is to be maintained our farmers must not grow crops year after year without returning something to the land. Such a course may be successful for a while, but the land will finally become exhausted and crop failures will be the inevitable result. It is a proven fact that the best way to maintain the fertility of the soil is to raise animals on the farm. I think it is also a proven fact that the best way to market our crops is to feed them to live stock and then market the live stock. The production of live stock has steadily and gradually increased in Canada for a great many years, and this increase has been very marked indeed during the years of the war.

In a return brought down in answer to a question asked by the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Ross) it was shown that the hog population of Canada in 1939 was 4,360,000. In 1943 it had risen to over 6,000,000. The cattle population in 1939 was 4,693,000, and this had risen to over 6,000,000 in 1944. Another return showed that the value of cattle marketed in Canada in 1944 was $202,000,000 odd. The value of hogs marketed during the same year was $323,000,000. The value of sheep marketed was over $12,000,000. The over-all total was $538,000,000 worth of live stock marketed in Canada during 1944.

These figures illustrate clearly the importance of the live stock industry to agriculture generally throughout Canada. It is an obvious fact that this live stock is produced by thousands of farmers. There are over 740,000 farmers in the Dominion of Canada, and well over sixty per cent of those farmers produce live stock on their farms in some way or another.

It is an obvious fact too that production is only the first stage in the live stock industry. It is manifestly impossible for a farmer to slaughter his animals and process them for domestic consumption or for the foreign market. The result is that a large army of men has grown up throughout the country for the purpose of collecting, processing, grading and distributing our live stock. This army of men is continually taking a toll of consumer prices that are realized and on the whole, the producer must be satisfied with what is left. Middlemen are indispensable in the live stock industry, because they are performing a useful and necessary service. They must have an adequate reward for the performance of those services, but I think it is apparent to everybody that the time has come when some control of this vast and intricate system should be set up.

As the mover of the resolution has stated, a similar condition prevailed at one time in the wheat trade, and the board of grain commissioners was finally set up under the grain act to control and regulate all aspects of the wheat trade. At the time that board was set up there was considerable opposition, and I have no doubt that there will be considerable opposition to the idea outlined in this motion. However, I wonder if there is anyone in this country who would advocate a return to the conditions in the grain trade that prevailed before the board of grain commissioners was set up; I wonder if there is anyone who would advocate its abolition. I do not believe there is anyone in Canada who would do such a thing.

No doubt the same arguments that were advanced when the board of grain commissioners was set up will be advanced at this time. It will be argued that there is machinery already in the Department of Agriculture to regulate and control the live stock industry in all its aspects. It is true that there are many capable men in the Department of Agriculture; they have done good work, and I can find no fault with them or with the work they have done. At the beginning of the war, under the War Measures Act, a number of boards were set up, what you might term war boards. The first was the agricultural supplies board. It would not be possible for me to read into *Hansard* at this time all the duties that were conferred upon that board by the order in council which set it up. One principal thing, the basis of all duties which were enumerated there, was:

> To direct and regulate through the various dominion and provincial agricultural services and through advisory boards representative of the industry which are already constituted, or which may be established, the production, preparation and conservation of farm products.

A little later an agricultural food board was set up under order in council P.C. 5163. Briefly, the duties of this board are as follows:

Subject to the approval of the Minister of Agriculture and in cooperation with the agricultural supplies board to develop and direct the policies and measures of the Department of Agriculture for the wartime production of food.

A third board, known as the bacon board, was set up, and that board was later renamed and reconstituted as the meat board. It had certain powers, and I want to read one or two of them to the committee, because I believe it shows how important they are, and to what extent their powers could go if they carried them all out. May I say in passing that the meat board did take over the export trade in meat products to, I believe, all the countries of the world. At least the export trade which had formerly been carried on by private enterprise was taken over by this meat board. Here is one of the things they were allowed to do under the powers conferred upon them:

To determine the prices which shall be paid to packers or other persons for meat delivered for export. . . .

And so on. They were to determine the prices which should be paid to packers. Under another clause, paragraph (e), they have power to fix the minimum price to be paid by packers or other persons for live stock. I do not believe they ever exercised that power, but it indicates how broad their powers are and how necessary it seemed at the beginning of the war that there should be some supervision of the meat trade. I suppose that when the War Measures Act goes out of force, or very soon afterwards, these boards, unfortunately, will automatically cease. Whether they do or not, I think I have said enough to prove that some kind of supervision is necessary over the whole live stock industry if it is to flourish as it should.

What are some of the reasons why a live stock commission should be set up? Just speaking in generalities, because I do not want to go into particulars, I would first say that they should see that the farmer, who is the primary producer, gets a square deal. They should see that the farmer receives a fair share of the consumer's dollar. They should see as well that efficient production of live stock is made possible for the live stock producer. I think they should also ensure—from the other angle—that the consumer is not exploited. They should see that he does not have to pay too much for services rendered in bringing meat products to the consumer's door. They should see as well that the spread between producer and consumer

prices does not widen and continue to widen as it has done in days gone by, but on the other hand is reduced to the narrowest possible margin consistent with giving a fair return to the middlemen who have to process and distribute the food. To accomplish this, the proposed live stock commission should, as the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bryce) has said, be free from political influence, and I believe its powers should be clearly defined by amendments of the present live stock act. May I point out in passing that the leader of the party to which I have the honour to belong advocated at Lethbridge in 1943 that a live stock commission should be set up with powers somewhat similar to those of the board of grain commissioners.

Reference has been made by a previous speaker, and by myself, to the fact that the wheat board has done a remarkable piece of work for the people of this country, and particularly for wheat producers. But that is not the only board which has been set up for similar purposes. In 1933 the select standing committee on agriculture and colonization conducted an exhaustive examination of the fluid milk trade throughout the dominion. It was an extended investigation; there are some thousand pages of the report. It was pointed out at that time that the fluid milk trade operates mainly within the boundaries of the provinces and is therefore under provincial control, but there is a recommendation in the report which I think should be of interest to parliament at this time. It is this:

Your committee recommends that tribunals should be set up vested with authority to settle differences between producers' and distributors' organizations and, if necessary, to fix the returns to the producers and the prices charged the consumer.

Following that, some six provinces set up boards to exercise supervision over the fluid milk trade, and I am sure everyone will agree that the results have been very beneficial indeed. I know at least that in Ontario, with which I am better acquainted than with any other part of the dominion, higher prices to farmer producers were obtained than could have been realized otherwise. The price to the farmer has been stabilized and he has been given some feeling of security by these boards which have been set up.

Let me go a little further. Ten years ago there was set up a royal commission on price spreads. That commission made an extensive study of all phases of the live stock industry, and the report makes very interesting reading. It investigated the production, the collection, the processing and the marketing of live stock products of all kinds.

Its conclusions were clear-cut and were given somewhat in detail. I believe that conditions to-day would be somewhat similar if it were not for the war years and for the fact that we have boards set up already which, as I have already remarked, I assume will go out of existence when the War Measures Act is repealed.

One paragraph of the report was devoted to the stockyards and the public markets. The chief criticism which was offered in the report was the lack of competitive buying in the yards. In the early history of the stockyards there were many buyers on the market, but as the years went by the numbers grew less and less; many of the smaller packing plants were eliminated, either by mergers or by absorption in bigger plants; and then there was the other question of direct shipment, with which I shall deal in a few moments. The report also states that there was evidence of arrangements between buyers. One sentence in that report has special significance and a particular bearing on the commission now under discussion. It is this:

> When many competing sellers are faced by few buyers who act in concert or who tacitly agree to follow the lead of larger buyers, exploitation becomes possible.

This is true to-day as it was in those days.

Another paragraph deals with the retailing of meat products by stores. Chain store activities came in for criticism because of the use of "loss leaders" and inequalities in prices. Then the matter of direct shipments was dealt with, and a recommendation was made by the commission which I wish to read; it is very short:

> Direct shipments of live stock should be subject to the same rules of weighing, grading, publication of prices, deliveries, and supervision, as shipments to the public stockyards.

I believe that if that were done by the live stock commission it would very nearly meet the ideas of the hon. member who introduced this motion. It also urged that strict supervision of the export trade should be undertaken. One could mention at some length other features which were discussed and recited as proof of the need of greater supervision of the whole live stock trade. Their recommendations, as I have said, were clear and concise. It will only take a moment or two to read what they have to say in their final recommendation which was brought down late in the year 1935:

> As a step toward the solution of some at least of the problems which we have outlined, we recommend the establishment of a live stock board, under appropriate jurisdiction.
>
> The duties of the board should include, among others, the following:
>
> (a) The prompt dissemination of information to producers and the trade generally, in respect to production, marketing, stocks, and prices, both export and domestic.
>
> (b) Administrative jurisdiction in matters connected with all phases of live stock marketing and in connection with disputes between producers, processors, etc.
>
> (c) Licensing and supervision of truckers, dealers and export packers; where necessary in cooperation with provincial authorities;
>
> (d) Adequate inspection of all marketing stages and action to correct abuses;
>
> (e) Cooperation with producers, processors and the trade generally, to ensure as far as possible a balance between production and available markets;
>
> (f) To encourage the organization of producers of live stock for regular and orderly marketing;
>
> (g) Improvement of quality of all live stock;
>
> (h) The formation of a uniform policy on external marketing, with a view not only to promoting new, but also retaining and developing, existing markets.
>
> (i) The stabilization of supplies, and the regulation of quality to each particular market;
>
> (j) The utilization of all available means to secure fair returns to the primary producers of good stock.

The powers that the board should have under these recommendations coincide very well indeed with these powers which were outlined by the hon. member who brought this resolution into the house. This recommendation is very definite. It is strictly in line with the pronouncement made by the leader of my party (Mr. Bracken) in his Lethbridge speech, and having been a member of the royal commission on price spreads. I agree with that report and its recommendations. I have always thought since that it would be in the interests of the live stock industry at large.

One more matter. The live stock industry is now faced with a very serious situation. If the threatened strike of packing house workers materializes, the effect on the live stock industry in this season of heavy shipments will be disastrous. I was surprised yesterday when the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner), in reply to a question on the orders of the day, stated that the government could do nothing about the matter.

Mr. GARDINER: I did not say that.

Mr. SENN: The minister's statement was pretty close to it.

Mr. GARDINER: I answered the question, if these men did go on strike what could the government do in order to remove the difficulties that the farmers would have? I said there was not very much that could be done to remove the prejudice if they did go on strike.

Mr. SENN: The minister said there was nothing he could do. I think there is some-

thing that could be done even then, but it should be done earlier. According to a statement made recently by the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs, Canada is still at war and the War Measures Act is still in effect. It is not altogether the proper thing for the Minister of Labour to state that this is a matter that is up to the province. While the War Measures Act is in effect the federal authority is supreme and has a right to do as it likes in these matters. I urge that the question be dealt with immediately if the producers are to be saved from the consequences which would inevitably follow a strike at this particular time.

I think it is unanimously conceded that the establishment of a board of grain commissioners has been of decided advantage to the people of Canada and to the grain trade, and I think it is equally true that the provincial boards set up to deal with the operations of the fluid milk trade have greatly benefited both the producer and the consumer. I therefore ask the government to take into serious consideration the recommendation made in this motion, and in fact to adopt the motion as a forward step for the benefit of the live stock producer and of agriculture generally.

Mr. J. W. BURTON (Humboldt): I wish to say a few words in support of the motion moved by my friend and colleague the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bryce). In doing so I shall give a number of reasons why I consider it necessary and desirable that the members of this house should pass this resolution. First, I believe that the request contained in the motion is reasonable. If you will allow me, Mr. Speaker, I will read the motion again, wherein it states that:

> . . . the government should take into immediate consideration the advisability of appointing a board of live stock commissioners in Canada, for the purpose of regulating and controlling the assembling, transporting, grading, marketing and exporting of live stock and live stock products.

If we the members of this house consider this motion we shall find that we are asking something very reasonable of the government. All that we are doing is to ask them to give immediate consideration to taking this action. At times I look into the book that some of us occasionally need to refer to, the dictionary, and I find that "consider" means "to think, to think about." I am quite sure that the government will not refuse to think, because we would have reached a very sad state of affairs if the government refused to think. We ask them to think about appointing this board of live stock commissioners, and the terms we suggest to them to follow are also reasonable—"for the purpose of regulating and controlling the assembling, transporting, grading, marketing and exporting of live stock and live stock products."

The second reason why I am happy to support this motion is that it is necessary in the interests of the live stock industry as a whole.

I am happy that we can bring before the house and ask the government to consider a motion to take action on something that is of concern to such a large number of people, not only as producers and handlers but ultimately as consumers. There are many people concerned with the live stock industry. They are dependent upon it. I should like, therefore, to refer the house to a publication entitled "Live Stock Market Review," published by the authority of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner). If I may, I would congratulate the minister and the officials of his department, first of all, on compiling the statistics given and preparing and presenting them to us in the manner in which we have them. I do not know how widespread this publication is in the country but I know that I appreciate receiving it regularly. Page 5 of this booklet indicates that there are live stock yards in Toronto, Montreal West, Montreal East, Winnipeg, Calgary, Edmonton, Prince Albert, Moose Jaw, Saskatoon, Regina and Vancouver. When I first looked over this list I failed to understand why the maritimes did not have a live stock yard or market. If they have not one I think they should get busy and obtain one. If they have a number of markets I suggest that they get in touch with the minister to see that they are put on the map. I was disappointed to see that such a large section of the dominion, which I know raises considerable live stock, is not included in this list.

We find that spread all the way from Montreal to Vancouver there are these large centres and markets where the live stock that is produced is being handled in one way or another. In that connection I should like to refer to the week ended October 4. In that week 33,727 head of cattle went through the markets I have mentioned. There were 9,912 head of calves, 18,454 hogs, and 21,131 sheep. In addition to that, we have the other situation referred to by the hon. member for Selkirk. He then indicated that a practice has developed whereby the packing houses send their own drovers out into the country to gather up live stock and hogs and ship them direct to the packing plants without putting them through the public markets or the live stock yards.

The department gives us some information on that. Included in this booklet are the

shipments to plants for the week ended October 4. It shows that 53,170 cattle were shipped direct to plants whereas there were only 18,454 listed through the stockyards. There were 17,363 calves shipped direct to the plants and only 9,912 to the stockyards. In the same week there were shipped direct to the plants 52,376 sheep. To obtain comparable figures for hog marketing we are asked to turn to the table on page 6. They do not give us the total number of hogs shipped direct to the plants. I think the minister might ask the officials of his department to check into that and see if we cannot get this additional information.

On page 6 to which we are referred we find that hog carcasses graded in the week ended September 29 and also from January 1 to date, 1945. There we find some interesting figures. According to the table, in the week ended September 29, 83,538 hogs were graded. In the same week last year there were graded 112,017. I should like to have the minister and hon. members bear in mind how these figures compare. To date in 1945 there have been graded in these packing plants 4,378,655 carcasses. In the same period last year there were 6,614,226 carcasses graded.

In that connection I might refer the minister to what my colleague, the hon. member for Selkirk and I brought to his attention a number of times during the past year or so. We said that with the policy being followed we were bound to have a reduction in the production of hogs and bacon products. I might say that, speaking in the Saskatchewan legislature before that, I drew it to the attention of the then minister of agriculture of Saskatchewan, who is now chairman of the Canadian meat board, and he along with the federal Minister of Agriculture practically laughed at the suggestion that we would have a reduction in the production of hogs. However, the figures show that to-day. That is not the point with which I am concerned to-day, although it is something that we should have been concerned with during the past few years. The point that I am concerned with is to show to hon. members that the live stock business is big business and that it is affecting the lives of a lot of people. We have these markets scattered from Montreal to Vancouver. In addition to that we have eleven stockyards, and the packing plants involved have numerous drovers. Then there are shippers, cooperative concerns, individual shippers and trucking by farmers. I contend, that, with a business of that size spread all over the country, with the interests of so many people involved, and with so many people handling the product, it is in the interest of everyone concerned to have some regulating authority along the lines suggested by the hon. member for Selkirk. I suggest that the resolution, if agreed to, will not deprive anyone of his just dues, but, on the contrary, will be of service and protection to everyone.

I have another reason for supporting the motion. The majority of the people whom I have the honour to represent are greatly concerned about this matter. I believe that there are very few if any constituencies in Saskatchewan where the people as a whole are so dependent on mixed farming, as we call it, as they are in the constituency of Humboldt. In that constituency we have no mines, no timber of marketable size and no industries except perhaps an odd creamery or something of that kind. We have only two towns, which would not be of any great size as towns are considered in the east, but one is a divisional point for the Canadian National railway and the other is a divisional point for the Canadian Pacific railway. With the exception of the people in those towns practically everyone in the constituency is dependent upon the returns from agriculture for livelihood, most of them directly and the remainder indirectly. Ever since that country was opened up some forty odd years ago we have been carrying on what I have referred to as mixed farming. We did not go into it in a spectacular way; there are few if any herds of prize-winning cattle, but still the people on the land from the early homesteading days have gone into the production of cattle and hogs, and during the years have produced an enormous amount of wealth by way of live stock.

I am sure that all the older members from the west, including the Minister of Agriculture will recall the difficulty we had in persuading the governments of that time that we needed a board of grain commissioners to supervise the handling of the enormous amounts of grain being produced in the prairie provinces. Eventually, after a great deal of work and agitation, that board was appointed. Any person who would suggest now that the board of grain commissioners be done away with and that in regard to grain we go back to conditions similar to those under which live stock products are handled to-day, would meet with a cool reception and would deserve ridicule. In the early days the emphasis was placed upon the production of grain, and finally we obtained the board of grain commissioners. In the intervening years the agricultural picture in western Canada has gradually changed, and more

and more districts have taken up what we have had in the Humboldt district from the very beginning, mixed farming and the production of live stock. As I mentioned previously, we have arrived at the position where the live stock industry has become big business, and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the members of this house that it is in the interests of the producers, in the interests of those who handle our products, in the interests of those who process our products and in the interests of those who consume our live stock products that we have a board of live stock commissioners.

Mr. J. A. ROSS (Souris): Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the resolution moved by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bryce) may I say that on various occasions during the last parliament I requested the appointment of a board of live stock commissioners with producer representation. This has been and is a plank in our platform, as was stated this afternoon by my colleague the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Senn), who dealt with the findings and recommendations of the commission on price spreads some years ago, which I agree were all to the good. He also dealt fully with the many boards which have been set up during the war years to deal with the production, processing and handling of meat in this country, pointing out that with the elimination of the War Measures Act most of these boards would go out of existence.

The marketing and exporting of live stock and live stock products has been most unsatisfactory even during the last few years. As has been pointed out, in western Canada at any rate in the early twenties we depended upon wheat for our livelihood. In those years I believe some seventy per cent of the income of the western farmer came from the production and sale of wheat. That picture has changed very greatly to-day. In the same area I believe wheat accounts for only about forty per cent of the income of the farmer. Great increases have taken place in both hog and cattle population of Canada from coast to coast, and particularly in the prairie provinces. In 1939 our cattle population was 4,693,500. In 1945, according to a return brought down at the end of September, it was 6,676,400, so that there was an increase of approximately forty-two per cent in the cattle population this year.

As one hon. member said a few moments ago, the production and marketing of live stock in this country has become big business to-day, and many people depend upon it for their livelihood. Previous speakers have pointed out the difficulties which were encountered a few years ago when we asked for the establishment of a board of grain commissioners, but I am sure everyone will agree that this board is rendering a great service in the various ways it regulates the marketing of grain in Canada. I hold in my hand the report of that board for 1944, setting out on the last page the regulations of the board, under some fifty-nine headings. I do not think I should take time to mention them all, but that should indicate the great service being rendered by this board to the wheat producers of the country.

Now that live stock has become just as important as wheat, in dollars and cents; now that it affects probably as many producers in Canada, if not more, I think we are just as much entitled to a live stock commission. The hon. member for Haldimand pointed out that my leader and this party for years have requested that such a commission be set up. It has been pointed out that the greater percentage of hogs marketed now go direct to abattoirs or packing plants. Not long ago the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) made an appeal in this house for a greatly increased production of bacon for shipment to Britain during the next two months. I fully agree with his appeal, but it seems strange that since that appeal was made the price of pork has gone down in various markets across Canada. I have never been able to understand why these fluctuations should take place. If I might refer again to the way in which our grain is handled, the government are now in a position to tell the producers, usually before seeding time in the spring, what they can expect for their product for the coming year. Under a price ceiling system such as is operating in Canada I have never been able to understand why these fluctuations should take place in connection with live cattle and hogs at marketing centres. Perhaps I might add that these fluctuations have been more varied in respect of cattle than hogs. On several occasions at this session I have asked the Minister of Agriculture to try to explain to the producers why the same animal which was running in pasture, on good grass, at the end of June or July, and which has grown and gained in flesh and in condition, should sell six weeks later for a smaller figure per pound. Why should this condition obtain, especially when meat is controlled as it is in Canada? That situation does prevail and has prevailed year in and year out at certain periods of each year. It is one which should not be permitted to continue.

Many other arguments have been advanced this afternoon. While I shall not repeat them, may I say that I concur in them. Cer-

tainly it is my view that a majority of producers in Canada from coast to coast are in favour and most desirous of setting up a live stock commission such as has been described by the hon. member who moved the resolution. This is something for which, as I have said, I have asked on repeated occasions since 1940.

Without taking further time I make an appeal to the government to take steps toward the setting up of a commission to operate in the interests of live stock producers in Canada as a whole, so as to assure them of some degree of justice in the marketing and processing of their live stock—operations which have become big business in this country.

Mr. ROBERT FAIR (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, as another practical farmer and as a member of the committee on agriculture which sat during the last parliament, I wish to add my support to that of hon. members who have already spoken in favour of the resolution moved by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bryce). I consider that this matter has been far too long delayed. It has been considered by farmer organizations all across Canada, and on different occasions requests along this line have been made by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture.

I realize, as do many other hon. members, that since the beginning of the war the live stock industry flourished to a greater extent than it had previously. Even at that, however, far too many abuses still exist, and far too many leakages take place. The result of those leakages is going into the wrong channels.

I believe it is in the interests of the government and of the Canadian people as a whole that the commission be set up, so that the wrongs which still exist can be set right. I do not believe it is necessary to discuss some of the questions which have been debated this afternoon. Perhaps it is sufficient to say that the members of this group are fully behind the suggestion made by the hon. member for Selkirk, and that we fully endorse it. Therefore we ask the government to give this suggestion immediate consideration, and to have the new commission appointed.

Mr. E. D. FULTON (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, I should like to support the suggestion made in the resolution now under discussion that there be set up a board of live stock commissioners to order and regulate marketing of live stock products in this country. It is not my intention to enter into any great detail with respect to that matter, but there is a related subject to which I should like to give some attention this afternoon, one which has a most definite bearing on the marketing of live stock. I refer to the report of the likelihood of a strike taking place in meat packing plants throughout this country.

On various occasions in the course of this debate it has been said that those engaged in agriculture, and particularly those connected with the production of live stock, are in a better position to-day than they have been for many years. This is perfectly true, and I scarcely think it is necessary to remind hon. members that their present position is in marked contrast with the state of affairs which existed up to the beginning of the war. Therefore any steps that can be taken to prevent a recurrence of pre-war conditions are in my view essential to the welfare of the country.

I should like to refer to certain questions which have been addressed to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) in connection with the threatened strike in the meat packing plants. Two questions which were put to him on Tuesday, October 9, and to which he gave answers, sought to bring forth from him some assurance that a strike would not be allowed to take place in the meat packing plants. The questions were asked in order that the producers of live stock might be assured that their markets would be kept open, and that there would not be that decline in price which is bound to follow from any strike in packing plants.

As reported at page 827 of *Hansard* for October 9, the Minister of Labour admitted that he did understand the position in the packing plants, and made this statement:

> I have received a letter from the secretary of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture. Any decision made with respect to the purport of the letter will be made known when the government makes a decision. The answer to the first part of the question is yes.

That is, the minister was aware of the situation.

> We are in constant touch with the provincial departments of labour with respect to what some people anticipate will be a dispute or strike in the packing house industry in this country.

I submit that very little comfort can be found in these words. There is little of the assurance which the producers of this country are hoping for, namely that the strike will not be allowed to take place, or that if it does take place their position will be safeguarded.

The minister, asked for a further statement, made this reply:

> If my honourable and garrulous friend will just give me an opportunity to answer the question which was put by the leader of the opposition—

One would have thought we were to get a reassuring answer, but he went on to say:

I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that I can add much to what I have already said.

I submit, therefore that the live stock producers of Canada have very little justification for thinking that their interests will be protected by responsible ministers of the government.

I should like to give briefly the reason why a strike in packing plants of Canada is a matter of such importance to the producers of live stock. I have a telegram from the British Columbia beef cattle growers' association asking me to take up this matter with the government. I have done so through questions in the house and private discussion with the Minister of Labour. The purport of the telegram is that the producers of live stock wish to have the assurance that the government is taking all possible steps to avert a strike and to allay producers' fears, in view of the fact that a panic at this time would mean disaster. The seasonal run now on would be aggravated by the efforts of producers to market before the threatened stoppages occur.

If hon. members will cast their minds back to the situation last July they will recall that at that time a strike took place in the meat packing industry of Canada. What I wish to do now is to show why a strike is important and why it is viewed with alarm by producers. I would show, too, the adverse effect on the cattle marketing situation brought about by the strike that took place at that time, and I would point out the adverse effect a repetition of the strike would have to-day. I am reading from the "Live Stock Market Review" published by the Department of Agriculture marketing service for the week ended July 19 of this year. On page one of the "Review," under "Summary," it is stated:

Cattle offerings, as compared with the corresponding week last year, were fairly generous, but the market showed ability to absorb everything on hand. In some instances gains were recorded.

And further down:

Eastern cattle markets. A good clearance of cattle was made at Toronto, with all grades selling firm, and the top of the market at $13.75 for two loads of prime weighty steers.

By the next week the strike was beginning to make itself felt. Reading from the same report for the week ending July 26, we find under "Summary" the following:

The demand for cattle was adversely affected this week by unsettled labour conditions. In some packing houses in Toronto there was a strike early in the week and the possibility of a similar situation developing at some other packing house centres. The larger buyers were therefore operating sparingly but the small operators, not being directly affected, were active at the somewhat reduced values which resulted from the temporary slowdown in total demand.

And further down:

Eastern cattle markets. Closing prices on cattle at Toronto were about fifty cents lower, with last sales of choice weighty steers at $12.75 and $12.80.

If we take the top price for the previous week of $13.75, it will be seen that in one week the price went down from 95 cents to $1 per hundred pounds, not 50 cents. That is the drop in price in one week as the result of the strike.

Mr. GARDINER: Not on the same class of cattle.

Mr. FULTON: Even taking the statement that they were fifty cents lower, we find on page 5 of the report that cattle marketings at public stockyards during the week were 21,121 head. Taking the average beast as weighing 1,000 pounds, which I think the minister will agree is a fairly good average, at fifty cents per hundred pounds we find the loss on an average beast amounts to $5. If you multiply that by 21,121 you get a total of $105,605, which represents the loss to the producers in one week. The decline in prices to that extent was the direct result of the unsettled labour situation, as stated in the market review, or, in plain words, it was the result of the strike in the packing plants.

I think we can see quite clearly how important this matter of a strike in the packing plants is to the producers of meat. It is of increased importance at this time because of the seasonal run of cattle on the market. This always takes place in October and November when grass on the range is getting short and winter is about to set in. Producers are anxious to market their cattle and take advantage of high prices before feeding difficulties may begin. The result is, again using the department's own figures, that for the week ending September 27, the latest report, sales of cattle at public stockyards were 29,221 head, an increase over the July figure of 8,100 head. That is to say, the seasonal run of marketings at this time is over thirty-five per cent higher than it was in July. With those two facts in mind, that in one week in July the loss to producers was over $105,000 and that in October the marketings were over thirty-five per cent higher than they were in July, I think this house will see how important this question of a strike in the packing plants is to the live stock producers of this country.

In view of this serious situation I directed a question yesterday to the Minister of Agri-

culture, which I should like to read, along with his answer, as reported on page 827 of *Hansard*:

With respect to the anticipated strike in the meat packing plants, is the Minister of Agriculture in a position to make a statement which will reassure the producers of meat that their position with respect to marketing will not be prejudiced should there be such a strike?

Hon. J. G. Gardiner (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I think all that I can say is that if there is a strike in the packing plants the position of the producer will be prejudiced and nothing this government can do will prevent it.

Mr. GARDINER: Read it all; read the next part.

Mr. FULTON: By all means.

Mr. Homuth: Should do, or will do?
Mr. Gardiner: Nothing that they can do will prevent the producers' position from being prejudiced if these men do go out on strike.

I submit that that answer is indicative of the defeatist attitude of this government. I am reminded of a previous occasion when a member on the government side of the house said that after all, private members of parliament could not accomplish very much, and they would soon find that out. We on this side of the house do not share that view. It seems to me that this government is bemused and bewildered by the problems which now face them. If they are going to answer a question in that way, I say to them: If you cannot do anything about it, perhaps you will move out and let somebody in who can.

Mr. GARDINER: I did not say that we could not do anything about it.

Mr. FULTON: The minister said:

Nothing that they can do will prevent the producers' position from being prejudiced—

Mr. GARDINER: If they do go out on strike.

Mr. FULTON: I am going to suggest something that the Minister of Agriculture can do to prevent the producer's position being prejudiced. There is at this time an embargo on the export of cattle to the United States. It has been suggested by members of this house and by cattle producers' associations that that embargo might be removed. I am going to suggest to the minister that if a strike in the packing plants of this country should take place, he take into consideration the lifting of the embargo on the export of cattle to the United States. The minister may answer that we are attempting to supply a maximum amount of meat to Great Britain and to UNRRA.

Mr. GARDINER: Would the hon. member like my answer?

Mr. FULTON: Not yet; wait until I have finished.

Mr. GARDINER: My memory is that every member on that side of the house voted against the trade treaty which allowed cattle to go into the United States at lower duty.

Mr. FULTON: I do not know of the occasion to which the minister is referring. I am referring to the possibility of a strike in the meat packing plants of this country. I was not here on the occasion to which the minister refers. If the minister will permit me to make the suggestion I want to make to him, I will sit down and he can have the floor to give his answer. If a strike takes place in the packing plants and we do nothing about it I am certain that Great Britain, UNRRA and the devastated countries in Europe will not get our meat. The result will be our producers will be affected and our standard of living will go down. If the embargo on exports of cattle to the United States is lifted, that country, which is also trying to export the maximum amount of meat to the devastated countries, will have our meat and they can export it. If our packing plants cannot handle it, why not make a deal with the United States to have their packing plants handle it until the strike is over in this country? I suggest to the Minister of Labour—

Mr. MITCHELL: Just to carry it through to the logical conclusion, it is the easiest thing in the world to suggest that we do what the hon. member says we should do.

Mr. FULTON: I am glad to hear that.

Mr. MITCHELL: I know my hon. friend is an expert on cattle, and I bow to his superior knowledge, but suppose they would not process the meat in the plants of the United States; what then?

Mr. FULTON: I am sorry I cannot give the minister an answer. I suggest a deal should be made or some inquiries instituted. I am offering the suggestion. Unfortunately we are not on the government benches, so we cannot carry out this suggestion. I am suggesting that some approach be made to finding a solution to this problem.

The Minister of Labour said he realized that I am an expert on cattle. I certainly do not hold myself out as an expert, but I do know that producers of meat, of whom my constituency contains a very large number, are extremely worried over the prospect of this

strike. That is why I am suggesting to responsible ministers a course which they might take, a course which would result not only in the opening again of that potential market in the United States, but would help solve to some extent the United States meat shortage, would make meat available to the devastated countries without the loss of time and of meat which would follow a strike in our packing plants, would prevent a certain and definite loss to the producers, and, if it were stated now that some such step will be taken, would remove the fear they now have which may bring about a panic and a sudden run and glut of cattle on the market.

As I say, we are not on the government side and therefore are not in a position to put these suggestions into effect. But a suggestion was made yesterday in another matter to the Minister of Labour which he was kind enough to say was very constructive. All I ask is that, in the interests of the meat producers of this country, the Minister of Agriculture give the same degree of consideration to this suggestion.

Mr. ROBERT McCUBBIN (Middlesex-West): I have listened with interest to the discussion which has taken place on the motion which was moved by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bryce). I have also listened to other members discussing this question, and as to whether it would be in the interest of Canada as a whole and of the live stock industry if a board of live stock commissioners were appointed. All those who have spoken during this last hour and a half have taken the stand that such a board should be appointed, and have given their reasons for doing so. I am going to take the opposite view. I feel that we have now boards enough, if not too many.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Such as they are.

Mr. McCUBBIN: And at this time I do not think it is in the interests of the live stock industry to appoint such a board.

As you know, we have a dominion-provincial conference, and members of the house are watching its proceedings. It is adjourned until the end of November, when it will again meet. The government put out a little book, which I have read with interest, containing the proposals of the dominion government for this dominion-provincial conference on reconstruction. I suppose all hon. members have read it. Certainly those who are interested in agriculture will read what is therein contained with respect to agriculture, our basic industry. I am going to read into the record just a couple of paragraphs, containing proposals to the conference which should be of interest to those engaged in agriculture. I quote:

No industry has made a greater contribution to the Canadian war effort than agriculture. Its achievement has left problems of conversion to peacetime conditions comparable to those of manufacturing industry. Many branches of agriculture were greatly expanded in response to war needs, and overall production increased to levels far exceeding those of the past. This accomplishment drew heavily upon agricultural resources, resulting in heavy depreciation of machinery and equipment and great strain on the depleted farm population. The dominion government feels it has a responsibility to assist the industry in making the necessary readjustments to peace-time circumstances and to work in cooperation with the provincial governments to provide for a greater degree of stability in farm income and a greater measure of security than has prevailed in the past.

I skip a little, and come to the subject of marketing which is dealt with in the resolution of the hon. member for Selkirk.

In the field of agricultural marketing, there are two matters that merit special consideration; one has to do with the regulation of the movement and sale, the other with the grading and inspection, of products. With respect to the first, it has been noted that some of the provincial governments have provided legislation under which various marketing plans and activities are developed. It would appear that this is evidence of an interest that should be considered at this conference in so far as dominion-provincial relationships in the marketing field are concerned.

The second aspect of the matter, namely that relating to grading and inspection, is one that has concerned the dominion and provincial governments for a great many years. By various means, the regulations with respect to grading, inspection, packaging and labelling of products have been enforced to the advantage of producer and consumer alike. From time to time, however, the procedure followed has been interrupted by decisions of the courts which have indicated that either the dominion or the provincial governments had exceeded their respective powers. It is apparent that the dominion and the provincial governments are agreed as to the need for some action which will clarify the control and direction of activities in this field. Under these circumstances, it would appear that the conference should give some consideration to this matter with a view to achieving the desired control.

That is the attitude of this government at this conference in respect to agriculture and the marketing of agricultural products. The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Senn), who was the only speaker from Ontario, has referred to this live stock industry, which had a value last year of $538 million, as something which is worthy of consideration; and I wish to commend all the speakers who have taken part so far on their sincerity and honesty in trying to provide the necessary machinery for the orderly marketing of farm products. Though I may not agree with it, nevertheless they are putting forward their own proposal.

The hon. member for Selkirk has brought up this matter in the house before, as also has the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Wright) and, I believe, the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Ross). It has been stated that the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) spoke on it in a speech at Lethbridge. As the hon. member for Selkirk has mentioned, it is sought to deal with these problems in the same manner as that in which the board of grain commissioners are dealing with wheat. The price spreads report has been mentioned here to-day. I have in mind a statement which I read in that report, and also in *Hansard,* in the year 1935, when the ex-minister of trade and commerce, Hon. H. H. Stevens, said to the then leader of the government, Right Hon. R. B. Bennett, that he thought the government was dodging its responsibility to the grain trade by appointing a board of grain commissioners. That was his view at that time. I am not saying it was right or wrong. But we in Ontario got mixed up with the wheat board, to our sorrow, one time in the marketing of our wheat. I hate to have to say this; nevertheless it is true: the board and the administrators and the office workers in connection with it used up all the profits, after the initial price had been paid, in the administration of the board, and we as producers received only a cent or a cent and a half on our participation certificates.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I know that the hon. member will not mind a question. Is he talking about the Canadian wheat board or the grain commission? They are two different organizations altogether.

Mr. McCUBBIN: I am talking about the wheat board.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): That is not the grain commission.

Mr. McCUBBIN: Did I say the grain commission? I thought I said the wheat board. It is "the wheat board" that I have written down here. That was our experience with the wheat board in the province of Ontario.

I will admit, Mr. Speaker, that wheat is not handled in a satisfactory manner in the province of Ontario; it is not handled in the way it is dealt with in the west. This, however, will be discussed at another time.

We in Ontario feel that we are not getting a fair show as regards the price we are receiving for our wheat.

Mr. BURTON: In comparing the wheat board with the board which the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bryce) suggests, the hon. member is in error because what is asked for is a board of live stock commissioners similar to the board of grain commissioners.

Mr. McCUBBIN: Let me go on. The question will be asked, where will the money come from to run such a board if we are to have a board of live stock commissioners. I have no doubt that some one will say there will have to be a certain percentage taken off the price of each head of cattle. Some might say it would have to come out of the condemnation insurance. At any rate, it will come from some source, and the farmers of my province do not like to see any little slices taken off their product.

I have every reason for saying that there is no class of people in the dominion who love freedom more than the farmers, and as I listened to the debate yesterday, I was never so proud to belong to that section of the population. You may say, what are we doing in the interests of marketing cattle? Are we trying to help the producers of cattle? We have now a wheat board, and we have floor prices for farm products, with a board of administration. As I have said, I have always felt that we have too many boards, and I stand by that statement. I have not heard any previous speaker mention this, but we have now an advisory committee to the food board for the administration and selling and marketing of farm products such as bacon and beef. That advisory committee is comprised of three members appointed by the federation of agriculture—Mr. Hannam, who is chairman of the board, and two others —and nine members appointed by the provinces, making a board of twelve. This is an advisory committee to the food board and it is doing a very good job. I am not here to criticize the members of that body in any way. We feel that the dominion and the provinces will cooperate in the marketing of farm products.

May I refer to a sale that was held just two weeks ago in Manitoulin island, and in this connection I commend the farmers and the live stock men of that small island for banding themselves together and organizing that sale. They had the cooperation of the provincial government, who sent up Mr. R. H. Graham, a member of the Department of Agriculture there, a very good man. I knew he would do a good job. Some 2,100 head of cattle were disposed of on that day. Not only were there farmers from my own district, who went many miles to attend the sale to procure feeder cattle, but the packing houses in Toronto sent a representative to bid in cattle, so that there was competition at the sale, and I am sure that if you spoke to the farmers of Manitoulin island they would say that they made a good sale of their cattle and that the sale had been conducted in a splendid manner.

You may say to me, "If you are not in favour of this board, what are you in favour of?" In my opinion, under the dominion department of agriculture and the departments in the provinces everything possible will be done. They have efficient officers and they will try to see that our farm products are marketed in an orderly manner in the interests of the farmers of the country.

I suggest that we need markets more than we need boards, and I would not support this government if I did not think that they will do everything in their power to procure markets for Canadian farmers.

This question of a live stock board was brought up some years ago. The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Senn) will remember this better than I do, because I was not a member of the house. The matter was brought up by the then member for Peace River, Mr. Kennedy, who introduced the subject in 1935. At that time the leader of the government, Mr. Bennett, opposed the setting up of a live stock board because in his opinion there would be overlapping. I have a copy of *Hansard* of that day and I could quote from it to show that in his opinion it was not in the interests of agriculture to set up a live stock board of the kind that is asked for to-day. That was his view. As I say, we are more interested in markets.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Let us look to the future.

Mr. McCUBBIN: I am looking to the future, but we have to review the past if we are to look properly into the future. Some of the hon. members who have spoken to-day voted in 1936 against the trade agreements which did so much for the farmers and the cattle producers of the country.

The hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton) referred to the lifting of the embargo from Canadian cattle going into the United States. No one would be happier than I to see it lifted, but that is not possible at the present time. However, I hope the day is not far distant when that can be brought about.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Why is it not possible?

Mr. McCUBBIN: It is not possible because we have certain commitments. The governments of Canada, the United States and Great Britain have certain commitments across the sea, and we intend to carry out those commitments. We have been asked for two hundred million pounds of beef, and another twenty-five million pounds, if we can send it, and it is our duty to see that it is shipped. However, as I say, I hope the day is not far distant when we can ship our cattle to the United States, and I wish to commend the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), my leader, for the visit he paid President Truman before leaving for overseas. I am sure that under his able leadership and that of President Truman, agreements will be consummated which will be in our interests as well as in the interests of the American people. We know that the United States Senate is permitting the president to reduce tariffs in future trade agreements by a further fifty per cent, and that will be to our advantage. I am happy to see our friends on the other side of the house willing to support these trade agreements. I hope I shall be sitting on these benches when such an agreement is voted on in the house, and I trust that members on the other side will not then do as they did in 1936 and 1939, but will stand up and support the agreements which I have every reason to believe will be brought into effect by the present leader of the government.

I am not here to uphold and commend everything the government has done with regard to the cattle industry. It has done certain things in the last five years that I do not like as a cattle producer, and the people whom I represent do not like them; nevertheless, there are certain things that must be done in wartime, and we are willing to do them. But we are willing to have them done by this government and not by any board. This government should take on the responsibility of bringing in any legislation that is necessary; it should not be done by members of a board.

Mr. CASE: And not by orders in council.

Mr. McCUBBIN: That is all right.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): There are exceptions.

Mr. McCUBBIN: I have always taken that stand because I believe in it. The other day I listened to the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario, (Mr. Macdonnell) and with a good deal of what he said I was in agreement. I am a farmer and I speak on behalf of farmers. I feel that this government, of which I happen to be a supporter, is one that will do the utmost to legislate in the interests of our farmers and primary producers; for there is no class of people who have done more—and they will continue to do a great deal—for the welfare of this country. I hope the government will go forward with the legislation that is on the statute books and not appoint a lot of boards. I hope they will take the necessary steps themselves, and if there is to be any discussion it should take place on the floor of the house or in committee.

Mr. BRYCE: Would the hon. member permit a question? Am I to assume from the hon. member's remarks that the Ontario federation of agriculture is against a board of live stock commissioners for Canada?

Mr. McCUBBIN: I never made any such statement. I am speaking only for myself.

Mr. BRYCE: The hon. member is speaking only for himself?

Mr. McCUBBIN: I am only expressing my own views.

Mr. BRYCE: A board of live stock commissioners has been endorsed by four hundred thousand farmers in Canada.

Mr. F. W. TOWNLEY-SMITH (North Battleford): May I say a few words in support of the resolution which has been introduced by my colleague the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bryce)? I fail to see, if the principle is sound in the case of grain, why it should not also be sound in the live stock industry. We have a board of grain commissioners to-day.

At the present time we are short of meat. The reason we are short is that our live stock producers have stopped producing live stock. There are two main reasons for this. One is shortage of help. Incidentally this may concern the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Abbott) more closely than he possibly realizes. The other reason is that the live stock producers feel that they have not been receiving a reasonable return. There is a physical limit to what a man can do. The difficulties of the war have pressed rather heavily upon the older men who have had to feed the live stock. They have not been able to feed the quantity of live stock that they might wish to do. One of the first things that a man lets go of when he feels he is unable to handle the whole situation is what is commonly known as his chores, and on the farm his chores consist principally in the feeding of live stock. Therefore live stock raising suffered immediately the labour shortage became apparent. Of course, if there is not sufficient help to raise live stock the farmer cannot do it. But if he feels that he is not getting a reasonable return he will not do it regardless of the labour situation. I know this is the feeling that obtains to a considerable extent in the west. Rightly or wrongly they feel that their position could be improved very much by the establishment of a board of live stock commissioners.

The farmers have run into all kinds of small difficulties. I do not wish to speak of them in a general way, but I shall touch on one or two. First of all, let me say that my hon. friend to the right could not understand why there was such a range in the price of dressed hogs, since the price of bacon and the grades are fixed and the animals are on the rail. That is to say, there is no need for allowances in errors of judgment of the buyer when he is buying a live animal; yet we find that there is a range of prices. Last week in Toronto prices ranged from $17 to $17.90 a hundredweight. While $17 is the average price and $17.90 is the range, it would indicate that some of the hogs were sold for even less than $17. That is one thing I, too, do not understand.

In 1936, the west was in difficulties over its shortages of feed and we were compelled to get rid of a lot of our live stock. At that time our live stock was pretty thin. The government of the day guaranteed a price of one cent a pound if we shipped in our live stock and disposed of them. Even at that we received complaints. I approached a drover who was in charge of the handling of a lot of this one cent stock in order to see what the difficulties seemed to be. These are a few of the things he told me. The cattle were taken, incidentally, from my small home town up to Edmonton, a distance of some two hundred miles in a straight line on the railway. The complaints of the farmers at that time were, first, that the cattle were taken straight to the packing plant and not weighed in the stockyards. They were weighed on the packing plant scales. The second complaint was that they were not fed and watered before they were weighed. In one case that he mentioned they were kept in the yards for fifty hours before they were unloaded. He then gave me some of the shrinkages on a two hundred mile rail journey. He had three cows which shrank 760 pounds. He had one bull which shrank 300 pounds; he should have shot him, I imagine. He had another cow which belonged to a neighbour of mine and in which I was particularly interested which shrank from 1,400 pounds to 1,160 pounds, a matter of 240 pounds of shrinkage in this cow.

Another grievance which they feel they have at the present time—and I speak quite feelingly about this because it happened to me—is the range of the different grades. Anyone who is connected with farming knows that the A-pig carcass ranges from 140 to 170 pounds, the B-1 from 135 to 175 pounds, the B-2 from 125 to 134 pounds, and the B-3 from 176 to 185 pounds. There have been difficulties and stoppages at various packing plants for various reasons, and the farmer has not always been able to gauge accurately the weight of his live animals. He guesses at it and sometimes he is a good guesser; sometimes he

is quite a long way out. But in some cases his live animal was just on the edge of being too heavy for a particular grade. With another couple of pounds it would have been too heavy for the particular grade and would have had to go down a grade because it was too heavy. Then his animals were shipped away and, the packing plants not being able to handle them for various reasons, an animal was sometimes kept for a week before it finally got into the packing plants. During that week it was fed, at enormous cost incidentally, and when it did get into the packing plant it had made so many more extra pounds that it was out of the grade. That was one grievance. In my own particular case I had one particular pig which was one pound too heavy and it went down a grade. It was docked fifty cents a hundred pounds because it was one pound too heavy, and incidentally it missed the government premium. I talked this matter over and complained to a man who was familiar with the workings of the packing plant, and he thought it was very funny, because he said that with one quick slice of the knife one pound would be taken off the carcass and it would go up in the grade after it had got out of my hands and when it got into the packer's hands. Therefore, as I have said, we have the feeling that with the appointment of a commission to take charge of all these matters we could iron out many of our difficulties. If there should be a jam in Edmonton, cattle could be sent to Saskatoon, and so on. The commission would keep an eye on all these things and probably we would not be troubled with strikes or threatened strikes at some of the packing plants, as we are at the present time. I consider it highly probable that such a commission would be able to keep all these difficulties under control, and in that way we would have less trouble.

The main point I wish to make is that rightly or wrongly the live stock producers believe they would be better off under a commission. Our ambition at the present time is to get them back into the production of live stock; so let us agree with them for once and grant them this live stock commission.

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I should take time to speak to the house on a resolution of this kind. This is supposed to be a day when private members have the time pretty well to themselves. However, in view of the remarks that have been made and the suggestion that the minister should say something on the matter I have decided to break the general rule and say a few words in regard to this resolution.

As the hon. member for Middlesex West (Mr. McCubbin) has pointed out, this is not a new question in this house. A similar resolution was introduced as far back as 1935, prior to the election of that year, which means that the matter was considered in this house before most of those now here, including myself, were elected. In other words, none of us here to-day can claim credit for having suggested for the first time that a commission of this kind should be appointed. I do not know that a resolution of this kind has ever passed the house on any previous occasion, although I have not checked the records to make certain, but it has been discussed during many sessions since I came here ten years ago, and it was also discussed before that time.

I make that statement in order to point out that the matter has been given a great deal of consideration. I agree with the statement of the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Burton) that in order to give consideration to anything you must think; and I am sure a great deal of thinking has been done about this matter. It is not necessary for the House of Commons to ask the government to give thought to it; we have done so already. On many occasions we have discussed it with representatives of farm organizations and members of this house who have brought the matter to our attention; from time to time it has been discussed in council meetings and elsewhere. So that it has been given a great deal of consideration and a great deal of thought.

I wish to speak this afternoon only in order to follow up some of the expressions of opinion that have been given in regard to the matter. It has been suggested that we ought to appoint this commission because away back, I think about 1901, we set up what was known as a board of grain commissioners to deal with the marketing of wheat in western Canada. Everyone who was in the west at that time, as I was, will recall that the situation existing then in relation to wheat was entirely different from the situation existing to-day in connection with the marketing of live stock products. Our grain was graded by elevator and warehouse men out at country points, and we had no redress in connection with that grading. It was because of the manner in which the grading was done and because of the manner in which our grain was handled that we agitated for, and I might even go so far as to say that the western farmers demanded, a board of grain commissioners. Certainly they

[Mr. Townley-Smith.]

brought their influence to bear upon Ottawa, and finally secured the appointment of that board.

I believe the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Senn), who this afternoon referred to the report of the commission on price spreads in 1934 or 1935, will agree when I say that it seemed to be the opinion of most people at that time that the act setting up the board of grain commissioners is ultra vires of this parliament. The question naturally arises, then, as to why this legislation has never been contested. The fact of the matter is that from seventy to eighty per cent of all the wheat grown in the three western provinces is exported, and that only a very small portion of the wheat grown in those provinces is consumed there. We are the most sparsely populated part of the Dominion of Canada; we farm great acreages, and we produce a great many bushels of wheat in comparison with the number of people in that area. So that, since we market such a large percentage of our wheat outside the provinces where it is grown; since that wheat is practically all grown in three provinces, and since at that time all the wheat had to pass through the city of Winnipeg, it was comparatively easy to set up an inspection point at Winnipeg and have all the grain that was going to foreign markets or to the mills in eastern Canada graded at one point by one set of inspectors.

I mention these facts in order to indicate two principal points of difference between dealing with wheat and dealing with live stock products. One is the fact that unlike meat or milk, the greater percentage of the product is not consumed in the province where it is produced but is shipped out and sold somewhere else. The amount of wheat grown in Saskatchewan that is marketed in that province, for example, has practically no bearing at all upon the price which can be obtained for the entire crop grown there. There is not enough consumed in the province to have anything to do with the value of the wheat to the farmer who produces it. The wheat is consumed outside the province.

Mr. HARKNESS: Is that not also true of beef, in the western provinces?

Mr. GARDINER: I will deal with that in a moment. May I repeat, in order to direct attention to the difference between wheat and cattle which I mentioned a few moments ago, and the importance of which apparently my hon. friend did not realize, that this wheat not only passes out of Saskatchewan; but it passes out of Canada, to be consumed in some other country. I mentioned that fact in order to point out that in dealing with a product of this kind no one in Canada has any interest in taking that matter to the courts of the country. They do not believe anything could be accomplished by doing so. They believe that to set up a board of grain commissioners in order to look after everything having to do with the transportation and grading of our wheat is the best possible way of handling that wheat, the greater part of which has to be marketed outside Canada. Therefore everyone agrees to let matters stand, and the question has never been taken to the courts. I am not a constitutional lawyer; in fact, I am not a lawyer at all. I have no personal opinion with regard to the matter, and I am only reciting what others have said, who are presumed to know something about it, that if it ever were taken to the courts it would be declared ultra vires, just like much of the other marketing legislation we have attempted to pass, either in this house or in the provincial legislatures.

There is, however, one thing in connection with the question which ought to be repeated—and it was stated a few minutes ago by the hon. member for Haldimand. He said that a commission which previously had investigated the whole matter of the marketing and sale of farm products had said that because milk, which is produced within provincial boundaries, is largely consumed within those boundaries, therefore this parliament had no authority to set up a commission to deal with the marketing of it, in the same sense that the board of grain commissioners would deal with the marketing of wheat.

I submit to the house that if that is true of milk, it is just as true of live stock generally; because while it is true to say that whole milk is for the greater part consumed within a province, when one lives in Montreal he knows that a great part of the milk consumed in that city comes from Ontario, which is just across the river from the city. When one lives in other cities of the dominion one realizes that a similar condition prevails in respect of a city situated across the boundary of a particular province.

On the other hand a considerable part of the milk in Canada or of the butter fat that comes out of milk, is turned into butter. Another considerable part of the milk produced in this country is turned into cheese. Nearly all the cheese, again almost seventy per cent or eighty per cent of it, under normal conditions is exported from the country. On the other hand, butter is all consumed in Canada, but it is not altogether consumed in the province in which it is produced.

The surplus of milk produced in Saskatchewan finds its way to Ontario in the form

of butter, or to the city of Montreal in the same form. Therefore I would say that perhaps not any greater percentage of the milk production of the provinces is consumed within the boundaries of those provinces than there is of the meat products produced within the boundaries of those provinces.

In other words, while there may be no reason whatsoever for anyone taking any action with respect to legislation which has to do with the marketing of wheat, produced as it is in the three provinces, and selling part of it in some other parts of the world, yet when it comes to dealing with products such as meat products, the situation is not on all fours with that of wheat.

Therefore I would suggest it is not necessarily sound or right to say that because a certain board of grain commissioners has done a good job in relation to wheat, therefore we should have a similar board to handle live stock. Just what does the board of grain commissioners do in its handling of wheat? Well, it has nothing whatsoever to do with the production of wheat. It has nothing whatsoever to do with the actual marketing of wheat. It has something to do with the placing of cars at local points in order to move grain from those local points to the central elevators. It has something to do with the spotting of cars, and all that kind of thing. It does give some direction to the railway companies as to the moving of the grain. But its main work has to do with grading and the assigning of the grain that comes in from all points in the country to certain graded classifications, in order that it may be properly marketed under the price schedule set up by the board of grain commissioners. They set the margins as between No. 1, No. 2 and No. 3. Then, in cooperation with a standards board, they set the ratio as between those top standards and all the other grades of grain, running down to around twenty in number, if my memory is correct.

That is their real job; that is what they do. Then they leave the marketing, including price, either to the wheat board, as it has been done during the period of war, or to the wheat board plus the trade, as it was done before the war, or to the grain exchange and all those associated with it, as it was done before the time we had a wheat board at all. The board of grain commissioners has gone on operating in its own way and doing its own job, without any more interference than is necessary in order to carry out the regulations under which it operates.

One has only to recite the set-up in order to convince the house that is one of the chief reasons why no one has ever contested that legislation. It is legislation which is doing a job for everyone. It is doing that job efficiently; but it is doing a job quite different from the one suggested to the house by hon. members who this afternoon have supported the appointment of a live stock commission.

What is proposed in the present instance? We are not told, not in the resolution, because apparently someone was sitting in on some of the discussions before the present resolution was drafted, but hon. members have emphasized the fact that they still think in terms of the old resolution. And that old resolution did have in it words which called our attention to the board of grain commissioners. In contrast, this resolution has not.

One of the reasons why it has not is that this matter has been discussed with farm organizations, and those farm organizations apparently have taken the words out. They did not want them in. They have been convinced by arguments similar to those I have been offering the house this afternoon that the resolution in its original form was not sound. But they are still arguing that they want a commission to do certain things. They set out what those certain things are.

This takes me back to the beginning of the war. At the beginning of the war farm organizations were not only asking for a commission—or a board, whichever you like to call it—to handle the marketing of live stock, but they were asking that boards be set up provincially to handle marketing within the provinces, much as they have it in British Columbia for the marketing of their farm products, and they asked, other provinces to bring about that condition. Then further, they were asking for legislation to be passed by this federal House of Commons to provide certain powers for marketing of products as between provinces and for export.

We considered those resolutions in, I believe, three different years after I came to the house; and on the last occasion they were presented to us—I believe that was in 1940—I made a statement to the farm organizations. I am not quite sure of the date but it was some time within the first twelve months of the war.

We were asked to appoint boards or to set up legislation which would permit the appointing of boards by the farmers themselves for the handling of their own products. After discussing the matter with the government at that time, I said to those who were making the application that we were of opinion that during the period of war any boards to be set up to handle farm products as between this and other countries, largely because of the conditions existing during the war, would

of necessity have to be set up by the government. I believe I am speaking correctly when I say that the farm organizations accepted my answer as the necessary action on the part of the government. In any event, during the period of war they did not press the matter; but they have kept reminding us from time to time that they would be pressing the matter when the war was over.

During the war, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Haldimand, we appointed, first, an agricultural supplies board. Then we set up under that agricultural supplies board a bacon board, which was finally converted into a meat board when it was thought necessary to do so. Then we set up under it a board to deal with dairy products, and we also set up a special products board which dealt with all other farm products which were being sold under agreements during the war. Those boards have handled the marketing of our farm products from that time down to the present, that is, the marketing of those that go outside Canada. Practically all of them were going to Great Britain.

Those boards made arrangements with the authorities who represented the British government. We delivered the products to the British at our ports and the British took them across the seas and distributed them to their own people in their own way. Our job, first, was to get the product produced, which is quite different from the job of the grain commisioners. In the next instance, our job was to get the product graded up to the quality that we had agreed with the British to deliver. As I say, those products were laid down at our ports where the British could get them and take them to their own people. We have been doing that during the war.

About two years ago it was suggested that we ought to have a food board. I believe that suggestion came from the other side of the house. We said that we did not intend to have a food board of the type suggested, but that we intended to set up in the department under the agricullural supplies board a food board. I went personally to the officers of the farm federation and asked them whether they desired to have membership on the board or whether they desired to have membership on an advisory committee. After discussing the matter in their own executive and with their own people they reported back to me that they preferred to be on the advisory committee.

Therefore we appointed the food board as it is to-day, composed largely of high ranking officials of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Fisheries, the two departments concerned with the supplying of food. Then we asked others to name the men they desired to have appointed. The government took the responsibility for the appointments. My hon. friends have suggested that any board or committee that is to be appointed should be non-political. I think they will agree that a board composed of officials appointed by the civil service commission, most of them being appointed during the time our hon. friends opposite were carrying on the government of the country, ought to be a non-political board. It is composed of persons who have been in the civil service for a long time.

Mr. SENN: We did not play politics.

Mr. GARDINER: No, but my hon. friend knows as well as I that some of his friends nevertheless got into the civil service. But they are in the civil service and, no matter whether they were appointed under the Bennett government or the Borden government or the Laurier government or the King government, I find that they are giving 100 per cent service to the Canadian people. If they were not, of course I would have tried long ago to see that they were not there. But there they are. That is the best non-political board I know of. It is made up of the most experienced agriculturists of this country. They have been gathered up, first from the farms of Canada, then put into agricultural colleges either by themselves or by their dads where they received the best agricultural education they could get, and next they were sent out to gain experience throughout the dominion. I am quite sure the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken), although he is not in the house at the present moment, will agree with me when I say that that is the right way to produce good agriculturists. That is the way he was produced himself.

I have the benefit of knowing that he and I were born in the same year. We were both born on farms in the province of Ontario. He went to agricultural college while I went out west. I know that from his experience he has advantages which I do not have. There are officials in my department who have all the advantages that he has, whether they were appointed under one government or another. I consider them the best authorities on agriculture that we have in the Dominion of Canada. These are the men who constitute the food board.

When it came to appointing the advisory committee, about which the farm federation wanted to have something to say, we suggested that the first man appointed ought to

be the president of that organization. I asked him if he would accept the appointment as chairman of the committee. He consulted with his organization and agreed. Then I asked him to name two other men. I told him he could nominate them, although I was not going to give him the right to appoint them. Then we asked the provincial governments, no matter who they happened to be, to nominate men. As the governments change they would have the right to change their representatives on the committee. We got the other nine men through nomination by the provinces. A considerable number of those men are officers of the federation in the provinces, while the others are nearly all deputy ministers.

I do not think any government has changed its representative on this committee. One government which changed during that period —to relieve my hon. friends from Saskatchewan I will say at once that it was not the government of that province—did remove from their employ—or the man removed himself who was their representative on the committee. We have been asked within the last few days to appoint another man. I have written to the president of the farm federation and to those concerned, suggesting that a man be nominated who will be appointed in the same way as the others have been. That is the way the committee is appointed.

I say this in order to indicate that our present set-up in the Department of Agriculture is non-political and has greater possibilities for doing all the things that have been suggested would be done by this board, and doing them better than they could be done by any single board that might be set up according to the suggestion made to this house. If I appear to oppose the suggestion which has been made it is not that I oppose the objective which hon. members have in mind; it is because I believe that provision is made already for doing what they suggest ought to be done in a better way than could be done under any legislation passed by this house, which would set up some other form of board.

If it is the wish of farmers of this country to have boards to handle the marketing of their farm products, then the proper place to have a board to handle the marketing of farm products, say in Ontario, would be at Toronto where most of the farm products not consumed in the rural areas are consumed. In Quebec very much the same thing would be true with regard to Montreal. In British Columbia the same thing would be true with regard to Vancouver, and in Manitoba with regard to Winnipeg. Just as milk boards handle the marketing of milk to better advantage, I believe that live stock boards in the provinces could operate to better advantage and could operate constitutionally. If we set up a board here it might immediately be challenged by the interests in those central points where a greater part of the products is consumed.

At six o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Thursday, October 11, 1945.

The house met at three o'clock.

NEWSPRINT

PRESS REPORTS AS TO SUSPENSION OF IMPORTS TO BRITAIN FROM CANADA

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): A few days ago the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon) asked me a question regarding the reported cancellation of Canadian newsprint contracts by the United Kingdom authorities. I stated at the time that I would have the matter looked into, and I am now in a position to make this brief statement.

As a result of various representations which have been made through both government and industry channels, the United Kingdom authorities have agreed to accept a definite tonnage of Canadian newsprint during 1946. The tonnage specified is considerably less than the original contract amount, but is nevertheless a not inconsiderable volume. Delivery of the remainder of the contract amount is postponed. The settlement which has been arrived at is, under all the circumstances, a reasonable one, and is I believe acceptable to the Canadian producers.

Mr. GRAYDON: Will the minister please inform the house what the tonnage is that he refers to?

Mr. MacKINNON: I have not the figures before me.

CANADIAN ARMY

DISMISSAL OF EDITOR OF "MAPLE LEAF"—POLICY IN REPATRIATION OF N.R.M.A. SERVICE PERSONNEL

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of National Defence): A week or ten days ago I gave an undertaking to my hon. friend the member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green) that I would put on *Hansard,* as soon as I received them, the two editorials in the *Maple Leaf* which were made the subject of his question. I now have them. The other day I said

I would table them but was advised that they would not be printed in *Hansard*. In order to carry out my undertaking I will therefore read them to-day.

The first appeared in the *Maple Leaf* on September 19, and is entitled, "On this Repat Question the Maple Leaf Reveals . . . —"

Some hon. MEMBERS: Dispense.

Mr. ABBOTT: The second appeared in the *Maple Leaf* for September 20, 1945, the following day, and is entitled, "To Continue . . . ".

Some hon. MEMBERS: Dispense.

Mr. ABBOTT: *Hansard* will reproduce the editorials.

(*Editorial of September 19*)

On This Repat Question the *Maple Leaf* Reveals . . .

There's no reason to entitle this piece "To Whom It May Concern" for it concerns the whole Canadian army, the Canadian government and the Canadian people and there's no "may" about it. It's the result of a *Maple Leaf* investigation on repat drafts that produced facts and figures adding up to something that shouldn't happen to a soldier—and we mean fighting soldier.

The *Maple Leaf*'s investigation led from Nijmegen to No. 8 Repat Depot in England and involved the Saskatoon Light Infantry, support battalion with the First Canadian Infantry Division, first unit to go through the depot.

Here is the report:

"Really Boiling"

"Our draft is on the strength of 8 Repat Depot and in the same depot is the SLI. Started the investigation of two men with boxcar numbers on our draft by going to the records office and talked to . . . on the PE. He had just been going over the SLI rolls and was really boiling. To start with, here's the point score of the draft:

Officers

Points	Number
131 and over	11
121 to 130	4
111 to 120	1
101 to 110	3
91 to 100	4

Warrant Officers

131 and over	6
91 to 100	1

S/Sgts. and Sgts.

131 and over	31
121 to 130	1
111 to 120	2
101 to 110	4
91 to 100	1
81 to 90	1
71 to 80	1

Corporals

131 and over	10
121 to 130	3
111 to 120	5
101 to 110	4
81 to 90	6
71 to 80	5

L/Cpls. and Privates

131 and over	48
121 to 130	21
111 to 120	19
101 to 110	31
91 to 100	40
81 to 90	24
71 to 80	63
61 to 70	66
51 to 60	34
50 and under (since taken off draft)	7

The report continues: "Okay so I can settle for most of that under the unit system of repat, but here is the dope that really hurts and don't think for a minute that many of the men in the U.K. here who are handling repat (plenty of them high-point men) aren't really burned about the whole deal:

Unit strength including rank of corporal (no NRMA men above corporal)	382
NRMA strength (boxcar numbers)	115
Percentage of NRMA	30·1

(Report is that this is a little higher than non-unit drafts which normally run about 28 per cent at No. 8 Repat Depot.)

Taken at Random

Further with the report: "Just to go a bit farther I asked to see the documents of some of the NRMA men to get a picture of their points and service. I went through the documents—with an expert I might add. We took four cases, the first four we could find selected at random, and here you have it:

L85538 (old number L466249, number changed when he went active, see date below).

Pte. Usher, B. J.

Called up	9 Jun 42 (non-active)
TOS UK	1 Jan 45
Went active	7 Mar 45
TOS Europe 7 Garrison Battalion	3 Jun 45 (sent to Europe after V-E day)
SOS to SLI	28 Jun 45

Point of interest: This man has seen no rpt no operational service and has a point score of 73.

L606762 Pte. Hazen, C. (still non-active)

Called up	12 Aug 42
TOS UK	10 Jan 45
SOS UK to 2 Garrison Battalion	24 May 45 (despatched to Europe)
SOS to SLI	28 Jun 45

Going home with the unit, no operational duty and point score of 67.

L608521 Pte. Maier, E. B. (still non-active)

Called up	7 Jan 43
TOS UK	1 Feb 45
SOS UK (CIC X4 list)	16 May 45
SOS to SLI	9 Jun 45

Going home with unit, no operational duty and point score of 56.

L608710 Pte. Olsen, A. C. (still non-active)

Called up	5 Jan 43
TOS UK	3 Jan 45
SOS UK (CIC X4 list)	18 May 45
SOS to SLI	21 May 45

No operational duty, point score 57.

"Have gone into this matter pretty thoroughly and any men with six figure numbers (above

600,000 at any rate) are definitely NRMA men. When they go active, and they could do so until after VE-Day, their number was changed as is the case with Usher.

"Something which bears an investigation and a good answer is how these men got posted to a First Division unit for return to Canada when they hadn't even left the U.K. on VE-Day. If this practice is being carried out by the reinforcement depots, which everything would lead me to suspect, then it's not good enough. There are a lot of fellows in L of C with high points who rate ahead of the NRMA men, of this category at least, who could be posted to units for return to Canada—not even taking into consideration the high point men from other active units who might like to have a look at Canada."

For Fighting Men

The *Maple Leaf* was established in Naples, in Italy, back in January, 1944, for Canadian Forces IN ACTION. The *Maple Leaf* has been produced for the soldiers, the fighting men. The *Maple Leaf* has always done everything in its power to help the fighting men get a break. It's not stopping now.

This sort of business isn't funny. The men who volunteered to come overseas, who either went into action as volunteers or did their best as volunteers to see that the fighting men were equipped with the necessaries, deserve better treatment. This is an appeal on behalf of the volunteers who made this Canadian Army an army of which to be proud. All that is wanted is justice. J.D.M.

(*Editorial of September 20*)

To Continue . . .

Men in garrison battalions, called up under the National Resources Mobilization Act, still non-active, but going home. The more we think about it, the less we like it. We like it even less than we did yesterday which was something considerably short of small huzza.

Let's get the picture straight:

These men were called up as far back as 1942. So they didn't go active. So maybe that's their business. Some blame the system, some the men. Some don't blame anybody. Some, on the other hand, think everything worked out just dandy. Some, on the other hand, wrist and elbow, still think Canadian men should never have gone overseas at all. It's a matter of opinion.

But, whatever the opinion, these men didn't come overseas until early in 1945. And they didn't come to Europe until after V-E day, after the shooting had stopped. And they came in garrison battalions. Those garrison battalions, if memory serves correctly, were slated for the occupation force.

And what happens? Some of the men in them, who have just come overseas, who have never fired a round anywhere but on the ranges, are steered into a First Canadian Infantry Division unit draft for HOME!

It may be said that they were specialists, tradesmen. If they were, all the more reason for holding them in Europe and releasing active specialists and tradesmen in L of C and CAOF with the necessary point score. It may be said that they weren't specialists, that they were just a bunch of guys. If they were, guard duty for a while with the CAOF on them would look good.

[Mr. Abbott.]

It may be said that they were needed to fill up unit drafts. And it may be answered—has the need ever been THAT great? A good many gents with the points and shooting service would like to know.

It may be said that it's the "luck of the draw". And it may be answered that this is too serious a business to leave to chance, that there was no "luck of the draw" when men volunteered to come overseas and do something about a war that needed winning.

It may be said that it's the system, that's the way it's laid down, and that's the way it's got to be; that the men in charge of repat overseas are hamstrung, are doing their best in the face of policy. That is probably the real answer. But policy has been changed before and can be again.

This situation cannot be corrected too soon.

J. D. M.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

SASKATCHEWAN AIRPORTS

Mr. McKAY:

1. What was the total cost of the land purchased for the airports at, (a) Weyburn, Saskatchewan; (b) Halbrite, Saskatchewan?
2. From what person or persons was the land purchased for the above named ports?
3. What acreage was purchased for each?
4. How much has been expended on the airport at Weyburn for, (a) surfacing highway; (b) draining airport; (c) constructing a water line from city of Weyburn to airfield?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1, 2 and 3.

Re airport at Weyburn

Name	Acreage	Amount
L. J. Emery.....	160 acres	$ 3,500 00
G. A. McCuaig.....	320 "	8,000 00
E. C. Staveley.....	160 "	3,520 00
J. Friedt, tenant.....		84 50
G. A. McCuaig, crop damages....		488 92
H. Tracey, crop damages.....		488 92
Total	640 acres	$16,082 34

For railway siding

Name	Acreage	Amount
Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien	5·11 acres	$ 250 00
Weyburn Security Co. Ltd.	0·33 "	25 00
Total	5·44 acres	$ 275 00

Re airport at Halbrite

Name	Acreage	Amount
E. Rubin	380 acres	$ 7,500 00

4. (a) $3,505.97; (b) $67,266.37; (c) $22,962.79.

INTERIM INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

Mr. ROSS (Souris):

1. When was the interim international wheat agreement concluded?

2. When and where was the last international conference on wheat held?

3. By whom was Canada represented?

4. What countries sent representatives to the conference?

5. What were the purposes of the conference, and what subjects were on the agenda?

6. Upon what subjects, if any, was agreement achieved?

7. Upon what subjects was it impossible to achieve agreement?

8. What was the attitude of Canada on each of these subjects?

9. What nations took an attitude on any of these subjects, differing from the Canadian attitude, and what was the attitude of each such nation on each such subject?

10. By what nations has the agreement been broken, and in what particulars has it been so broken?

11. When will the next international conference on wheat be held, and by whom will Canada be represented?

Mr. ST. LAURENT:

1. A memorandum of agreement between the Argentine, Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States of America to which a draft convention was attached, took effect on June 27, 1942.

2. The International Wheat Council met in London on August 31 and September 1, 1945.

3. R. V. Biddulph, European commissioner of the Canadian wheat board.

4. Argentina, Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10. It has been agreed by the participating governments that the discussions in council are secret. Any disclosure by Canada of the information requested, without the concurrence of the other governments, would be a breach of confidence.

11. The next meeting of the council will be in January, 1946, unless a meeting is convened earlier. Canada's representative has not yet been appointed.

FAMILY ALLOWANCES

Mr. FRASER:

1. What was the total amount spent on advertising of family allowances to date?

2. How much was spent in each province, (a) in the daily newspapers; (b) in the weekly newspapers?

3. How much was spent from May 1 to June 15, 1945?

Mr. CLAXTON:

1. $83,041.42 on newspaper advertising to date.

2.

	(a) Daily newspapers	(b) Weekly newspapers
Prince Edward Island	$ 324 71	$ 212 76
Nova Scotia	2,075 16	2,719 11
New Brunswick	1,116 91	1,447 14
Quebec	2,279 90	4,243 05
Ontario	11,363 77	19,991 55
Manitoba	1,553 16	6,913 76
Saskatchewan	1,267 44	8,712 01
Alberta	2,146 83	6,452 08
British Columbia and Yukon	3,707 89	6,514 19
	$ 25,835 77	$ 57,205 65

3. $37,452.20, included in the above.

ALASKA HIGHWAY

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

Will that part of the Alaska highway which is in Canada be maintained and kept up by the government when said highway is surrendered to Canada by the United States?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: The government is continuing to give active consideration to this question and an announcement will be made at an appropriate time.

COAL—TORONTO

Mr. CHURCH:

1. What action is being taken to supply the city of Toronto with anthracite coal this winter?

2. What shortage is there in delivery of Canada's anthracite quota or allotment, (a) for the whole of Canada; (b) for Toronto and district?

3. What is being done to secure further anthracite supply?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. Arrangements have been made with the United States authorities to supply Canada with anthracite coal in exactly the same proportion as is being supplied in the United States. Anthracite coal is being distributed to Toronto and to all other consuming centres in Canada in equitable proportion to their past record of consumption.

2. (a) Anthracite deliveries to the whole of Canada for the current coal year up to September 28, 1945, have been 92·8 per cent of quota or allotment.

(b) Anthracite deliveries to Toronto and district for the current coal year up to September 28, 1945, have been 94·4 per cent of quota or allotment.

3. Representations are being made as necessary and advisable to the solid fuels administrator in Washington to maintain quota shipments. In view of the short supply from the

mines, however, Canada cannot expect a bigger percentage of available anthracite than is being supplied in the United States.

P.E.I. CAR FERRY SERVICE

Mr. McLURE:

1. What progress is being made in the construction of the new car ferry steamer for the Borden-Tormentine service?
2. When will this steamer be completed?
3. What will be the name of this boat?

Mr. CHEVRIER:

1. The hull and car deck is about three-quarters finished, with the other steel work fabricated to the extent of about 50 per cent of all steel.

The fabrication of machinery is about 40 per cent completed.

2. In the late summer of 1946.
3. Not yet determined.

Mr. McLURE:

1. Did a United States army engineer make a survey of Borden-Tormentine ferry during the summer of 1944?
2. If so, has a report been submitted to the government?

Mr. CHEVRIER:

1. No. A retired member of the United States corps of engineers was engaged in 1945 to review the previous reports on the Prince Edward Island car ferry terminal facilities and has submitted certain recommendations with reference to the Tormentine terminal works.

2. No. The engineer's report is still under consideration by the Department of Transport.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BANK

Mr. McGARRY:

1. Where is the head office of the industrial development bank?
2. How many branches are in operation and where located?
3. Is there a branch office in the maritime provinces? If so, where is it located?
4. How many loans have been made by the industrial development bank?
5. What is the total of all loans?
6. Of the loans made, how many were, (a) made to established industrial concerns; (b) to new industrial firms; (c) to ex-service men?

Mr. MAYHEW:

1. Ottawa.

2. Montreal—general manager's office; Toronto and Vancouver.

3. No.

4, 5 and 6. The Industrial Development Bank is not a branch of the Dominion government but a subsidiary of the Bank of Canada.

Section 29 (1) of the Industrial Development Bank Act requires that "The bank shall, within twenty-one days following the end of each calendar month, make up and transmit to the Minister of Finance in such form as he may prescribe, a statement of its assets and liabilities at the close of business on the last day of the preceding month." This statement as at August 31, 1945, appeared in the *Canada Gazette* of September 22, 1945, and showed loans and investments (excluding dominion government securities) at $711,965.87.

In addition, section 29 (2) provides that "The bank shall make up and transmit to the Minister of Finance at least once in its fiscal year or more frequently if so directed by the minister, in such form as he may prescribe, a classification of its loans and investments and of the loans guaranteed by it." Provision is made for the publication of this statement in the *Canada Gazette* following its receipt by the minister.

GOVERNMENT-OWNED WAR PLANTS

Mr. COLDWELL:

1. Have any government-owned war plants been sold up to the present time?
2. If so, how many and which ones are they?
3. To whom have they been sold?
4. What price did each plant bring?
5. Are sales of any government-owned war plants pending at present?
6. If so, how many plants does this involve and which ones are they?

Mr. COLDWELL: May I suggest that this question be dropped? It was answered in part the other day by an answer to another question. If I need further information I will reword the question.

Question dropped.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BANK—PRAIRIE PROVINCES

Mr. JAENICKE:

1. Is it the intention of the industrial development bank to establish branches in any of the cities or other communities of the three prairie provinces?
2. If so, in which cities or communities, and when?

Mr. MAYHEW: 1 and 2. The policy of the Industrial Development Bank in opening additional branches will be determined by the board of directors in light of the number and distribution of applications for loans received by the bank.

POST OFFICE—HEADS OF BRANCHES OR HIGHER

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough):

1. What appointments have been made, since January 1, 1945, to the headquarters staff of the Post Office Department to positions of heads of branches or higher?
2. What are the salaries paid to each such appointee?
3. What are the qualifications and previous positions held of each such person?

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier):

1. Walter J. Turnbull appointed deputy postmaster general, 9 June, 1945; John A. Sullivan appointed associate deputy postmaster general, 9 June, 1945. (Retirement effective 15 November, 1945); W. D. Adamson appointed director, Public relations branch, 9 June, 1945.

2. Walter J. Turnbull, $9,000 per annum; John A. Sullivan, $9,000 per annum; W. D. Adamson, $3,900 per annum.

3. Walter J. Turnbull—21 years experience in Post Office Department. 9 years experience in office of Prime Minister; John A. Sullivan—9 years experience in Post Office Department as deputy postmaster general; W. D. Adamson—Since 8 August 1940, private secretary to Postmaster General. Formerly news editor Ottawa *Journal*.

NATIONAL FILM BOARD

Mr. BLAIR:

1. Who are the members of the national film board?
2. What salary is paid to each such member?
3. What are the qualifications of each such member, including a statement of their experience in film work?
4. When does the term of office of each such member expire?

Mr. McCANN:

1. Hon. Dr. James J. McCann, Ottawa; Hon. Brooke Claxton, Ottawa; Dr. Georges Bouchard, Ottawa; Mr. J. F. MacNeill, K.C., Ottawa; Mr. M. M. MacLean, Ottawa; Mr. Donald Cameron, Edmonton; Mr. C. G. Cowan, Ottawa; Mr. Edmond Turcotte, Montreal.

2. None.

3. The members of the national film board are appointed under the terms of section 3 of the National Film Board Act, 1939, and subsequent amendments, which require that the national film board should consist of eight members qualified as follows: Hon. James J. McCann, M.D., Minister of National War Services; Hon. Brooke Claxton, Minister of National Health and Welfare; Dr. Georges Bouchard, Assistant deputy minister of agriculture; Mr. J. F. MacNeill, K.C., Law clerk of the Senate; Mr. M. M. MacLean, director, industrial relations branch, Department of Labour; Mr. Donald Cameron, director, department of extension, University of Alberta. Has been in charge of educational film work in Alberta since 1937. Director of national film society since 1938. Mr. C. G. Cowan, vice-president, British-American Bank Note Co. One of the organizers of national film society of which he has been director and vice-president since 1935. Mr. Edmond Turcotte, Editor in chief, *Le Canada*. One of the organizers and officers of Montreal branch of the national film society of which he has been director since 1941.

4. Dr. Georges Bouchard: August 31, 1946; Mr. J. F. MacNeill, K.C.: November 11, 1945; Mr. M. M. MacLean: January 12, 1947; Mr. Donald Cameron: August 31, 1946; Mr. C. G. Cowan: August 31, 1948; Mr. Edmond Turcotte: September 1, 1947. Hon. James J. McCann and Hon. Brooke Claxton: at pleasure.

Mr. HENDERSON:

1. What is the total number of employees of the national film board?
2. What was the total number of employees of the national film board as of September 1, 1939?

Mr. McCANN:

1. 785.

2. None at that date as the national film board which replaced the motion picture bureau did not begin functionng until late October 1939. The motion picture bureau consisted of some forty employees at that time.

DOMINION TRADE AND INDUSTRY COMMISSION

Mr. ROBINSON (Bruce):

1. Who are the members of the dominion trade and industrial commission?
2. What are the duties and responsibilities of the commission?
3. How many sittings of the commission have been held in each of the past four years?

Mr. MacKINNON:

1. Chief commissioner, H. B. McKinnon; temporary assistant chief commissioner, W. J. Callaghan; commissioner, C. P. Hebert (overseas).

2. The duties and responsibilities of the Dominion Trade and Industry Commission are set forth in sections 15 to 27, inclusive, of the Dominion Trade and Industry Commission Act, 1935.

3. The board does not hold sittings or public hearings in the same manner as the tariff board, but since 1942 the commission has dealt with forty-four cases. This number of cases, however, does not indicate the total number of complaints investigated by the commission. In a number of instances there were a large number of separate and distinct complaints which, in view of the fact that they were all of the same nature and against the same people, were included with the original complaint under the one case number. For example, in case number 233 there were seventy separate complaints investigated. To a lesser extent a like situation exists with respect to other case numbers.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

SUGAR STABILIZATION FUND

Mr. BLACKMORE:

1. In the sugar stabilization fund, how much money was acquired from sources other than that of buying imports of raw cane sugar and reselling such raw cane sugar to the sugar refineries?
2. From what other sources was such money acquired, and how much from each source in each of the years, 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945 to September 12?

DISALLOWANCE OF PROVINCIAL LEGISLATION

Mr. COLDWELL:

1. Were any petitions for the disallowance of any acts of the Saskatchewan legislature filed with the Department of Justice during the tenures of office of Liberal administrations in that province?
2. If so, what legislation was involved?
3. Was the Saskatchewan Liberal government notified by the federal authority of the receipt and content of any such petition?
4. Were any requests made by any petitioner for permission to make supplementary oral argument?
5. Was any such request granted?
6. What action regarding the petitions, if any, was taken by the federal authority?

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—APPOINTMENTS SINCE SEPTEMBER 1, 1939

Mr. BLAIR:

1. How many persons have been appointed to the Department of External Affairs since September 1, 1939?
2. What are their names, indicating those that are temporary and those that are permanent?
3. What is the title of the position held by each and what, in detail, are the duties of such positions?
4. By whom was each such person appointed?
5. What salary is paid to each such person?

CANADIAN NAVY—RETIREMENTS—COMMODORE OR HIGHER

Mr. WHITE (Middlesex East):

1. What are the names of all persons holding the rank of commodore, or higher, who have been retired from the Royal Canadian Navy since January 1, 1943?
2. What was the date of each such person's retirement?
3. What annual pension or superannuation has been granted to each such person?

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

THE BUDGET—SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS RESPECTING PRIVATE AND PUBLIC BILLS ON FRIDAY NEXT

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs) moved:

That standing order 15 in relation to the consideration of private and public bills on Fridays, and standing order 28 with regard to Mr. Speaker leaving the chair without question put, be suspended on Friday, October 12 instant, so that the budget may be brought down on that day by the Minister of Finance.

He said: This is purely a routine motion, in conformity with the previously expressed unanimous consent of the house.

Motion agreed to.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

STRIKE AT FORD MOTOR PLANT, WINDSOR

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): I have a question to direct to the Minister of Labour. Has the government been informed of a threatened strike in the steel industry in sympathy with the automobile workers at Windsor, and if so, what steps are being taken to settle the dispute?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): The answer to the first part of the question of my hon. friend is, no; we have no information whatsoever of the kind which apparently he has received or obtained.

I should like to make a brief statement, if I may, in reply to the leader of the opposition. I believe he wanted to speak of the Ford dispute, not a steel dispute, and I assume that is the purport of the question.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): Go ahead.

Mr. MITCHELL: The hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis) sent me notice of a question yesterday, but as we did not have orders of the day yesterday I was unable to reply to it. I think that I might now answer both questions at the same time.

The answer to the question of the hon. member for Cape Breton South is that the responsibility for bringing the strike of the Ford Motor company employees at Windsor to an end is one which must be assumed by the parties to the dispute. It is for the government to make available conciliation machinery by which assistance can be given to resolve such disputes. My department is ready at any moment to do so if the parties will take advantage of it. Up to the present moment it has not been possible to bring the parties into conference, but efforts in that direction are continuing.

It might be well if I were to give to the house the facts in connection with this strike. A board of conciliation had reported unanimously that the chief issue between the parties was the question of union security. The union demanded the application of the union shop principle as well as the check-off of

union dues. Other questions such as increased wages, take-home pay, job security, et cetera, were brought before the board, but the board was unanimous in the view that such matters were required to be taken up with the regional war labour board for Ontario under the provisions of the wage control order. If, therefore, as some hon. members have suggested the Ford workers are on strike to obtain higher wages, and shorter hours of employment and similar improvements in conditions of employment, the way was open to them to obtain consideration of such demands by the war labour boards under the wage control order. To the extent that they are on strike to obtain such demands, they are in violation of the provisions of the wage control orders.

However, be that as it may, the fact is that the Ford workers decided to strike, their objective being to force the Ford company to give them a contract which would be satisfactory, one which would include provision for the union shop and check-off. These were the issues which the board of conciliation said unanimously were "at the root of all the difficulties between the company and the union." The union concerned was not willing to wait to take their wage and other similar demands before the regional war labour board for Ontario, or to await the reply of the company to the recommendations made by the board of conciliation on the issues of union shop and check-off, but on the next day following consideration of that report called a strike of all the employees concerned. The union now is seeking further intervention by the government, and a demand has been made that the government take over the company's operations and appoint a controller.

The situation has been made more difficult by the fact that the picketing policy of the union has prevented officials and necessary office staff of the company from gaining access to their place of business, and by the withdrawal of the maintenance employees of the company—that is, the men engaged in the power houses. Such a policy makes conciliation practically impossible. I give these facts to the house because I feel that, both here and outside, attempts have been made to confuse the issue and to make it appear that there is a lack of effective government legislation to deal with the demands of the workers and to bring about a settlement of the dispute. This is wholly without foundation. There is no lack of effective legislation, and everything possible has been done by the Ontario Department of Labour and by the Dominion Department of Labour over the past eighteen months to bring about a settlement of the dispute between the company and the union by conciliation.

May I close with this final word. I have this day wired the parties to the dispute, inviting them to attend a meeting in Toronto on Monday, October 15. I have also urged upon the union the desirability of giving company officials and necessary office employees access to their place of business prior to the meeting on Monday, which would remove an obstacle found by the company to attendance at a conference on a previous occasion, and I think would also create a condition which would help make the conference a success. I have no advice as to whether or not the union will take this suggested action. It may mean that some hon. members will be asked for guidance by the union leaders, and if so I trust they will endorse my recommendation. At the proposed meeting would be representatives of the Dominion Department of Labour and also of the Ontario Department of Labour; arrangements already have been made to this effect.

UNITED NATIONS

CANADIAN REPRESENTATION AT CONFERENCE TO CONSIDER EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): I understand that on behalf of the conference of allied ministers of education, the British government has extended invitations to all allied governments to be represented at a conference in London, England, beginning November 1 of this year, when the draft constitution to establish the educational and cultural organization of the united nations will be considered. Since Canada played an important part in the drafting of the chapter in the united nations charter relating to the social and economic council under which the educational council will be set up, and in view of the interest of this country in cultural cooperation among the nations, what steps have been taken to ensure adequate representation from Canada at the forthcoming conference, and, if we are to have representation, who will be the Canadian representatives?

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs): The Canadian government has been invited to be represented at the international conference mentioned by my hon. friend, which is to discuss the establishment of an educational and cultural organization related to the united nations organization. The conference will have before it a draft constitution, prepared by the con-

ference of allied ministers of education, and it is expected that this conference will be largely concerned with the consideration to be given to this draft. It is the intention of the government to accept the invitation for Canada to be represented at the conference. I hope, very shortly, to be able to announce the composition of the Canadian delegation.

FAR EASTERN COMMISSION

CANADIAN REPRESENTATION AT MEETING OF ALLIED ADVISORY COMMISSION ON JAPAN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to ask the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs if the government has received an invitation from the government of the United States to send a representative to the meeting of the allied advisory commission on Japan which is proposed to be held in Washington on October 23. If so, by whom will Canada be represented?

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs): I had a statement prepared to communicate to the house to-day which I think constitutes a very fitting answer to the question just submitted by the leader of the opposition. On October 8 the United States ambassador addressed a note to the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs which read as follows:

Sir:

Acting under instructions from my government, I have the honour to convey to you the following message:

"The governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and China have agreed to the establishment of a far eastern advisory commission for the consideration of political matters connected with the fulfilment by Japan of its obligations under the instrument of surrender. It is the desire of these governments that the commission include representatives of certain other states which have actively participated in the war against Japan and which are principally interested in the area of the western Pacific. A cordial invitation is extended to the government of Canada to participate in the commission."

Accept, sir, the renewed assurance of my highest consideration.

The following reply has been sent to the United States ambassador to-day:

Excellency,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your note of October 8th informing the government of Canada of the establishment of a far eastern advisory commission by agreement between the governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and China. I am happy to inform you that the government of Canada accepts, with pleasure, the invitation contained in your note to participate in the commission.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurance of my highest consideration.

I should add that a further communication has been received from the United States ambassador, stating that the initial meeting of the far eastern advisory commission is to be held in Washington on October 23, and requesting the Canadian government to designate its representative. Mr. L. B. Pearson, Canadian ambassador to the United States, has been designated to represent the government of Canada at the initial meetings of the far eastern advisory commission.

REMEMBRANCE DAY

INQUIRY AS TO PLANS FOR OBSERVANCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. W. GLADSTONE (Wellington South): Inquiries have come to the hon. member for Brantford City (Mr. Macdonald), to me and no doubt to other hon. members, as to the continued observance of November 11 as Remembrance day. I should like to ask the Secretary of State if the government has some plans to suggest to the country for the observance of that day.

Hon. PAUL MARTIN (Secretary of State): The hon. member for Wellington South, the hon. member for Brantford City and to-day the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) served me with notice that they intended to ask this question.

It is intended that Sunday, November 11, shall be observed in Canada this year as a day of remembrance of those who have died while serving the country during the two great wars. This is in accordance with the arrangements which have been made for observance in the United Kingdom, which arrangements have been approved by His Majesty the King.

It is desired, therefore, that two minutes' silence be observed throughout Canada between 11 a.m. and 11.02 a.m. on Sunday, November 11. It is also expected that arrangements will be made in local centres for such services or ceremonies of remembrance as may appear appropriate in each locality. The Canadian Legion of the British Empire Service League contemplate arranging a national remembrance day ceremony at Ottawa at three o'clock on the afternoon of Sunday, November 11. The detail of the arrangements for this ceremony will be announced later.

In the question of the leader of the opposition which was sent to me this morning he asked as to the intended practice for subsequent years. What will be done in future

years will be a matter for future consideration. Consideration will be given to the practice to be decided upon later in the United Kingdom and elsewhere, and the decision will be made after full consultation by the Department of the Secretary of State with the Minister of Veterans Affairs and the ministers of the defence departments, together with representatives of soldier organizations of the two great wars.

SURPLUS WAR ASSETS

DISPOSAL OF PLANTS AND EQUIPMENT USED IN MAKING EXPLOSIVES AND FILLING SHELLS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction): Mr. Speaker, because there has been criticism in respect of the destruction of war materials, I should like to make a statement in the hope of forestalling further criticism along the same lines.

As many hon. members are aware, following the first great war a number of accidents, some of which were fatal, resulted from the careless disposal of plants and equipment used for making explosives and filling shells. We are determined that no such unfortunate occurrence shall result from our disposal of the explosives and shell filling plants this time. For this reason, decontamination work is proceeding in all such plants prior to their being turned over to War Assets Corporation. This work is going forward under a decontamination committee of the Department of Munitions and Supply. This committee comprises a group of explosives experts. Their task is to ensure that, to the greatest extent possible consistent with safety, all machinery, equipment, buildings, and lumber shall be salvaged, and at the same time to ensure that no hazards remain.

No property is being destroyed without the express permission of this committee, and all salvageable materials after being thoroughly desensitized and freed of hazards will be turned over to War Assets Corporation for disposal.

So that hon. members may be made aware of the careful work being done by the decontamination committee and those under its control, and so that they may be assured that no salvageable material is being destroyed, I have asked the committee to arrange that newspaper men be permitted to visit a typical plant where they will see the decontamination methods being employed and view the material being salvaged. They also will witness the destruction of a building which became so impregnated with dangerous explosives that no amount of decontamination could make it safe. This press party will visit the Bouchard works near Ste. Therese, Quebec, on Friday afternoon, October 12. I would welcome any hon. members, or any members of provincial legislatures, who might wish to accompany the party. The group will leave the Munitions and Supply office at 1155 Bishop Street, Montreal, in a chartered bus at 12.45 p.m., and will be returned to Montreal in the same bus.

At later dates, similar tours of the plants at Pickering, Ontario, and at Winnipeg, will be arranged, and should any hon. member of this house or of a provincial legislature wish to attend, he will be made welcome.

RESEARCH ENTERPRISES

POSSIBLE DISPOSITION OR FUTURE USE OF PROPERTY

On the orders of the day:

Hon. H. A. BRUCE (Parkdale): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Reconstruction. Have any suggestions or reports been made to the minister by the administrators of Research Enterprises Limited as to the disposition of this property or its possible future use? If so, will the minister lay on the table of the house any documents or reports relating thereto?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction): Recommendations have been made. They are made by officers of the department to the minister, and I regard them as confidential documents. It would be impossible to table them at this time, when the disposal of the plant, more or less along the lines of the recommendations, is under consideration. After the transaction is closed and the property has been dealt with I shall be glad to table all the relevant documents.

HOUSING

SEMI-PERMANENT WARTIME HOUSES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. K. FRASER (Peterborough West): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. May I refer to page 899 of *Hansard* where, under the heading "Motions for Papers" I find one in my name with reference to semi-permanent wartime houses. The report of the discussion is in part as follows:

Mr. Fraser: I shall call the minister's office on that. Subject to the reservation mentioned, I should like the motion to pass.

Mr. Speaker: Dropped.

Mr. Fraser: No.

Mr. Speaker: Stand.

My understanding was that the minister agreed the motion should pass, under the conditions mentioned.

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction): My hon. friend sent me a note in which he set out the express documents he wished to have. I am sending him those documents. I did not understand that the motion was to be dropped, but in any event he will get the documents. If he wishes to put it back, that can be done.

Mr. FRASER: It will be all right with the minister if it passes?

Mr. HOWE: Yes.

UNITED NATIONS

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture) moved the second reading of bill No. 14, for carrying into effect the agreement for a food and agricultural organization of the united nations between Canada and certain other nations and authorities.

He said: Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the house was kind enough to agree that full discussion of this measure should come on the motion for second reading, rather than upon the resolution presented at that time. I said to the house on that occasion that I would give a review of the circumstances leading up to the presentation of the bill to the house, and that I would be prepared to listen to any discussion in which hon. members might wish to take part with regard to the measure itself or other matters pertaining to it.

Item No. 9 on today's order paper is one calling for the second reading of bill No. 14, an act for carrying into effect the agreement for a food and agricultural organization of the united nations between Canada and certain other nations and authorities. At this time I am moving second reading of the bill which I have before me and which, I believe, is in the hands of all hon. members.

The explanatory note to the bill sets out the real reason for its being brought to the house, it states:

> The purpose of this bill is to enable the government of Canada to give effect to the agreement for a food and agriculture organization of the united nations which is to be signed and come into force when twenty nations have notified their acceptance of the constitution set out in the schedule to the bill. The method proposed is to empower the governor in council to do whatever may be proper and expedient for carrying out the provisions of the constitution, or any recommendations of the conference of the organization, or its committees, made pursuant to such provisions. It is also provided that all expenditures incurred in carrying out the agreement shall be defrayed out of moneys provided by parliament.

I do not think I need go into detail to emphasize the importance of the measure now before us, but perhaps it would be proper to give a historical review of the circumstances leading up to its introduction.

In the spring of 1943 a conference was called at Hot Springs, Virginia, by the then President of the United States, the late President Roosevelt. That meeting was attended by representatives of forty-four united nations. It was the first international conference to deal with post-war plans and development, and it seems fitting that the first conference held to carry into effect some of the principles set out in the Atlantic charter should be one having to do with food. Since agriculture is particularly related to the production of food products both in this country and elsewhere, this measure has been placed on the order paper under my name.

It has been shown that there is a need for improved nutritional conditions throughout the world. The benefits to be derived from improved nutrition in human welfare and international relations and in the interests of agriculture and other natural products industries is well recognized by all members of this house. The recommendations of the conference were to the effect that a permanent food and agriculture organization be established, and that in the meantime an interim commission be appointed to base upon the recommendations of the conference a constitution which could be submitted to the governments of the united nations, the adoption of which would result in the formation of a permanent organization. The chairman of that interim organization was Hon. L. B. Pearson. I think we in the Dominion of Canada have reason to be proud of the fact that Canada's representative was chosen as the first chairman of that organization.

Under the terms of the proposed constitution a maximum of twenty nations must become members before the organization can be formed. I have before me at this moment a list of the names of the nations which have signified their intention of becoming members. This list is composed of thirty names which I think should be placed upon *Hansard*. The following is the list of countries that have indicated their intention to accept the constitution of F.A.O.:

Australia	Liberia
Belgium	Luxembourg
China	Mexico
Czechoslovakia	Netherlands
Denmark	New Zealand
Dominican Republic	Nicaragua
Ecuador	Norway
Egypt	Paraguay
France	Philippines
Greece	Poland
Guatemala	Union of South Africa
Haiti	United Kingdom
Honduras	United States
Iceland	Venezuela
India	
Iraq	

The organization will be an inter-governmental body. It will administer its own activities within the provisions of the constitution which are outlined in the schedule to this bill. There will be a director general appointed at the conference of the organization. An executive committee consisting of not less than nine and not more than fifteen members will be appointed by the conference and to which the conference may delegate powers. It will concern itself with studies of production and marketing problems as they relate to food, agriculture, forestry and fisheries, and it will endeavour to promote research work having to do with the solution of these problems. It will endeavour to render assistance to any government requesting such assistance. It will assemble and distribute official data and promote the development of information that can be coordinated internationally. It will serve the interests of both producers and consumers and function as an organization representing food, agriculture, fisheries and forestry in international deliberations with other international organizations of the united nations.

One matter that will be of interest to hon. members who are being asked to consent to this bill which will permit our taking part in the organization of this conference is the question of expense. I should like to set out the position in relation to the expenses of the organization. For the first year, when the organization is getting under way and when it will have only a small staff, F.A.O. will operate on a budget of $2,500,000. Any unspent balance will form a nucleus of a capital fund. The commission recommends that the average expenditures for the first five years should be estimated at about $5,000,000 yearly. A temporary apportionment of expenses has been recommended by the commission, and a division of the expenses among the different nations involved will be found at the end of the schedule to the bill which is before the house. No member nation will be asked to pay more than 25 per cent. The four major powers will assume 54·5 per cent of the total expenses. For the first year the United States will pay 25 per cent of the expenses, the United Kingdom 15 per cent, the Soviet Union 8 per cent, China 6·5 per cent and France 5·69 per cent. Canada is sixth in the list with 5·06 per cent. Provision is made for new members to the extent of two per cent of the total expenses. The contributions of liberated countries has been scaled down as a measure of temporary financial relief, but when world conditions improve and they are able to pay more, the proportions allotted to some of the other countries will be reduced accordingly.

Those are the important facts in connection with the measure itself. The need for this measure being passed with as great dispatch as possible arises from the fact that the first meeting of the conference is to be held in Quebec, opening on Tuesday October 16. I assume that the nations that are mentioned as having already indicated their desire to be parties to the conference will be represented. We are sending a delegation representative of the government. A list of those who are to go will be available to members of the house as soon as the order in council appointing them is made complete. I should like to say to hon. members that those representatives will be largely officials of the departments of agriculture, fisheries and forestry under the Department of Mines and Resources and persons representing the health department or having to do with nutrition. The delegation will be made up largely of officials of the government taken from these different departments.

There will also be present as a representative of that organization the president of the farm federation, Mr. Hannam, as well as others who have been selected here and there to a limited extent. There are others who have been selected as delegates or as advisers to those who are delegates to the conference. This list will be made available at the earliest moment. As soon as it is placed before me it will be laid on the table so that it may be available to hon. members.

In addition to the officials of the departments, Hon. L. B. Pearson will be a delegate. I understand that the acting Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. St. Laurent) will be there on Tuesday to open the meeting, and I have been asked to attend as a member of the government and as one of the delegates. My deputy will be a deputy representative of the government at that first meeting.

It is our desire to have this legislation passed in order that our membership in the conference may be made official along with others who will be gathered there and who have already taken suitable action in their own countries to make their position legal and official, and in order that we may be on the same footing as other delegations.

I would therefore move that the bill be given its second reading.

Mr. BRACKEN: I wonder if the minister would answer one question before he sits down. The explanatory note to the bill contains this statement:

. . . the agreement for a food and agriculture organization of the united nations which is to be signed . . .

The second paragraph of the preamble contains these words:

And whereas Canada is transmitting an instrument of acceptance of the constitution to the interim commission . . .

There is a little confusion as to whether the government has transmitted that instrument of acceptance to the interim commission or whether that is to be done after this measure is passed.

Mr. GARDINER: I understand that it has been prepared and will be forwarded as soon as the legislation is passed.

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the house has listened with interest to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) as he outlined the circumstances leading up to this proposal and gave a brief outline of the clauses of the bill. I am rising at this time to do two things: first, to commend the objective and the purpose of the measure, and second, to criticize the means by which the government is planning to set up and carry on this organization.

The bill provides for two things which were outlined by the minister: the carrying into effect of a certain agreement with respect to the food and agriculture organization of the united nations; and that all expenses in connection therewith shall be defrayed out of moneys provided by parliament.

As I said, we on this side approve the objective of the bill, but we criticize the manner in which it is proposed to administer it. The first question which we have to try to understand is, what is the agreement? There was an agreement made at the Hot Springs conference, which is referred to in the report of the interim commission, but I gather—and I presume it is a fair interpretation—that the government means by the agreement the terms of the constitution set out in the schedule of the bill.

Arising out of the Hot Springs conference there was an agreement that steps should be taken to form a united nations organization to try to improve the standards of nutrition and the standards of living of all peoples, and an interim commission was appointed to prepare complete plans for a permanent organization for that purpose. The report of that interim commission was tabled in this house in the early days of the session. It set out the form of constitution, and that form of constitution is now included as a schedule to this bill. I asked the Minister of Agriculture a moment ago what the government has done by way of advising with respect to the government's acceptance of the agreement, and the minister said that they have the acceptance ready to go and are awaiting the approval by parliament of this measure before the advice goes forward.

In this bill, as I read it, the government is asking that power be given to the governor in council to do all "such things as appear to him to be necessary for carrying out the provisions of the constitution." The governor in council is to be given power by this bill to "make such appointments, establish such offices, make such orders in council and do such things as appear to him to be necessary" to carry this agreement into effect or to carry out the constitution as outlined in the schedule to the bill; and further, to carry out recommendations of the organization, which may comprise forty-five or more nations in which Canada has only one vote; and power also to carry out the recommendations of any committees that the organization may set up. These are very wide powers which the government seeks in connection with this bill. Three questions arise which every member of this house, I am sure, will want to think about. First, what are the essential features of this agreement or of this constitution or of this bill? Secondly, what recommendations may come forward from the conference which it aids in setting up, and what recommendations may come forward from the committees that the conference may set up? The bill aims to give the government power to carry out not only the recommendations of the conference of the organization, but the recommendations of committees of the conference. As the bill now stands, it is giving the government power to do all these things.

Let me refer for a moment to one or two of the essential features of the bill. The schedule contains twenty-six articles, and I want to refer to two or three of them. First of all article XVIII, from which I quote:

Upon approval of a budget the total amount approved shall be allocated among the member nations in proportions determined, from time to time, by the conference. Each member nation undertakes, subject to the requirements of its constitutional procedure, to contribute to the organization promptly its share of the expenses so determined.

As the minister has pointed out, the budget proposed for the first year is two and a half million dollars, of which Canada is expected to contribute 5·06 per cent, or something over $125,000 the first year. In another place, not

in the bill but in the report of the interim commission, as the minister pointed out, this organization expects that the expenses will be $5,000,000 a year after the first year. If the percentage allocated to Canada remains the same, 5·06 per cent, our contribution will come to more than $250,000 a year. The conference is given power to alter by a two-thirds vote the percentage that each nation will pay, but in any event the government of Canada will be committed on the passage of this bill to that figure for five years. In other words when we pass this bill we are committing ourselves to an expenditure of something over one million dollars—5·06 per cent of $2,500,000 the first year and 5·06 per cent of $5,000,000 for each of four years—and we cannot get out of it until the end of five years. It is clear that we are asked to commit ourselves to that expenditure for five years. At the moment I am not criticizing that feature of the measure; I am just pointing out what it is that we are being asked to do under this bill.

I have said that by the passage of this bill the government will be in a position to carry out the recommendations of the conference of from forty to fifty nations which this bill makes possible, and will be empowered to carry out also the recommendations of the committees of that conference. I think, therefore, that we should inquire as to what powers the organization is being given under this bill. Something of that may be seen in the preamble to the bill and in the outline of the functions of the organization given on page 3 of the schedule. The preamble states:

> The nations accepting this constitution, being determined to promote the common welfare by furthering separate and collective action on their part for the purposes of:
>
> raising levels of nutrition and standards of living of the peoples under their respective jurisdictions,
>
> securing improvements in the efficiency of the production and distribution of all food and agricultural products,
>
> bettering the condition of rural populations, and thus contributing toward an expanding world economy,
>
> hereby establish the food and agriculture organization.

Then follows an outline of the functions of the food and agriculture organization once it is set up. Here is the outline in article I of the schedule:

> 1. The organization shall collect, analyse, interpret, and disseminate information relating to nutrition, food and agriculture.
>
> 2. The organization shall promote and, where appropriate, shall recommend national and international action with respect to:
>
> (a) scientific, technological, social, and economic research relating to nutrition, food and agriculture;
>
> (b) the improvement of education and administration relating to nutrition, food and agriculture, and the spread of public knowledge of nutritional and agricultural science and practice;
>
> (c) the conservation of natural resources and the adoption of improved methods of agriculture production;
>
> (d) the improvement of the processing, marketing, and distribution of food and agricultural products;
>
> (e) the adoption of policies for the provision of adequate agricultural credit, national and international;
>
> (f) the adoption of international policies with respect to agricultural commodity arrangements.

There are even wider powers, because:

> It shall also be the function of the organization:
>
> (b) to organize, in cooperation with the governments concerned, such missions as may be needed to assist them to fulfil the obligations. . . .

And so on. I need not read it all. I have read sufficient to show, what the bill clearly indicates, that the purposes of the organization are very wide, as are the powers we are giving the government to carry out the recommendations of the organization.

I have outlined briefly the purposes of this permanent food and agriculture organization. I have shown something of their functions as set out in the bill and something of the powers being granted the government with respect to it, and I have said that we favour the objectives both of the conference and of this measure. I have said also that we object to the manner in which the government is proceeding to carry it out.

Three questions are raised in my mind, and, I am sure, will be raised in the minds of other members of the house: What is the need in Canada for this measure? What obligation does it place upon Canada, and what advantages will Canada derive from it?

With respect to the advantage to Canada, I do not think that anyone will question the advantage of trying to improve the nutritional standard of the Canadian people and of others. I have here a statement with respect to nutritional standards in Canada and in other countries, and I shall apply myself closely to it so that I can get through in two or three minutes.

With the coming of the new knowledge of nutrition we now know that inadequate diets, either in quantity or in quality, or in both, are responsible for much of present-day disease, sickness and lack of general good health. We now know also that even in such high standard of living countries as Canada and the United States, malnutrition and undernourishment are surprisingly widespread. Before the war the Canadian council of nutrition

made a number of food surveys in the cities and rural areas. All these studies showed that a high percentage of the people were inadequately nourished. A shocking situation was revealed, for of the families not on relief, who were earning under $1,500 a year, 77 per cent had a diet too low in total calories; 80 per cent had diets deficient in calcium; 70 per cent had diets deficient in iron. The vitamin situation was then as bad; 61 per cent were deficient in vitamin A, 92 per cent were deficient in vitamin B and 60 per cent were deficient in vitamin C.

A former under-secretary of the United States department of agriculture stated that at least one-fourth of the people in that country who were not on relief had poor diets, and that three-fourths of the total population did not have fully satisfactory diets—and this in spite of the fact that that great nation is probably one of the best fed countries in the whole world.

With respect to Great Britain, the situation is not dissimilar. In 1939 a well known scientist, Sir John Orr, stated that the diet of at least fifty per cent of Britain's population fell short of a desirable standard of nutrition.

In Europe responsible authorities have drawn attention to the fact that prior to the war 80,000,000 people of the rural population of that continent were normally living on the verge of destitution, and that from 30 million to 40 million were permanently underfed. One of these authorities, Mr. F. L. McDougall, in 1935 said that if Europe were to raise its fluid milk consumption to a desirable standard it would be necessary to double the number of milch cows on the continent.

No statistical data are available to show the state of normal undernourishment and normal semi-starvation which is the every-day state of millions in Asia, but enough is known about periodic famines and the high death rates in such countries as India, China and Arabia to indicate that destitution and hunger to a degree are either always present or just around the corner for untold millions. So much for the need of an institution of this kind, not only for the benefit of our own country but for the benefit of other countries as well.

What obligations does this place upon Canada? First, by article XI, we are required to report to the organization the measures we take to try to carry out its purposes. Other countries are required to do the same. Then we are required to grant certain privileges and immunities to the organization —immunity from suit and exemptions from taxation. That will be found in article XV, clause 2. We are required to pay at the moment 5·06 per cent of the cost, the total of which after the first year, it is estimated, will be around $5,000,000 a year, and we are required to do that for five years. After being in for four years we can give notice if we want to get out, but we have to pay for the fifth year before we can get out.

What are the advantages to Canada for that contribution of more than $1,000,000, and for other contributions by way of cooperation, which we shall make? We shall gain the experience of other countries through an international organization which one might call a little league of nations within the limited jurisdiction of food and agriculture. We shall no doubt receive some stimulus to the improvement of our standards of nutrition in this country. There will probably be some improvement in international understanding, probably some increase in the stability of our export trade and our domestic trade, and probably also some increased demand for our own products. As other nations begin to grow what we call protective foods, there will probably be demands for a greater amount of the agricultural products which we produce.

It may be asked, what means are to be employed by this international organization, in which we shall have only one vote and to which we shall contribute over a million dollars, to accomplish these ends? As I read the bill, it seems to me that the efforts are to be directed along three lines: research, the dissemination of already existing knowledge, and the exchange of services. I am sure that every hon. member will support the organization in such approaches to the objectives in this bill.

I believe that scientific research is the key which will unlock the door to greater production, greater consumption, and a higher standard of living among our people.

With respect to the dissemination of already known information, one of the lamentable facts in our society is that there is so much known information and so little of it which gets to the rank and file of our people. As one student has well put it, the accumulation of information far exceeds the assimilation of it by the people. To the extent, therefore, to which this organization succeeds in spreading already existing knowledge in Canada and outside of Canada, it will be doing good service.

The third means they propose to use to accomplish their ends is the exchange of services. In that way knowledge accumulated in one country, another country need not go to the expense of obtaining. There is an exchange of knowledge gained and duplication

of effort is lessened. One of the great advantages to Canada of being a neighbour of the United States is that through the last two or three generations we have been able to draw upon the lessons they have learned from their researches and their experiments.

How does the organization propose to use these potential aids to progress? By applying them to five things. You see them in the outline of the functions of the organization: by raising the standards of nutrition, by increasing production, by increasing consumption, by improving distribution, and, in addition, in the conservation and development of our resources.

I cannot take time to-day—it is not necessary, before this house—to point out what great gains can be made in each of these directions. We know that the standard of nutrition can be raised, and as a preventive of illness and as a humanitarian objective it ought to be raised.

With respect to increasing production, one of the serious features of our economy in the past was the danger of surpluses; those who produced the world's food often produced a surplus, and they were frequently impoverished in the process. It is said that if every person in the world were adequately fed we would have to double our production. Well, if the nutrition of the world can be raised, let us hope that the threat of poverty to the people who in the past have raised the world's food will be banished. As our Social Credit friends to the far left here have often said in recent years, one of the weaknesses of our economy is the lack of purchasing power. With that I wholly agree. With the low wages we have had, with unemployment, with low prices for agricultural products, there has not been the purchasing power for farmers or for the workers who produced the things which farmers buy. So there has not been the necessary consumption of agricultural products. We have thus been able under that system to produce more than we could consume. Let us then bring all the research which can be brought to bear on solving the problem of increasing consumption, chiefly by increasing purchasing power.

Then comes the question of improving distribution. Reference is made to transportation, and the preservation of food by quick freezing and otherwise. Let me take a minute to tell the house of something I saw in France last January with respect to the effect of poor transportation on the nutrition and comfort of a country. They told us that four thousand of their bridges had been destroyed by bombing during the war, and that only some twelve hundred had been repaired. In France a good deal of transportation is by canals. They told us that whereas they had had ten thousand ships carrying their goods, at that time only 4,500 were in operation, and only 900 available for interior transport. They told us that before the war they had 15,000 locomotives, and that after liberation there were only 1,200 fit to use, and even when we were there only 4,500 were in operation.

What was the result? In one part of France they had coal mines, and in Paris they were freezing because the allowance to each household was only a few pounds a week. In parts of France they grow sugar beets, but because these could not be hauled to sugar factories there was a shortage of sugar in Paris. In the outlying parts of France there were potatoes in large quantities, but in the absence of transportation facilities to move them there was a serious shortage in Paris.

These are typical of the kind of problem that this international organization is proposing to attack. It is the kind of thing we in Canada have been attacking alone, but now it is proposed that in cooperation with other countries, it shall be tackled jointly. What is Canada's answer to be to the Hot Springs conference? Personally I dislike the growth and expansion of bodies accountable to no responsible democratic assembly. They are apt to become little dictators within the jurisdiction given them. But to-day we are living in a world different from the world of a few years ago. We are living in a world which day by day is growing smaller, in which potential dangers increase daily, in which there are half a hundred nations separated by national boundaries, by national laws and by national traditions. In such a world Canada, like other nations, must make a choice. In such a world I think, and I am sure this house thinks, we must make some concession to internationalism. There must be some continuing approach to world understanding. There must be the maximum cultivation of good will. So we support the principle and the objective of this measure.

Under this proposal Canada will give directly more than a million dollars, and will make other contributions by way of cooperation with these other countries. Our return on this investment will be indirect, perhaps invisible; it may be that we will never be able to measure it. What the net result will be no man can tell. We could do a great deal with a million dollars toward improving the nutritional standards of the Canadian people, but as an investment in a healthier human race it is probable that we shall receive an even larger dividend. By this measure we are casting our bread upon the international waters, hoping it will return

manyfold. We do this as an investment in good will; we do it as an act of faith, hoping it will contribute to an expanding world economy, to a healthier human race, and to a more peaceful world.

From what I have said, Mr. Speaker, hon. members will gather that we are wholeheartedly in support of the purposes of this measure. I come now to the parts in connection with which I have some criticism to offer.

Portions of section 2 seem to have been copied verbatim from the statute ratifying certain treaties of peace in 1919, but that makes no difference to my criticism. In this measure we are giving too wide powers to the government, powers wider than they need. The other measure referred to was an act to terminate a war. Whatver justification there may have been in 1919 does not exist now for surrendering the rights of parliament and giving the government a blank cheque to do as much or as little as it chooses in assisting in the setting up of this organization.

This bill should be meticulously examined in committee of the whole. Some of its clauses are objectionable for a number of reasons, some of which I shall mention. Section 2 of the bill provides that the governor in council may make such appointments as may be necessary. This is an intrusion upon the Civil Service Act. Surely the time has come when we should call a halt to making appointments outside that act. The government should discontinue the practice of seeking the power of appointment by the cabinet at the expense of the civil service commission. Too often in the past as new instruments of government have been created the power of appointment has been vested in the governor in council, which in fact means in the political minister, whoever he may be, in charge of the administration of the act. If the practice continues at the same rate as in the past, appointments under the Civil Service Act in accordance with the merit principle will become the exception rather than the rule.

Section 2 provides also that the governor in council may—

> —establish such offices, make such orders in council and do such things as appear to him to be necessary for carrying out the provisions of the constitution.

That is, he may do what he considers necessary to carry out the recommendations of a body of forty-five nations, on which we are represented by only one vote, or for carrying out the recommendations of committees appointed by that organization. That is a most sweeping power to vest in a government. It is highly objectionable in principle; it is likely in practice to be a serious derogation from the legislative rights of parliament, and there is no restriction as to time. Sweeping powers of this kind may have some justification in war time, but they have none now, and they are not needed to carry out the constitution or the principles of this bill.

Section 2 also provides that the money shall be paid out of moneys provided by parliament. I believe that provision should be qualified by inserting after the words "provided by parliament" the words "for this purpose". Then each year we would know what votes, other than the amounts being now approved, were required by the government.

Section 3 requires a report of operations under the act to be laid before parliament "as soon as practicable after the close of each fiscal year". The phrase quoted is highly objectionable. It permits the Secretary of State for External Affairs to determine in his sole discretion when it is practicable to prepare and present this report. There is no limiting factor whatever. Other acts passed at the last session of parliament and in previous sessions indicate a more correct procedure in this respect. For example in the family allowance act, chapter 40 of the statutes of 1944, section 15 reads:

> The minister shall submit to parliament within fifteen days of the commencement of the first session of parliament in each year a report of expenditures and administration in connection with this act during the previous fiscal year.

Likewise the Exports Credits Insurance Act, chapter 39 of the statutes of 1944, provides in section 26 as follows:

> The Minister of Finance shall report to parliament on the operation of part 2 of this act within thirty days after the end of each fiscal year or, if parliament be not then sitting, within thirty days after the commencement of the next ensuing session thereof.

In the same way the Industrial Development Bank Act, which is chapter 44 of the statutes of last year, provides in section 29 that the president of the bank shall transmit to the Minister of Finance a full report within ten weeks after the end of each fiscal year. It is then provided that this report shall be laid before parliament within fourteen days if parliament is then sitting or, if parliament is not sitting, within fourteen days after the commencement of the next session. The appropriation act customarily has this clause:

> A detailed account of the sums expended under the authority of this act shall be laid before the House of Commons of Canada during the first fifteen days of the then next session of parliament.

These sections indicate what is the correct procedure in a measure of this kind, and I would suggest that section 3 should be amended to provide something like the following:

> The Secretary of State for External Affairs shall prepare and lay before parliament a report of operations under this act within thirty days after the end of each fiscal year or, if parliament be not then sitting, within thirty days after the commencement of the next ensuing session thereof.

My last point by way of criticism is this. The bill should contain a provision requiring all orders in council to be laid before parliament. That is not required in the present bill. I would suggest that a clause be inserted in the bill as follows:

> A copy of all orders in council passed pursuant to this act shall be laid before parliament forthwith after the passage thereof if parliament be then sitting or, if parliament be in recess, then within fifteen days after the commencement of the next ensuing session.

We want to facilitate in every way the passing of this bill. We support whole-heartedly the objective of the measure. We do not think, however, that the government needs the wide powers contained in sections 2 and 3, and we respectfully suggest that the government consider some limitation upon those powers.

Mr. P. E. WRIGHT (Melfort): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate on this very important measure I want my first words to be a tribute to the work of the representatives Canada sent to the Hot Springs conference, where this measure originated. The contribution of those who went there to represent Canada was outstanding; and in appreciation of their contribution the Hon. L. B. Pearson, our respresentative at Washington, was made chairman of the interim committee which was given the job of drafting the present constitution. Mr. Pearson did a good job on that committee, and Canadians can be proud of some of our representatives abroad.

I believe there are few in the house who will make any objection to the purpose of the measure. So far as I can see, the objective is to bring into operation one of the freedoms set out in the Atlantic charter, —freedom from want. There was a time in the world's history when it was thought that that could not be accomplished. Back in 1798 Robert Malthus, a prominent British economist, in an essay on food, propounded what has since been known throughout the world as the Malthusian theory, which stated, in effect, that we would always have want, and that the pressure of population against the available food supplies would always remain. To-day, however, a hundred and fifty years later, we realize that that theory is not sound, in at least so far as the western hemisphere is concerned. We have shown that through modern technical development and improvement in our agricultural methods and equipment, and through the greater use of fertilizers, we can secure freedom from want. The objective of the bill is to spread that freedom from want to other parts of the world, and surely there can be no objection to anything of that kind.

From a purely selfish point of view, Canada is keenly interested. We realize the significance of our interest when we remember that of the ten per cent of the world's food supplies exported, Canada supplies an amount entirely out of proportion to her population. If the measure will raise the nutritional standards of the world, it will mean greater markets for Canadian food. The success of the legislation now before us to a great extent will depend upon the individual nations which have joined the conference, and upon whether they will be prepared to carry into effect some of the recommendations which undoubtedly will be made by the organization when it is established.

I cannot altogether agree with some of the deductions made by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken). I find difficulty in reading into the bill anything in the nature of dictatorship, or anything which would suggest that the organization would have power to force its decisions upon members adhering to the constitution. As I read them, their powers are only by way of recommendations which they would make to the governments joining the organization.

Mr. BRACKEN: Has the hon. member read the provision respecting expenses?

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes, I have read that provision, but I would point out that the amount of money we are being called upon to contribute is but a very small part of our budget. If we can raise the nutritional standards of the world and secure better markets for our agricultural products, I am convinced our bread cast upon the waters will return a hundredfold. In my view this is one of the best investments Canada could make, and I cannot see how we are committing ourselves to anything which in the future might cause us to regret our action. My one criticism would be that we have been late in taking action. As a matter of fact at the last session I suggested that we should then have ratified this constitution. Even from the purely selfish point of view, Canada should have been among the first instead of among the last of the united nations to effect ratification. If

through this measure we can raise the nutritional standards of the world, we shall have accomplished something.

According to reports presented to the interim committee, if we are to have freedom from want, it would appear necessary to increase the food supplies of the world. I was surprised to read that, even to give a minimum nutritional standard to the peoples of the world, the total world's food production should be doubled. The suggestion is made that the production of cereals should be expanded 50 per cent, of meats 90 per cent, of milk and other dairy products 125 per cent, of vegetable oils 125 per cent and of fruits and vegetables 100 per cent. It will be necessary to produce more food per acre, and eventually to bring under cultivation every acre which can be developed economically, if we are to have freedom from want.

This organization has gathered statistics on nutrition, production and distribution, and is making them available to all nations so that they can increase not only their production but also their consumption of foods. I do not think any hon. member would object to that programme.

Some recommendations made to the interim committee I should have liked to see carried into the constitution. The original document drafted at Hot Springs made certain definite recommendations which it was expected the interim committee would draft into the constitution. One of the recommendations, having to do with the distribution of foodstuffs, was that cooperative organizations throughout the world should be used to a large degree in the process of distribution. Speaking of the cooperative movement, it is pointed out that the United States conference on food and agriculture has recommended the strengthening and expanding of the cooperative system in rural and urban areas. While I have not readily at hand the reference respecting cooperative organizations, I do know that their recommendations were definite, and that they emphasized that those organizations were taking an important part in the collection and distribution of foodstuffs.

We have large cooperatives in western Canada such as the wheat pools, and there are large consumer cooperatives in Great Britain handling the distribution of foodstuffs. They recommended that these organizations should be encouraged and given a greater place in the collection and distribution of food throughout the world. That recommendation has not been carried forward into the constitution, at least in any direct way. It might be considered that it was implied, but I would have liked to see it in a more definite form.

Another thing to which I should like to direct the attention of the house is that as in the nineteen thirties, in certain sections of the world the production of food at the present time is under quota. In Canada and in certain other areas which produce wheat we have more or less come to an agreement that we will restrict the production of this essential food to the amount the market will absorb. I am not objecting to that, because under our present system it seems that that is the only way we can dispose of it, but I do want to say that any system based on that theory is wrong. In a world in which two-thirds of the population need more food, it seems ridiculous that we should have restricted the production of such an essential food as wheat. In the United States in the nineteen thirties they restricted the production of cotton, of corn, of hogs and other foods, and yet at the same time there were thousands of people in that country who were going without the necessary clothing, the necessary shoes and the necessary food to maintain a reasonable standard of living. Later they recognized the foolishness of that procedure and introduced the stamp plan for the distribution of food to those in the low income groups. I think the world should recognize that that is the most sensible thing to do. We should produce all the food we can and then see that it is distributed to the people who need it. If we want a world in which there will be permanent peace, I believe we will have to do that. You cannot have permanent peace in a world in which one part is restricting food production while another is starving to death. It is not Christianity, it is not economically sound, it is not common sense. It is one of the things I hope this organization will avoid. I hope they will make recommendations to the various governments to prevent it from taking place in the future.

Another matter on which this organization can make recommendations is agricultural credits. This has been one of the drawbacks to more efficient agricultural production throughout the world. The cost of credit for agricultural development, for the clearing of land, for obtaining proper equipment to work the land economically in order to get the best production, has been too great. The rates of interest charged throughout the world for agricultural credits have been unreasonable. In countries where agricultural credits have been made cheaper, there is greater production. I do not know whether

it is correct, but I am told that in India and in other countries where small acreages are worked, very often the people engaged in agriculture pay rates of interest of eight, ten and fifteen per cent. The result is that they are always in poverty and there is never the necessary production to meet the needs of the people.

In Canada in the past few years we have been able to reduce the cost of credit to agriculture, and I think it can be still further reduced. Any recommendations which this organization may be able to make with respect to the obtaining or making available of cheaper agricultural credits will be all to the good.

Another matter on which they could make recommendations is land tenure, the method under which we hold our land. We think that with our individual ownership in Canada we have attained the best method of land ownership, but there are drawbacks to this system. I have followed agriculture pretty closely for the last forty years, and it seems to me that with our present system of ownership we have reduced the fertility of our soil. I know that in Ontario very few farms are producing what they produced fifty years ago, and in western Canada we find that our per acre production is being reduced. If we are holding our own, it is simply because we have developed better types of grain, not because we are maintaining the fertility of the soil.

I am not satisfied that we know all that is to be known with respect to land tenure, and any recommendations of this organization with respect to it should be taken into consideration by this and other governments. In Great Britain they have a different system of the land tenure from what we have, and during the past hundred years they have practically doubled the per acre production on most of their land.

Mr. REID: Because the law is laid down as to what crops to grow.

Mr. WRIGHT: The law is not laid down in Great Britain as to what crops they shall grow.

Mr. REID: It is laid down by the landlord.

Mr. WRIGHT: That may be so in some sections.

Mr. REID: All of Scotland is under that law.

Mr. WRIGHT: If that method of land tenure produces better results and more for the peoples of the world, then I say we should at least study it. I do not want anyone to go away with the idea that I am opposing our present system of land tenure, but I do say that we should study the matter and find out if it is the best method. The production of the soil constitutes the wealth of any nation; make no mistake about that. If you deplete your soil, eventually the nation will go down. It is the basis of our very existence, the food which we eat.

Another matter to be considered is that of land conservation. Certainly we can learn a lot in Canada with respect to land conservation. You can drive through Ontario or Quebec or any of our older provinces and see hundreds of farms now vacant which at one time maintained a family.

Mr. MacNICOL: And educated them too.

Mr. WRIGHT: And educated them, as my friend says. Those farms are vacant to-day because the fertility has been taken out of them. Competition became too keen and they could not produce enough to maintain a family. All these things can be studied by this organization and recommendations made.

The organization does not propose to standardize production or consumption throughout the world. There are entirely different methods that will have to be used in different countries. Such an organization as this is a step in the right direction and one which can be of great value to Canada. The money which we shall have to contribute to the expenses of the organization will be money well spent.

In conclusion I should like to quote what Mr. Appleby, the under-secretary of state of the United States, said with respect to this organization. After indicating that the organization was being developed for the purpose of obtaining a freedom-from-want programme in the world, he went on to say:

> It can be achieved, as freedom from fear can be achieved, only by substituting international cooperation for the excessive international competition from which the world is suffering.

I agree one hundred per cent with that—that cooperation among the nations of the world is the solution of a great many of our problems of to-day. Believing that this organization is a step in that direction, I am prepared to support the passing of this bill.

Mr. SOLON E. LOW (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) in moving the second reading of this bill, but I must say that his speech will be noted more for what it did not contain than for what it did. I think it would save valuable time and add much to the clarity and effectiveness of debate in the

house if the minister in charge would make a detailed and comprehensive statement on any bill or resolution that he is moving. But the practice seems to have grown up in the house of throwing into the ring as innocent-looking a measure as possible and then letting the opposition groups fight over it. We on this side are left to guess as to the real meaning of many of the measures that come before us and have to hunt around for a "nigger in the wood-pile", being often left in complete ignorance of the background or intention behind the measure. If the opposition are set to fighting each other on the principles involved, as is so often the case, then it seems so much the better. All the while I have noticed that the minister concerned sits silent, laughing up his sleeve, while we blindly grope about for the main purpose behind a measure. Often it is only by sheer accident that we stumble upon its real substance, while all the time the minister is in full possession of all the facts, or should be if he is introducing the measure in full sincerity.

We have nothing before us in this case except what is contained in a perfectly innocent-looking bill, dressed up in high-sounding phrases, but with its real intent possibly obscured by the emotional appeal of a highly humanitarian purpose.

There is one other thing I should like to say while I am at it. The minister usually comes into a debate on a measure like this loaded to the ears with documents and schedules and arguments compiled by staffs of experts, accountants and researchers that are at his disposal, while we on this side are largely on our own. We have to do all our own research. We have to prepare all our own schedules, and we have to do it often with little help from the staffs in the various departments which are overloaded with work. That is very uneven competition. It should be in the public interest to have a full and effective debate on any one of these measures, especially one so important as the bill now before us. Therefore it should be the duty of the minister to give us something worth while to debate. The members of this house should also have available to them an adequate staff to assist in preparing material for these important debates, similar to what is allowed to members of congress of the United States. Surely we are no less important to our country than they are to theirs. I hope that that will be taken under advisement by the government. The practice now seems to be to let the various groups in the opposition bludgeon each other into insensibility almost, and then for the minister to come into the debate at the last minute to close it, to apply the *coup de grâce* and then away, and the measure is passed.

This bill carries into effect an agreement among nations which become parties to it through legislation. Neither the bill itself nor the schedule appended thereto in my opinion gives anything like a full exposé of the terms of the agreement among the nations. Therefore I should like to examine for a few moments some of the resolutions passed and recommendations made by the conference at Hot Springs, all of which are embodied in the pamphlet entitled "Final Act" of the united nations conference on food and agriculture. There are only seven or eight points that I wish to emphasize at this time. The first is found on page 29 of the pamphlet I have just mentioned. In article XXIV, headed "Achievement of an Economy of Abundance", it seems that the conference after great deliberation made a discovery of importance, for they say:

> Whereas the first cause of hunger and malnutrition is poverty.

For the last twenty-six years, the leader and founder of this great movement of which I form a part has been pointing out to the world that the first cause of hunger and malnutrition is poverty. I refer to none other than Major Douglas, founder of the social credit movement.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, that I might phrase that sentence I have quoted in just a little different way. They say: "The first cause of hunger and malnutrition is poverty." I would put it this way: Good food means prosperity. That turns the thing right around. It would seem to me that in an enlightened age such as this the first duty of any government should be to see to it that every citizen is adequately nourished. Such things as arterial roads, new bridges, housing schemes and pleasure parks, and I might go so far as to say new wars, should take second place to providing every citizen in the land with adequate food of the proper kind. Yet we find that there never is lacking interest and also public money for the things which I have mentioned, roads, bridges and wars, to the total exclusion of the proper nourishment of the people. If proper methods were adopted it is my contention that everyone would have enough to eat, and when everyone has enough to eat I am sure that unemployment would not be a problem, and that diseases of all kinds would become very rare indeed.

One other thing which this report says interested me and is of importance. It is found on the same page, 29:

> To maintain an equilibrium in balances of payments, and to achieve the orderly management of currencies and exchange.

I wonder if they are referring here to a policy of foreign trade. If they are, I should like to say this about it. A policy of expanding foreign trade can never succeed in raising the standards of living of our own people in Canada if we persist in following the archaic foreign trade policies that have been followed by governments up to this time. This same idea seems to be emphasized on page 23 of the same booklet where they state, as the last subsection under article XV, "Long-term Production Policy":

> That with a view to balancing production and consumption the permanent organization consider to what extent and by what means such reports might contribute to international collaboration both on a regional and on a world basis in the field of agricultural production.

That appears to me to relate to two things: First, distribution within the country, and, second, balancing exports with imports. It seems to me also that it might refer to action which would be taken within any nation to make sure that the people are so furnished with purchasing power that they can buy and consume all that that nation produces, if they wish to do so.

It might be interesting at this point to emphasize to the house what foreign trade really should amount to. I have under my hand an article appearing in the *Reader's Digest,* which is headed, "Stuff for Stuff, the Elemental Equation; a condensation from the forthcoming book, "To-morrow's Trade," by Stuart Chase." At page 67, column 1 he says:

> Never let go the idea that stuff must be exchanged for stuff.

That is the policy of foreign trade which this group has always advocated. This article concludes with the following statement:

> Let me repeat the commonsense formula. The stuff we produce as a nation, plus the stuff we import, less the stuff we export is the measure of our standard of living.

In approaching the problem that is before us, whether or not this bill should be passed by the house, we ought to keep that formula in mind, because unless we are prepared to adopt, along with our foreign trade, policies and measures which are designed to make it possible for the people to buy the goods when they are imported in exchange for our exports, we shall fail dismally in any effort we make to raise the standard of living of our own people.

Mr. HANSELL: That is good stuff.

Mr. LOW: This same point is also referred to briefly on page 13 of this "Final Act" of the united nations conference on food and agriculture, under article I, paragraph 4. Here is the declaration:

> The first cause of hunger and malnutrition is poverty.
>
> It is useless to produce more food unless men and nations provide the markets to absorb it.

That is fundamental.

> There must be an expansion of the whole world economy to provide the purchasing power sufficient to maintain an adequate diet for all.

I ask hon. members how they are going to set about seeing to it that every person in our nation has sufficient purchasing power to be able to balance production and consumption in our own land and thus raise the standard of living.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Ask the Minister of Agriculture that question.

Mr. LOW: It has been amply demonstrated time and again that never has the productive enterprise in any country succeeded in distributing sufficient purchasing power to enable the products of that productive effort to be purchased by the people. I say further that there never can be a sufficient expansion of the whole world economy to guarantee a decent standard of living for everyone until full control of money policy is restored to the various sovereign parliaments of the nations. I refer particularly now to our own nation. We can never introduce a policy of expanding economy unless the government of Canada is prepared to see to it that no such condition as existed in the hungry thirties is ever present in our nation again, namely, the condition in which, when our boys were called up before the army medical boards, forty-four out of every 100 were turned back because they failed to make category A. This was owing to malnutrition born of poverty; and poverty arises out of the failure of our productive enterprise to distribute to our people sufficient purchasing power that they can buy back the goods which are produced.

I should like for a moment to refer to the Southampton chamber of commerce report of 1933 which further emphasizes the facts I have just stated. On page 7 of that report, in reference to the unemployed, such as there were at that time, and such as it seems to me there will be again unless we take extremely quick action to prevent it, I read the following:

> Any consideration of the position of the unemployed is startlingly paradoxical. Either an unemployed person is without work because we are already producing sufficient without his services being required, in which case he is poor because there is an abundance of goods

and services available; or he is in want because the available wealth is not sufficient to provide for the satisfaction of his needs, in which case it is difficult to explain away why his services are not being utilized to produce more. Thus, from whatever angle it is viewed, we have the situation of widespread industrial trade stagnation, with producers capable of production and millions in want of the very things which can be produced in abundance.

Then I turn to page 9 of the same report. Speaking of industry, it says:

Industry performs a twofold function. It produces goods and distributes incomes in the process. The operation of the relations of monetary mechanism to production is along these lines: (a) Industry makes its capital assets and secures the money necessary to enable it to pay wages and salaries, buy raw material, and meet its overhead costs in the form of credit loans from the banking system. (b) In the process of producing goods it distributes wages, salaries, dividends and the profits which filter through as money incomes to the entire community. (c) The goods subsequently go on the market with price labels attached to them to include all costs of production. And (d) the community acquire goods in return for their money, which filters back through the productive system for the cancellation of credit loans originally created by the banking system. It should be noted that under this process industry is forced to charge into prices at least all its costs of production irrespective of any question of profit; otherwise it cannot liquidate its indebtedness to the banking system. Thus it will be seen that the creation of financial credits by banks results in the creation of a trail of costs attaching to the products of industry, and this trail of costs is created in the process of financial credits filtering through to the community as money incomes.

Then I should like to record the final conclusion of the committee on this matter, as printed on page 12:

The essential feature of this analysis is that, as a country becomes more highly industrialized, so it becomes increasingly impossible to distribute sufficient purchasing power to enable the community to buy the products of its industry or the money equivalent in products exchanged with other countries. This results in the country accumulating an unsalable surplus —unsalable in the sense that it cannot be bought at home and it cannot be exchanged for the products of other nations, as the purchasing power for the latter to be made available to the community simply does not exist.

That is the conclusion of that investigating committee of the Southampton chamber of commerce whose report was issued early in 1933.

Finally, I should like to refer to the declaration of the obligations of the governments of the various nations that entered into this food and agriculture agreement, as they are recorded on page 14 of the "Final Act" of the united nations conference on food and agriculture. Under section II, interim and permanent commissions for carrying out the recommendations of the united nations conference on food and agriculture, we find this:

The united nations conference on food and agriculture recommends:

(4) That the functions of the interim commission be to formulate and to recommend for consideration by each member government or authority (i) to raise the levels of nutrition and standards of living of its own people.

In other words, to set its own house in order first, which I can assure the house is a worthwhile objective.

I maintain that, since the minister has brought this measure into the house and wishes to carry it into effect, Canada, by passing this bill through the house, is committing herself to raise the levels of the standards of living of its own people, is committing herself to balance production and consumption through setting up in Canada an expanding economy; and is committing herself to ensure distribution of sufficient purchasing power among all of the people of Canada so that an expanding economy may be made possible.

I maintain further, Mr. Speaker, that the minister or the government ought to give serious consideration to just how they can carry out the responsibilities which devolve upon them through the passing of this bill and the making of this agreement. It seems to me that without a certain fundamental and far-reaching change and reform in our financial system to supplement any programme of expanding world trade they have in mind, it will be simply impossible to carry into effect those things which are set out here as recommendations and which obviously will be objectives of the permanent commission which is set up. I would suggest that the Minister of Agriculture now approach the study of a sound and scientific system of finance to assist him to ensure that the commission does its work properly, and to see to it that Canada's standard of living is adequately raised and that nutritional values and so on are made possible to every one of our people. I am anxious that we succeed in setting our own house in order and raising the level of nutrition and standards of living of our people. At the same time I am very much concerned that while we are doing this we preserve the freedom of the individuals in this nation, because I fear that by some procedure, by some techniques under which the programme of the permanent commission might be put into effect, the people of this country could lose their individual freedom.

I do not want to detain the house much longer, but there are certain things which I

should say in conclusion. I am not sure as yet what stand I should take when it comes to voting on this measure, because I feel that we have not yet sufficient information. It seems to me an obligation on the part of the Minister of Agriculture to inform us, and give us answers to questions such as these which I shall shortly ask. It might be possible for me to say something further in the committee stage and to ask these questions at that time again, but I am going to put them on record now as things which I must know before I can come to a decision whether this is a good measure or a bad one.

In the first place I should like to know the relation of the permanent commission, set up as part of bill No. 14, to UNRRA and its activities. I think it is important that we should know that.

My second question: since individual countries which are signatories to the agreement thus far, as the minister read them this afternoon, have failed completely to achieve security for their peoples under the present financial system, I should like the minister to tell the house how these same countries can achieve security for their peoples by collective action, still operating under the same financial system.

Another question which I should like the minister to answer so that I can make up my mind on the matter is this: why is it not possible for a country like Canada to set its own house in order without having to set up a permanent international commission to force them to do so? I wonder whether the government has come to the conclusion that it is necessary for the housewives on Elm street to form a permanent club among themselves by legislative action before each of the good ladies can proceed to feed her own children properly. And if they cannot cooperate on a voluntary basis, I ask the minister to make it plain what assurance he can give that by the introduction of compulsion the children will be any better fed.

Another question: why would not an informal conference, operating on a purely voluntary basis and consisting of expert delegates sent by the governments of the world, be as effective in exchanging views, experience, and the rest relating to the production of food and to improved cultural methods, as the setting up of a permanent international commission and clothing it with great authority, such as is evidently the case here?

Mr. GARDINER: It is purely voluntary.

Mr. LOW: Well, we shall see. If the minister can assure us of that, good and well. Of course, I am sincerely seeking information.

Mr. GARDINER: Purely voluntary, as will be seen from reading the constitution as set out in the schedule. It is purely voluntary in the first place as to whether a nation goes into it.

Mr. LOW: That is right.

Mr. GARDINER: Then it binds itself to remain there for four years, and then it is a purely voluntary matter as to whether it goes out or not. It can give one year's notice to go out, and then it is purely voluntary as to whether that nation goes. I do not know that one can make it any more voluntary.

Mr. LOW: That is all very well, but for four years we are under obligation to stay there; and when one looks carefully at the schedule, the constitution, he sees evidence that the international authority which is set up there is clothed with considerable power and authority.

Mr. GARDINER: No authority to that.

Mr. JAQUES: What is the good of it then?

Mr. GARDINER: If I may be permitted to explain, I want to give the information asked for.

Mr. LOW: Very good.

Mr. GARDINER: The committee has power to investigate, to conduct research, to make reports, but it has no authority to compel anyone to do anything. As was stated by the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Wright), the only authority it has is to recommend to the governments of the different countries concerned what it thinks would help bring about just what my hon. friend has been speaking of; then the governments are entirely free to adopt such recommendations or otherwise. There is nothing compulsory about it.

Mr. LOW: I am glad to have that assurance, but in referring to article V on page 5 of the schedule I find that subsection 4 provides:

> The members of the executive committee shall exercise the powers delegated to them by the conference on behalf of the whole conference and not as representatives of their respective governments.

That seems the negation of the principle of responsible government. I am quite prepared, however, to accept the minister's statement on that point if later in committee he substantiates it.

I come now to my fifth point. Does the minister believe that a permanent international food commission, set up by international agreement, will be in a better position to enforce its decisions and its dicta, if such there be? I am sure the minister will not mind answering that question in committee.

Mr. GARDINER: I have just answered it.

Mr. LOW: Sixth; does the minister think the plans of an informal world food conference would not be of equal value; and if not, why not?

Mr. GARDINER: I think it is about as informal as one can make it, if we are to have people brought together to discuss anything.

Mr. LOW: We shall just let hon. members make up their own minds on that point, and I am quite prepared to accept that statement until we are in committee.

I now come to my seventh question. Is this permanent world food and agricultural commission necessary because the government will not do what is right by Canadians without being forced by some external organization? I should like to have the answer to that question.

Mr. GARDINER: They did not force us.

Mr. LOW: Or are they afraid the social crediters will finally force them to do what is right in this country?

No. 8. Is this measure designed to set up one of the various "specialized agencies established by intergovernmental agreement and having wide international responsibilities," referred to in article 57 of chapter IX of the united nations charter? That also is very important, and I should like an answer to it before I can intelligently determine whether it is wise for me to support this bill.

No. 9. Is this conference and the commission growing out of it one of the brain children of Leo Pasvolsky, who wrote most of the San Francisco charter and the Bretton Woods agreement? I should like that information.

No. 10. What part in the origination of this scheme did Henry Morgenthau or Paul Warburg or Bernard Baruch have to play? These are important things for me to know.

No. 11. Has the minister assured himself that this measure is not one step, and an important step, toward a world coupon or rationing system? If it is, I might take one stand; if it is not, naturally I should like to know. Some months ago, I believe in 1944, the *Financial Post* did link up UNRRA with a possible world-rationing or coupon system.

No. 12. I wonder if the minister will say whether it is possible to solve a nation's problem effectively by making it a global problem. My reaction to this bill will depend somewhat upon the answer to that question.

Let me say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that I find myself in sympathy with the objectives of this innocent-looking bill, but I wish to assure myself that it is as innocent as it appears. I wish to assure myself also that we are not putting ourselves into the absurd position of creating a force outside Canada to compel Canada to put her own house in order. When I am assured of these things I shall be able to advise my group exactly what stand to take, and we may have something more to say in the committee stage.

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, at the outset I wish to support the stand taken by my leader, that in so far as the objectives of this bill are concerned we give them our support, together with the constitution which is appended as a schedule to the bill itself. But we do raise strenuous objection to the form of this bill, and during the course of my remarks this afternoon I intend to point out that innocuous though this bill appears, it represents the furthest effort ever made in this parliament to emasculate parliamentary control with respect to a matter which must be subject to control by parliament.

To me this bill as it now stands represents very indifferent draftsmanship. It appears that someone, somewhere, simply copied a bill or bills passed by parliament in 1919 or 1920 with respect to the signing of peace with Turkey or Bulgaria, and attached this appendix without regard to the significance of the difference between those peace treaties and the constitution of the food and agricultural organization of the united nations. In certain sections this bill is identical with the bills which were passed to provide for peace after the last war with the governments of Turkey and Bulgaria. There is one exception, however; in those acts some control was left to parliament. In this act, if it is passed in the form in which it has been presented to the house, parliament will divest itself of powers such as it has not divested itself of in the past. In particular it will divest itself of the power to demand from the government full and complete information on international policies with respect to agricultural commodity arrangements.

Before I conclude I intend to suggest that certain amendments, if made to this bill, will remove any objection we of His Majesty's Loyal Opposition have to this measure and will at the same time retain all the benefits

which were reviewed by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) in his opening speech.

First as to the objectives. So far as we are concerned, the agreement arrived at at the food and agriculture conference which met at Hot Springs more than two years ago is, as it was then, a constructive one, representing an attempt on the part of the united nations then at war to translate their concepts of unity into practical performance; or, in the words of the Minister of Agriculture, to translate the concept of cooperation in conformity with the principles of the Atlantic charter.

It was a great and forward step. It united the various nations who not only agreed to the acceptance of this declaration for the production of food in common alliance for the period of the war, but as well made provision for the achievement of a common objective, that of raising the standard of living everywhere in the world, as was stated by the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Wright), the ultimate aim in the production of food being to equalize population food ratios throughout the world.

I have figures issued by the League of Nations in regard to the inequality of the distribution of food. They show that with 6·6 per cent of the world's population North America produced 18·9 per cent of the world's food. Europe, with 18·6 per cent of the world's population produced only 37·6 per cent of the world's food. These figures indicate that, on the whole, North America was better fed at the beginning of the war than was Europe. Then they show, too, that Europe and North America, representing one-quarter of mankind, produced over fifty per cent of the world's food, and consumed even more. Asia covering 53·2 per cent of the world's population consumed only 17·2 per cent of the food produced in the world.

Some cynic has said that before the war the Chinese were born in order to die of starvation—a terrible indictment against world inter-responsibility. The hon. member who has just taken his seat has stated that by raising the standard of living throughout the world we shall remove the danger or one of the reasons for war.

The McDougall memorandum to the League of Nations was presented to the President of the United States in the 1940's and upon its findings the basis upon which the wheat conference was called was founded, namely, that of equalizing permanently, through a permanent international organization, standards of living throughout the world.

The hon. member for Melfort has put certain figures on the record. I join with him in saying that, if the investigations made by the League of Nations were correct, then we in Canada should do our part toward increasing the production of foodstuffs, provided that we believe that the principles in the declaration are to be carried into effect and that mankind throughout the world is to receive a greater amount of food and a higher standard of nutrition than has been received before.

The McDougall memorandum, which influenced the then President of the United States very considerably, indicated that in order to ensure all sections of the population throughout the world having sufficient quantities of the right kinds of food, it would require in the United States of America—and this would apply to an even greater extent in Canada—an increase and expansion in production in the following orders of magnitude: cereals, by fifty per cent. I noticed that the hon. member for Melfort gave the figure as ten per cent. Apparently he obtained his statistics from a source other than the McDougall report. Then, to give further figures: Meat, ninety percent; milk and other dairy products, 125 per cent; vegetable oils, 125 per cent, and fruits and vegetables, 300 per cent.

The McDougall report concluded that only by such increases could the world hope to attain nutritional equality and a sufficiency of food and have a proper expansion and distribution of food so that the dangers of war from this cause would be removed. This report influenced President Roosevelt, realizing as he did, as so often enunciated by him, that there can be peace only if the nations of the earth have an equal opportunity not only for security, but also for a degree of economic life the like of which the world has never known before. The report leads to the conclusion that the world could achieve a new basis of economic well-being, and the nations joined in the food conference agreed among themselves in informal discussions to act through a world food and agricultural organization to achieve that great objective.

For generations security has been the aim of mankind. Mr. Eden, when he was British foreign secretary, reviewed the situation; and what he said on that occasion is reported in British *Hansard* for July 6, 1943. After stating that the objective according to the declaration at Hot Springs, was to secure freedom from want of food everywhere in the world, he proceeded in part as follows:

> . . . it is clear that freedom from want of food depends largely on matters outside the scope of purely agricultural or nutritional policy. This was fully recognized by the conference, which took account of the broad

questions of international security and economic expansion which are the necessary background of sustained progress towards freedom from want and a higher standard of living.

In other words, the bill before us to-day, in so far as the constitution is concerned, represents one of the great endeavours on the part of the united nations to secure peace and security through the established instruments which were fashioned at San Francisco, and to take measures to assure economic well-being by making each nation in the world responsible to equalize the opportunities for food to lesser fortunate nations throughout the world.

No one believes that this will be entirely successful. We are building—and building without the benefit of experience. We are building an idealistic future on the basis of circumstances as we find them to-day, and sometimes without regard to the realities of the future. But at least, so far as this constitution is concerned, as my leader indicated during his speech it represents something we must accept, however fragile the foundation upon which it may be built.

In looking over one of the speeches delivered in the British House of Commons by Richard Law, the then under-secretary for foreign affairs in Great Britain, I found words which represented to me the epitome of the attitude statesmen are taking, in the realization that men everywhere are taking new, uncertain steps and doing things which have not been done before to assure peace. We are trying to take them in cooperation with other nations, to the end that two wars in one generation shall not be followed by a third in the same generation, or, indeed, in generations to come.

This is what Mr. Richard Law said in regard to the Hot Springs conference:

> At Hot Springs we began a process of pile driving. We drove one pile into the shifting sands upon which, in these days, our lives are founded. For my own part I am sure that this is the right method by which to approach the problems of reconstruction. We shall not find peace in a blueprint.

Those words are as true to-day as they were when they were uttered by Mr. Law, a man in whom, by reason of his Canadian ancestry, Canadians have a special interest. He continued:

> If we tackle these problems one by one, if we drive one pile after, some of them may dissolve but some of them will last and we shall have in the end a stable foundation upon which to build the temple of peace.

We are accepting the great principles contained in the constitution which appears as an appendix to the bill, as a step in the direction of peace among all nations.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

I cannot understand why this important piece of legislation is brought down a few days before the convening of this conference at Quebec. Why was it not brought down last year? This constitution has been available for two years, but during those two years it has been embalmed in the records of some department of government and at the last moment it is brought out. I say that we will accept everything contained in the constitution provided that we have an opportunity to scrutinize with every care and attention the bill to which it is attached, intended to implement Canada's responsibility under this declaration.

Two years ago the nations whose names are to be found in annex II were cooperating, but are they cooperating to-day in so far as food production is concerned? If so, why is it that the international wheat agreement of 1942 is to-day in a position where apparently the parties to that agreement are unable to agree, or, to put it in the best light, have not as yet been able to agree?

I hold no brief for Argentina the nation which did us so much harm during the dark days of the war. But Argentina has been accepted as a member of the united nations, having performed the acts she was required to perform under the act of Chapultepec. Argentina, one of the world's largest exporters of farm products, is not included among the member nations of this organization upon whom the responsibility will fall. When the Minister of Agriculture replies I ask him to let the house and this country know what attitude the government representatives are to take at the Conference with respect to Argentina; for unless something is done in this regard Argentina will act as a threat to agricultural equality and equilibrium all over the world. In my opinion, despite Argentina's attitude to the United Nations during the days of the war, we need her cooperation if the principles of this declaration are to be carried into effect.

As far as nutrition is concerned, I shall not go into detail. My leader dealt with that question in some degree, but I would point out that it is philanthropic philosophy that is contained in this constitution, the raising of living standards by the raising of the nutritional standards of the world. We know that the bureau of home economics in the United States has concluded that even in the dying days of the war, when nutritional standards were higher than they had been for years, thirty-five per cent of the population were still deficient in several essential nutrients.

I accept the objectives of the constitution, noble as they are, but I intend to ask the Minister of Agriculture to make some material changes in the bill. I want to see Canada represented at the conference, but I would point out that this bill which is to implement the constitution abrogates the right of parliament for five years with regard to any matters connected with international policies with respect to agricultural commodity arrangements. It will be said that that is a wide statement, but I make it after carefully reviewing the various sections of this bill.

We know what the powers of the international food organization will be. The minister stated very properly that those powers will not be mandatory, that they will be in the form of recommendations to Canada and other nations, merely recommending to Canada, as one of the signatories, to carry them into effect. Supposing the delegates representing Canada at the conference next week come to a certain arrangement, and there is nothing to indicate that such arrangement will not be arrived at behind closed doors; then what happens? Let me read the exact words of the declaration, showing the matters the organization will be empowered to deal with, which are:

(f) the adoption of international policies with respect to agricultural commodity arrangements.

(e) the adoption of policies for the provision of adequate agricultural credit, national and international.

As provided for in the constitution, a majority of the nations may come to a certain decision. Where does Canada come in? Parliament will never find out what has been done, with the bill as it now stands for there is not one provision which will enable parliament to know what is going on. I read the pertinent section, which states:

The governor in council may make such appointments, establish such offices, make such orders in council and do such things as appear to him to be necessary for carrying out the provisions of the constitution set out in the schedule to this act or any recommendations of the conference of the food and agriculture organization of the united nations, or of its committees, made pursuant to such provisions.

In other words, we are asked to empower the governor in council to pass orders in council ratifying or carrying out any of the recommendations made by the conference set up under the provisions of this constitution.

Mr. GARDINER: Only to establish the offices necessary.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That is a fair interruption, but listen to the words, because it is not only to establish offices:

The governor in council may make such appointments, establish such offices, make such orders in council and do such things as appear to him to be necessary for carrying out the . . . recommendations of the conference. . . .

Mr. GARDINER: Provisions of the constitution.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: "Conference" is the word. I am reading from the copy of the bill that has been given to me.

Mr. GARDINER: I do not know what copy the hon. member has, but mine says "constitution."

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Everyone seems to have a different copy. I am reading from the one that was handed to me. We are even more in the dark than we were if we are using different copies.

Mr. GARDINER: I have never seen more than the one copy, and that is the one I have in my hand.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Listen to the words:

The governor in council may make such appointments, establish such offices, make such orders in council and do such things as appear to him to be necessary for carrying out the provisions of the constitution set out in the schedule to this act or any recommendations of the conference of the food and agriculture organization of the united nations, or of its committees, made pursuant to such provisions.

That section is too wide. It is opening the door to irresponsible government by order in council, to which I raise the most strenuous objections. I am going to ask the minister to have the bill redrafted so that parliament will have something more than a photographic copy of an act made upon declaration of peace between Bulgaria and Turkey and Canada after the last war. Bring it up to date. So far as I am concerned, and I think I speak also for the members of this party, we believe that the time has come to deny the placing of these tremendous powers, untrammeled by parliament, in the hands of the government.

Mr. GARDINER: On that point—

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Now, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. GARDINER: My hon. friend, I am sure, does not want to misrepresent the facts. Let him read subsection 2 of section 2, which provides that all the expenditures must be referred to parliament.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Yes. But I am not dealing with expenditures. I am dealing with the carrying into effect of recommendations.

Certainly the government could not make expenditures without coming to parliament to get the moneys. I certainly do not contend that we had arrived at that stage. I am dealing with section 2, subsection 1, which gives the governor in council power to enter into any arrangement with an international organization set up under the provisions of this constitution. Was it an oversight that there is no provision in the bill at all that the orders in council shall be brought before parliament? Every other bill that has been introduced during the last year, as was pointed out by my leader, makes provision for the tabling of the orders in council. But not this one.

Mr. GARDINER: If my hon. friend will allow me, we are quite prepared to accept an amendment to that effect, that the orders in council be produced in the house or that a time be set under this section when a return shall be made to the house.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: We have one thing now; we are to know what has been done by the governor in council after he has done it.

Next I say that the governor in council should not have placed in his hands the power, behind the backs of the people of Canada, to carry out the recommendations, whatever they may be, of any international organization without their being submitted to parliament, and I intend, when the opportunity comes, to bring in amendments to that effect: first, to bring in an amendment which will require the approval of parliament within a reasonable time of any decisions made by this international organization and accepted by the governor in council. We required, too, knowledge of and publicity for the orders that are made. But that demand is now done away with by the minister's promise to have the orders in council tabled.

I think any person who looks at this bill reasonably will agree, and I am sure the Minister of Agriculture will be as desirous as any member that parliament must retain the power to decide economic matters which will affect this nation over a period of five years. I feel that we are getting to a point in this country where, unless a stop is put to this type of legislation, we may very well see the day when as a result of the setting up of boards and commissions and the like, no longer when writing official letters will board members and commissioners sign themselves as they did before the war, "Your obedient servant", but they will be able to say to us, "Your omnipotent master". Against that trend I absolutely protest. Why do I criticize order in council government? I criticize it because I have consistently taken that stand, supported by certain other members of the house. I believe that the time has come in this country when unnecessary boards and unnecessary controls must cease to exist. We are in this position, that we of the Progressive Conservative party alone, except for the assistance of hon. members in other parts of the house, take that stand because my hon. friends of the C.C.F. party cannot take that stand. They will not oppose these things; they accept these things, the setting up of boards, government by order in council, and the like, because in order to carry into effect the socialistic set-up which they believe necessary for the economic welfare of this country they would be bound to intensify far and beyond anything we have to-day the boards and controls already existing. That is the reason why they invariably support these things.

Mr. IRVINE: I hope the hon. gentleman does not want to be unfair. I do not think there is any connection at all between the point he is making and socialism.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Mr. Speaker, we are constituted differently. I see quite an apt connection between the two points. I am going to ask my hon. friends on the government side of the house also to give me support in the request that I am making. I am not going to deal with ancient history. I am not going to place before the house some of the statements made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) in 1920, although I have them under my hand. Certainly no man was ever more critical of order in council government in 1919 and 1920 than the present Prime Minister of Canada.

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier): Three years after the war.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That was the stand he took, and I am asking hon. members on the other side of the house to stand up now for the rights of parliament and demand that this bill be amended to restore to parliament the right to determine the economic future of this country.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, the motion before the house is for the second reading of bill No. 14, which deals with a very important subject. I would point out that if the motion carries, the principle of

the bill is adopted, and it seldom happens that the principle will be revised in committee. Once we adopt the motion for the second reading of the bill the principle has been accepted by parliament. The hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) before six o'clock referred to the matter of orders in council in connection with the bills which are before parliament. In addition to bill No. 14 there is a complementary measure extending the powers granted after the war in a national emergency. They relate to the same principle, namely, the reestablishment of many of the controls which the people have put up with during the war. Many of the rights and privileges of parliament were given up in order that the war might be prosecuted to a successful conclusion, and all classes of the population were glad to cooperate with the government.

As regards the particular matter which is before us to-night, when I saw the war coming a few years ago, in the sessions of 1937 and 1938 I urged upon the government the importance of taking steps to meet the serious menace of the U-boats on the Atlantic, especially in view of the fact that there were five million more mouths to feed in England than there were when war broke out in 1914. I also pointed out the great loss in tonnage that had taken place and that shipping had not kept pace with the progress of events, so that we were not in a position to meet an emergency. I urged on the government at that time the establishment of a system of food reservoirs in England to take care of 200,000,000 bushels of wheat and packaged commodities, canned goods and things of that sort. I may have been a prophet preaching in vain to those who were advocating pacifism at that time. I quote the prophet Jeremiah who said, "Where are now your prophets that prophesied unto you, saying, the king of Babylon shall not come against you, nor against this land," but he did. War came; the mother country was attacked, and the loss of southern ports just around the corner meant that Britain was nearly starved out by U-boats in her darkest hour. I had urged on the government for years, when I saw that war was coming, that we should have a proper system of storage reservoirs in Britain by which we could meet any emergency; but as a Conservative sitting on this side my proposals were opposed. There will come a day when the hon. gentleman who rose in his place last week and criticized not only the Progressive Conservative party but a good many public men in this country who have done a great deal for the empire will have to give an answer for the attitude he has taken. I was very much disappointed that steps had not been taken before the war came. The whole north American continent, both the United States and Canada, may thank providence that we escaped the horrors of war on our own soil.

I have always got along very well with the members from the province of Quebec, have urged that the principle of confederation is each for all and all for each, the old Cornish battle-cry, because what is for the good of one province is for the benefit of all. Where would the people of the maritime provinces have been; where would the people of Quebec, Ontario and other provinces have been, if it had not been for the mother country and sea protection in this war? What would have happened to our farmers? The people in eastern Canada might have found themselves confronted with internment camps, the loud speaker, the whip, the gestapo police, the tramping of feet, the brutal savagery of the axis powers. Hundreds of thousands of the population in the eastern provinces might have been carted off to work in Germany. That was the position of affairs which this country faced, and I urged upon the government the necessity for taking steps to provide some sort of food reservoir for Britain and our allies over there.

I admit that Canada did make a great contribution to the war. That contribution has been referred to by Mr. Churchill and others who have spoken of the magnificent part played by the farmers of this country throughout the war. I have no criticism of that programme at all; I am in accord with it. The people of this dominion expect the government of the day to do everything they possibly can to get all the food shipped to the mother country and the sufferers in Europe that can be provided.

I have before me the British white paper dealing with the Hot Springs conference, because I want to get the facts right. The matter was brought up in the House of Commons in England on July 6, 1943, when Mr. Anthony Eden, British Foreign Secretary, gave an account of what had taken place in connection with food at the conference which was held in Hot Springs, Virginia, from May 18 to June 3. That conference was attended by the representatives of forty-four nations, and a large number of those who have endorsed the food and agriculture organization of the united nations participated. Canada's contribution under the schedule to Bill No. 14 is to be 5·06 per cent; Australia's, 3·33; New Zealand's, 1·15; South Africa's, 2·31; Russia's, 8; the United Kingdom's, 15, and the United States', 25 per cent.

I was disappointed at the replies I received when I inquired about this conference at the time. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) made a statement to-day; and while I do not agree with the method that has been adopted I do agree, and I believe the house is unanimous in the view, that the government should do everything possible to make a success of this food undertaking. Since the house started, all parties have been working in a fine spirit of unity in order to find the solution of all our social and economic problems and as set out in bill No. 14.

Section 3 of the bill reads:

As soon as practicable after the close of each fiscal year the Secretary of State for External Affairs shall prepare and lay before parliament a report of operations under this act.

The trouble is that we have been thinking too much in terms of "external affairs," with the result that we are more than two years behind the mother country in the adoption of proposals which would have led to an improved agriculture and food situation. What did they do in the mother country? The Hot Springs conference, as I have said, was attended by forty-four nations, and on July 6, 1943, the British government got out a white paper in which there appeared all the resolutions passed at the conference. The three objects of the conference were: first, to raise the level of nutrition and standards of living of the peoples in the respective jurisdictions; the second was to secure improvements in the efficiency of production and distribution of food and of agricultural products; and the third object of the forty-four nations was to better the conditions of rural populations, thus contributing toward an expanding world economy. On the same day on which Mr. Eden made his statement in the British House of Commons, July 6, 1943, we should have had a corresponding statement here the same day. We have lost more than two years by not adopting up-to-date methods in dealing with this subject. Let me quote what Mr. Eden, British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, said that day.

His Majesty's government have no hesitation in accepting the resolutions and the obligation to give effect to them in so far as they apply to the conditions in the United Kingdom. They will also gladly cooperate with other governments in seeking ways to give effect to those resolutions which call for concerted action. They will commend the resolutions to the governments of His Majesty's colonies, dependencies and overseas territories.

The main object of the conference was to secure an abundant supply of the right kind of food for all mankind. World-wide investigations show, states the conference report, that the diets consumed by the greater part of mankind are nutritionally unsatisfactory. The white paper continues:

Nutrition therefore becomes a primary concern of governments everywhere. To give conscious planned direction to mankind's need for food in the modern sense each nation should develop a national food and nutrition policy to the full fruition of which related social and economic policies will need to be adopted.

In my opinion that is correct. A famous Conservative, Mr. Disraeli, said that the first concern of the nation should be the health of the people. Speaking at Edinburgh in 1867 to the farmers of that district, he said:

In a progressive country change is constant; and the great question is, not whether you should resist change, which is inevitable, but whether the change should be carried out in deference to the manners, the customs, the laws, the traditions of the people, or in deference to abstract principles, and arbitrary and general doctrines.

He went on to say, that "power has only one duty, to secure the social welfare of the people." That was the utterance of a great humanitarian, Mr. Benjamin Disraeli, a prime minister of the mother country. His principles have been carried out by his successors, including the government of which Hon. Mr. Hudson was recently a member.

All men are consumers of food, the report says, and more than two-thirds of them are producers of it. Clearly, therefore, the nutrition policy and the agricultural policy of the nations must be considered interdependent. If the nutritional needs of mankind are to be satisfied, a vast increase in agricultural production will be necessary throughout the world; and producers must know not only what they have to do, but also that their labours will secure for them an adequate livelihood.

The conference supported this bill No. 14. It does not refer, however, to the method or manner of controls through orders in council. The conference indicated its conviction that the types of food needed to improve people's diets and health are in many cases those produced by methods of farming best calculated to keep the soil productive and to increase and stabilize the returns of the farmers. In short, better nutrition means better farming.

There is a summary of these main resolutions in the white paper. The first deals with intention: governments should declare to their own people their intention to secure more and better food for the people.

Next, post-war shortage, which was known in this house three or four years ago to be a practical certainty. The summary states that it was agreed that the period following the liberation of occupied countries would be one

of excessive scarcity. Governments, therefore, should work together to produce more food, especially cereals and other foods which promote energy and satisfy hunger, and to prevent, speculative and violent fluctuations in prices.

Immediate measures. The white paper says that while the ultimate objective must be a world in which all are fed adequately for good health, it will be necessary as a practical measure to concentrate on intermediate objectives which can be advanced as conditions improve.

The next clause of the resolutions of the food conference adopted in Britain relates to research, a matter which I urged on the minister back in 1938 in connection with reservoirs of food for the mother country. We should have taken full advantage of science and research. At that time the British medical association was meeting in London, and they pointed out that grain and canned and other goods could be stored at suitable food reservoirs in Great Britain for emergency purposes. The Hot Springs conference suggests that all nations should train scientific workers and rural leaders for service in agriculture and promote technical efficiency among producers by means of education and research. The nations should exchange with each other factual information and statistics regarding food and agriculture.

A world-wide economy is the subject of another resolution. A balanced world-wide expansion of economic activity must be achieved to secure freedom from want, since it is no use producing the food if the standard of living of the people is too low for them to buy it.

A permanent international organization such as is set out in bill No. 14 is proposed, to collect and disseminate information and statistics regarding food and agriculture.

The British Minister of Agriculture, Mr. R. S. Hudson, with whom I once had some correspondence in reference to a food reservoir, said, speaking in the House of Commons on the same day that Mr. Eden announced the government's acceptance of the conference resolutions:

> The recent conference at Hot Springs was attended by forty-four nations. That conference passed several resolutions which I think will prove to be of the greatest significance for agriculture throughout the world. These resolutions were passed unanimously. No delegations entered any reservations at all. Incidentally, it was the occasion of considerable tribute being paid to the British delegation under the leadership of the under secretary of state for foreign affairs.

That was Mr. Eden. On the subject of post-war food scarcities, the minister remarked:

> One of the most striking facts which emerged from that conference was the general agreement that immediately after the war the world would be faced with an acute shortage of food, and that this shortage would cover not only actual foodstuffs, but would also cover methods of transportation, and methods of production, such as fertilizers, machinery, draft animals, petrol and so forth.

The British Minister of Agriculture continued:

> It is, I think, clear that the industry of agriculture, at all events in this country, will have to remain fully mobilized for a period after the war which cannot be determined to-day. . . . What is clear, and what all the nations gathered at Hot Springs were clear and agreed about, is that, taking the world as a whole, there will undoubtedly be a severe shortage of live stock and live stock products, of oils and fats, and it is highly likely, difficult as it may seem to believe, that there will be an actual shortage of bread grains and of rice. The reasons for this shortage are obvious. A large part of the agriculture of Europe, Russia and Asia has been thrown into disorder and it will take a considerable period for those countries and those continents to get on their feet again.

It will be noticed that Russia has been called upon for a contribution of only eight per cent, which I think is very fair.

As to the production programmes:

> The conference at Hot Springs recommended that all countries should plan their production programmes on a realistic basis and should concentrate on measures to relieve hunger in the first instance, even at the expense of putting nutritional improvements of diet second. They pointed out that it was necessary to concentrate on foodstuffs for direct human consumption. . . .
>
> The conference also said that those countries, like ourselves, which have already increased food production during the war, must maintain that increased production and if possible increase it.

Speaking of the British policy, the minister said that they agreed with the resolutions re food production, and added:

> We consider that the best contribution we can make to the food problems of the world is to continue producing from our own soil, food for as large a proportion as we can for as long as that process proves to be necessary.

For nearly a hundred years Britain has been dependent for her food supply very largely on imports from abroad. As a result of the government's recent policy they have expanded their own food production about seventy per cent since the war broke out, and have made a great contribution to the progress and security which the British farmer at present enjoys.

As to security for the farmer, I will read just one or two more sentences of this report:

> What are the economic risks to which the farmer is subjected? In the first place, he is subject to wide fluctuations in prices, with the subsequent ups and down in the returns . . . to fluctuations in employment, and to fluctuations in outputs, due to weather and outbreaks of disease. Clearly, the more mixed farming you get, the less is your danger from those fluctuations, because you spread your risks over a greater number of products.
>
> The conference stressed the point that all these economic and biological dangers can be greatly diminished by the adoption of systems of mixed rotational farming.

The minister goes on to say, referring to certain sections of hostile urban and politico-economic opinion:

> Is it too much to hope that those people will note that forty-four nations, assembled at Hot Springs, unanimously decided that it was in the general interests of mankind that agriculture should be based on sound fundamental principles, and those fundamental principles involve the maintenance of soil fertility and a system of mixed . . . farming.

The last resolution which is referred to deals with price stability:

> There is another resolution to which I should, in fairness, call attention, which says that increasing opportunities should be afforded for supplying consumption needs at prices fair to both producers and consumers alike, to prevent serious economic and social dislocation.

The resolution states that excessive short-term movements in prices of food and agricultural products are an obstacle to the orderly development of production, that extreme fluctuations of prices of food and agricultural products increase inflationary and also deflationary tendencies, and that these tendencies harm producers and consumers alike.

As to the world policy which has been decided upon for agriculture, this resolution sets out—and we are a party to it when we pass this bill—that the Hot Springs resolution definitely pointed the way to a world policy for agriculture, first of all for the short-term period of acute shortage and then a new period of gradual adjustment; then finally, they laid down the basic principles on which a practical policy for a well balanced agriculture could be carried out throughout the world. If these policies outlined at Hot Springs are followed and put into effect in each country according to its different economic conditions we shall, I think, have gone a long way along the road to solving the problems which faced primary producers throughout the world in pre-war days.

This interim commission was formed at the Hot Springs conference to formulate and recommend for consideration by each member government or authority a specific plan for a permanent organization in the field of food and agriculture, and the commission's first report has been published in the form of a white paper, in 1945. The British government's instrument of acceptance is signed by Mr. Eden and dated December 14, 1944. That is the policy laid down there. In 1943 Mr. Churchill said:

> Abundant food has brought our 47,000,000 Britons into the world. Here they are, and they must find their living. It is absolutely certain we shall have to grow a larger proportion of our food at home. During the war immense advances have been made by the agricultural industry. The position of the farmers has been improved; the position of the labourers immeasurably improved. The efficient agricultural landlord has an important part to play. I hope to see a vigorous revival of healthy village life on the basis of these higher wages and of improved housing after the war, and what with the modern methods of locomotion and the modern amusements of the cinema and the wireless, to which will soon be added television, life in the country and on the land ought to compete in attractiveness with life in the great cities.

So that they have increased their production by seventy per cent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer to the method the government has adopted in this case; that is, the method of carrying on by order in council, even after the war is over. As you know there was a great deal of criticism in this country during the war because of the way government was carried on by order in council. Knowing it was for the war, however, the people gladly gave up many of their rights and privileges which it took hundreds of years to secure. This matter was referred to this afternoon by the hon. member for Lake Centre. One of the great contributions the mother country has made to the history of the world and to civilization is the ideal of a community of free men governing themselves through a free parliament, such as we had in Canada before the war started. To-day, however, we almost take for granted many of the liberties which have been given to us during the last three hundred years. Let us think of the great struggle that was carried on to secure those rights and privileges. Remember the struggle carried on by the barons against King John. After all is said and done, it was the armed strength of the barons that made magna charta possible. Now, however, under measures like this we are giving up some of the liberties and privileges won at such great cost.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to draw the attention of hon. members to paragraph 118 under standing order 12, which reads:

Silence is required to be observed in both houses. In the Commons, all members should be silent, or should converse only in whisper.

Mr. CHURCH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In this connection I would refer to the Book of Revelations, to quote a verse which is relevant to this discussion:

Behold, I come quickly: hold that fast which thou hast, that no man take thy crown.

We in this House of Commons are rapidly losing the crown referred to and our control over the expenditures of the government. If it goes on much longer I do not want to be a member of parliament, because I do not want to see my rights and privileges taken away, and the institutions to which I have referred forgotten and abandoned. Men suffered at the stake to win these liberties for us, and we must not lightly drop them. This House of Commons is the court of last resort for the grievances of the people, and the private member is the connecting link between the government of the day and the electors. When he ceases to function, as he has had to cease functioning in this house during the war, free parliaments and parliamentary government is at an end.

With all due respect I repeat that I object to the method and manner by which this particular measure is to be carried into effect by orders in council. I do not believe it is necessary. The minister would be far better off to support the high court of parliament, as they have done in the mother country, and put a sum of money in the estimates to be passed each year. Heaven knows that in a rich country like Canada, where we had no invasion, where no buildings were destroyed and no damage done, we are in a very favourable position. We should have had in reservoirs overseas before the war 200,000,000 bushels of grain, instead of limiting acreage and things like that when we knew well before the war that all the grain, live stock, dairy products and other commodities we could produce would be required to feed the poor, long-suffering people in the devastated areas of Europe if war came.

Mr. DONALD M. FLEMING (Eglinton): Mr. Speaker, the measure before us is one of the highest importance, not only because of the provisions of the agreement but also because of the implications of both the agreement and the bill. It should be a matter of the greatest satisfaction that Canada had such a leading part to play in the negotiation of this agreement. Canada was ably represented by Mr. Lester Pearson, and we should take great pride in the fact that a young diplomat from this young country played a leading and most creditable part in the negotiation of this international agreement.

I urge that this instrument is worthy of unanimous ratification by this parliament, and I need mention only two reasons. In the first place this agreement should receive the greatest possible support because it is based upon humanitarian considerations. The feeding of the hungry in all parts of the world is and must be of concern to the people of this enlightened, Christian land. It is something of which we as Canadians should be proud that we can take a very important part in that great work. In the next place this agreement ought to command the widest support because it represents an important step in the field of international relations. It is an agreement among nations. We in Canada are looking for opportunities to assist in giving leadership throughout the world in relations between nations. Here we have the field of the production of foodstuffs in which Canada holds a position of leadership. Therefore it is only right and proper that in the negotiating an agreement and in implementing of an agreement in relation to the feeding of the peoples of the world Canada should have a leading part.

In the past we have done much for which we might reproach ourselves. Let it not be forgotten that we, along with some of the other food producing nations of the world, in days not so long removed, were busy reducing production and in some cases destroying foodstuffs at a time when millions of people throughout the world starved. Surely we have taken a step, a long step, from that discreditable situation. This agreement offers an opportunity to take a long step away from that discreditable episode of our past.

Let it not be thought that in helping to raise the standard of living among other nations of the world we are doing anything to reduce the standard of living of our own people—far from it. The surest guarantee of the betterment of the standard of living of our own people will be the betterment of the standard of living of those vast millions of people the world over who to-day have not enough to eat.

Can we ponder what it would mean to Canada, in safeguarding our standard of living, if the hungry millions of Asia, who some day may be competing with us for the world's markets, had as high a standard of living as we have?

The real hope for Canada, both in respect of her international trade and in respect of

the maintenance of the standard of living of her people at home, lies in this urgent need—and perhaps in other respects as well—that we must help other nations to raise their standard of living. This measure gives an opportunity to Canada to help in that worthy cause.

I suggest that measures of this type are the kind upon which we should like and ought to see parliament expressing its views in unanimous terms. It is a matter of disappointment, therefore, that the bill now before us presents this agreement in such a way that those of us who are determined to oppose arbitrary measures find that we must criticize the bill and criticize it strongly. It would have been so much better, I suggest, both for the effect at home and for the effect abroad, had it been possible to put this agreement before parliament for simple ratification, without at the same time introducing sections which are calculated to give the government the most sweeping powers, powers which a self-respecting parliament in a time like this cannot transfer to a cabinet.

It is a matter of disappointment that we have not the opportunity, as the bill stands to-night, to express ourselves unanimously in support of the ratification of the measure. There are one or two things which might properly be said to the government at this time, and which might prevent a repetition in connection with later measures which will come before the house.

Our experience in Canada in recent years with government by order in council has put at least those of us who sit on this side of the house, on our guard with respect to arbitrary measures. It has not served to allay our fears or our suspicions when, in the five and one-half weeks parliament has been in session, the government has continued to legislate by order in council and apparently under the authority of the War Measures Act with reference to subjects which have no connection whatsoever with the war.

It is against that background that we propose to survey all the measures the government introduces at this session. The government might as well understand right now that we propose to bring critical views to bear upon those government measures. I repeat that we are on our guard against arbitrary measures. We have had so much bureaucracy in recent years that we are on our guard against the creation of more of it, or the perpetuation of existing bureaucracy.

It is no comfort to the house to have the government point to some measures which were passed in parliaments of other years and which contain language similar to that found in section 2 of the bill. That is no comfort. It may be that the parliament which was in session when those measures were adopted was a parliament which felt that the government of that day, on its assurances and on its record, could be entrusted with certain powers to proceed by way of orders in council to implement the provisions of international treaties.

That situation does not obtain at the present time. Our position on this side of the house is that there shall be the strictest scrutiny applied to government measures, and the strongest opposition voiced to anything which proposes the extension of the powers of the government to legislate by order in council.

I suggest that, above all other kinds of measures with which we may have to deal in this parliament, measures affecting international relations ought to be kept squarely within the ambit of the powers of parliament, and that those in relation to international agreements ought not to seek to take from parliament and vest in a cabinet powers which normally would be exercised by parliament itself.

The reason for that position is obvious. Here we are dealing, not with something which affects only our own citizens, but with something which affects our relations with other nations of the world, some of the leading nations of the world. Our relations with those nations may be affected by the course followed with respect to the agreement with which we are attempting to deal in the measure before us to-night.

In these circumstances, if Canada means to fulfil her obligations and to fulfil the pledges contained in her international agreements, it is vital that such measures should command the most widespread support within Canada and within parliament. Above all other measures they should be the last to seek to take from parliament powers which are properly vested in parliament. How else can we ensure that solid foundation of public support and that necessary measure of success for these international agreements, and the permanence of international relations which we mean to seek?

Very briefly, I wish to compare this measure with one or two others which were adopted in earlier parliaments. I suggest that the comparison will be decidedly to the disadvantage of the present measure. I draw attention, in the first place, to the fact that in this measure we are not being invited to ratify in express terms the international agreement. We are not being asked to ratify the agreement. Let no one think that there is one section in the bill which is, in express terms, a ratification of the agreement, because that is not so.

We are told, as a matter of information, in the preamble of the bill that Canada is transmitting an instrument of acceptance. This house and parliament are not being called upon for ratification of the agreement. We are told, in effect, that the government has already transmitted, or is going to transmit ratification of the agreement on behalf of this country. All we are called upon to do is to put into the hands of the government certain very broad powers. That is what this bill contemplates and provides, and therefore I think that when approaching the bill the house ought to be put on its guard. It would have been very much more proper if the government, in submitting this measure, had chosen to follow the very useful precedent which is to be found in the statute which provided for the ratification of the protocol accepting the statute of the permanent court of international justice, which statute was enacted in April, 1921, as chapter 46 of the statutes of that year. There we had a similar situation. A bill was brought to parliament to deal with the protocol for adoption of the statute for the permanent court of international justice, and parliament was given an opportunity to ratify it. This is how section one of that statute reads:

The governor in council is authorized—

Mark you, authorized by parliament.

—to advise that His Majesty be humbly moved to ratify on behalf of Canada the said protocol of the sixteenth day of December, 1920, in the manner thereby stipulated.

Parliament of that day was given an opportunity to authorize the cabinet of that day to advise His Majesty to sign the agreement. Not so in the year 1945. In the amendments which we of the official opposition propose to introduce in committee that situation will be taken care of and there will be given to this parliament an opportunity which the government has not given in introducing this measure, to pass on this agreement in plain and express terms, to say whether we approve and ratify it or whether we do not.

There is another phase of the matter which I do not intend to deal with at any length because it was so ably dealt with this afternoon by the hon. member for Lake Centre. Section 2 of this bill is a most extraordinary piece of draftsmanship. Certainly the draftsman of this legislation was schooled in the school of bureaucracy which has flourished at Ottawa in recent years, because this is on all fours with the kind of legislation which has been ground out by parliament in recent years. Under that section the governor in council is authorized, not only to make appointments, establish offices, pass orders in council and do whatever things may appear to him to be necessary to carry out the provisions of the constitution; he is to be granted those powers in connection with the recommendations of the conference of the food and agricultural organization.

This conference has not yet met to make recommendations. In other words, we are being asked to say to the government: although there are no recommendations in existence and may not be for months, we clothe you with power to ratify recommendations that we have not seen, that have not been born as yet. Not only is that being done in connection with recommendations of the conference, it is being done in connection with recommendations of its committees. Think of that! This parliament is being asked to commit such an act of abdication as will vest in the government the broadest powers to proceed by order in council and do all kinds of things to carry out the provisions of this agreement as well as to carry out the recommendations of the conference and, further, to carry out the recommendations of the committees of the conference which have not even been established. These recommendations have not been made and may not be made for months, but this parliament is being asked to give the government power to ratify these things before they are even born. That is government, 1945 edition. We hope there will be an opportunity to correct some of the short-comings in this measure when we proceed to committee stage.

This afternoon mention was made by my leader and the hon. member for Lake Centre of features of this bill which seem to be designed to ensure secrecy about whatever acts the government may do in pursuance of the powers it is asking to have vested in it by section 2 of the bill. We had some intimation from the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) that there may be some measure of relief in store for parliament in that respect and we certainly trust that is so. It would have been much better if the government, in directing the drafting of this measure, had chosen again to follow a worthy precedent to be found in chapter 49 of the statutes of 1922, an act for carrying into effect the treaties of peace between His Majesty and Hungary and Turkey. That measure contains these words which one will search the present measure in vain to find:

Any order in council made under this act . . . shall be laid before parliament as soon as may be after it is made. . . .

One can search throughout this measure in vain for anything which even suggests the faintest obligation on the part of the

government to table these orders in council or to make them public when they are passed. We are not prepared to accept any bland assurances that that is to be expected, because we have had a great deal of that kind of secrecy which has attached itself to legislation by order in council. We hope, before this measure reaches third reading, to see it so amended that it will give parliament power to ratify this measure or at least to authorize the government to advise His Majesty to ratify the measure. We hope that it will not be left to the government to ratify the measure and then parliament simply come along and be given the glorious distinction of being permitted merely to authorize the government to carry out the measure.

In the second place we want to see an amendment introduced which will compel the tabling and publication of orders in council when they are made. Not only that; we want to see that there is no permanence given to orders in council or the measures the government may take in pursuance of the powers conferred by this bill. They must have a limited duration. In that and in no other way can parliament maintain and ensure its proper control over the implementing of this important agreement.

I have one observation to make in conclusion. I hope we are not to be offered by the government a sort of sop corresponding in form to a section of the National Housing Act of 1944, to which reference will be made in this parliament if something is not done soon in pursuance to the section to which I refer. Section 30 of that act reads:

> As soon as practicable after the end of each calendar year, the minister shall prepare a report with regard to the administration of this act and the loans made thereunder during the preceding calendar year and the report shall be laid before parliament forthwith or, if parliament be not then in session, within fifteen days after the commencement of the next ensuing session thereof.

It is not enough to have legislation which apparently requires the government to bring in a report, the sort of thing that is contemplated by section 3 of the bill. There have been two sessions of parliament in 1945 and the government is still in default under section 30 of the National Housing Act, because there has as yet been no report on the 1944 administration. The government was in default fifteen days after the opening of the first session of this year. The matter has been brought up several times this session and we still have not had a report. Is that kind of record going to give this parliament any confidence that it can expect a frank and full and complete and immediate disclosure by the government of all its acts in pursuance of the provisions of this measure? All we have to rely on is legislation in the terms of section 3 and that is not good enough. In the light of the experience of parliament in recent years that is not nearly good enough. The government may just as well take notice right now that we on this side intend to fight arbitrary measures to the limit. No matter how anxious we may be to further a measure, if it is couched in terms which seem to us to vest in the government arbitrary powers, we will criticize it and resist it to the limit.

Mr. E. G. McCULLOUGH (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I rise wtih a great deal of pleasure to speak in favour of this bill with which I am in sympathy. The bill, which is to establish an agricultural organization of the united nations, recognizes one great thing, namely, that to-day many nations of the world believe in a world citizenship. Such a bill would never have come before this parliament twenty-five years ago, but since then we have passed through one of the most crucial stages in the world's history and have fought a global war. The bill recognizes that to-day all countries have a responsibility to other countries throughout the world and must have regard to the rights and needs of other peoples. I consider this a Christian responsibility.

There has been a good deal of discussion of the bill and some controversy has developed over the maintenance of controls, but the very fact that we live in a country where we are more fortunate than peoples in other parts of the world does impose upon us a definite responsibility. It is not enough to put on paper or even to inaugurate a system of world organization unless we are ready to make fundamental changes, and in the few moments at my disposal I shall mention some fundamental changes which I believe are necessary.

One of the big questions which this parliament has to decide is whether we are to have a high or a low income in Canada. During the war, in 1943, we had a gross income of $8,800,000,000, and according to the bureau of statistics that is about sixty-eight per cent over the 1926-29 level. There has been some intimation from members of the cabinet that in order to have full employment or anywhere near it in this country labour would have to take a cut-back of from twenty-five to forty per cent. We have also been told by various ministers that agriculture must be satisfied with lower returns for its products. I should like to quote what the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) said, as reported at page 425

of *Hansard,* in outlining to the house the measures which this government has taken for the stability of agriculture. He said:

May I say in conclusion that we have made exactly the same kind of arrangement with regard to cattle. That contract extends down to December 31, 1946. There is no one in Canada who needs to have any fear that the price will be cut in the marketing of these live stock products between now and the end of 1946, below the minimum which the contract establishes, if the stock is marketed orderly and the plants operate at capacity.

The farmer in western Canada has already experienced a decrease in cattle prices. So I say that to-day we have no safeguard against falling prices. We have been told that we have unemployment insurance and family allowances, but after all the sacrifices the Canadian people made in war I do not think they will be satisfied with that kind of floor under our Canadian economy, and so I am going to submit that we need a fundamental change. We have had in this country a government which does not believe in planning. They have said so themselves. Yet through the sheer necessity of planning to meet our war commitments we have been able to increase our natural production from around three billions to approximately nine billions of dollars. Therefore I maintain that if we launch upon a system of high income in Canada we can maintain a high level of income for all our people. The fight is not between the farmer and labour, because we in this group have shown to the people that we are interdependent. We have shown that if we can take the resources of this country and can put our people to work on them we can produce a wealth of things. What we produce on our farms and in our factories represents wealth and the social services that we can provide for ourselves. What we export in the way of surpluses means that we thereby build up credits or else we import. The fact is, as it has been in the past, that unless we import as much as we export, the Canadian people are short by just that amount of foodstuffs and other commodities. The first thing we should realize, and as a farmer from western Canada I certainly realize it, is that a larger income in the hands of the workers means a larger consumption of the products of the farm. More purchasing power in the hands of the workers means that they will buy more butter, cheese, eggs, pork and other farm products. Those of us who live in western Canada need farm machinery and various other goods. Therefore to-day we should start our factories going, producing the machinery that is required by the western farmer and by farmers all over Canada.

One of the first things we must do in order to establish Canadian domestic economy on a sound basis is to establish it on a high income basis. Then we can meet our Christian commitments, if you like, to the united nations. We can join with the other nations who are willing to recognize their responsibilities to all countries of the world to-day to feed and clothe the starving and destitute who are less fortunate than ourselves. Surely we realize to-day that it is much cheaper and much better to share than to hoard surpluses which may lead us into another war. The leader of this group said at one time, not what Napoleon said, that an army marches on its stomach, but that armies march when their stomachs are empty. I am in agreement with that. When we have starving millions in Europe and Asia, unless we do something about it we shall have trouble.

I should like to read into the record something regarding the lack of stability in this country and the need for some sort of planning. Some of the opposition members have criticized the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, and one hon. member said that we would not agree with what he was saying when he was decrying the fact that this bill would necessitate orders in council, involving a lack of power on the part of this parliament. Let me say that we have never at any time said anything against democracy. We believe in democracy and in the rights of this parliament. At the same time we recognize that orders in council, and some of the actions of the cabinet, produce what one might call "funny" things. Certainly we do not want any situation to exist such as has been described in my own constituency. A certain man went everywhere looking for underwear in the middle of the winter. He went to every town within his reach and all he could get was one suit. He needed underclothing and so did his son, but it happened that the father's shoulders were cold while most of the son's trouble was in his lower extremities, and so they cut the suit in two, each using one-half of it. That is not what we want. We want carefully considered planning so that what we have done for war we can do for peace.

In closing, let me say that I heartily endorse the principle of this responsibility which the bill recognizes.

Mr. W. G. CASE (Grey North): I wish to make a few observations on the bill before the house. In the first place, it appears to be all-inclusive, but because it has a direct relationship to agriculture I feel that it commends itself to our serious consideration.

I look upon agriculture as one of the great basic industries of the country, an industry from which we derive much of our wealth. In fact, it is the one dependable source of real wealth we have in Canada. I am thinking now of our basic industries—agriculture, forestry, fishery and our mines. The bill has a direct relationship to each of these, and therefore I think that since it has these potentialities it should receive the favourable consideration of hon. members.

Then, too, its human character must not be overlooked. It will indeed play an important part in contributing to the solution of a great problem, that of distributing our agricultural products to the distant corners of the earth, particularly if those whose names appear at the end of the bill become members of this great organization. So I say that a bill which seeks to introduce some measure whereby we can in an orderly fashion distribute the products of our fields, our forests and our streams will indeed play an important part in the future economy of the nations.

I feel, however, that a certain amount of criticism can be offered and I have listened with interest to the observations made by my colleagues who have preceded me. I have recognized, in the limited time it has been my privilege to serve in this house, a tendency to introduce measures at a time when the element of haste is always attendant upon their presentation. Indeed, this is no exception to the rule, inasmuch as I think this has happened time and again. As a matter of fact, this bill is brought in for second reading on the very eve of royal assent, so that we are in a position where we must deal with a measure far-reaching in its import, having possibly great effects; and yet I doubt whether we have the time to consider properly the various articles of the agreement.

I should like to see some provision in the bill requiring that the various signatories or representatives of the countries involved—I suppose it must be approached in its broadest application—shall have to report to their respective governments so that the peoples' representatives may have an opportunity to view and review the contributions being made by the various members of the organization.

Do we realize that in our haste, from our lack of consideration, we may be delegating to some authority responsibilities which are primarily ours and which we may not easily reclaim? I have always taken strong exception to anything savouring of totalitarianism, and yet the very provisions of the bill seem, in my opinion, to be rather far-reaching, because we become members of the organization for a period of five years, or, to be more precise, four years with one year's notice in the case of withdrawal. I say, therefore, that we may be delegating authority to some organization which we shall no longer be able to control.

As a matter of fact, I believe that a commitment for five years is too long; it savours of the closed shop, which was debated in this house recently. I should like to know from the minister when he replies what was the basis of assessment in determining the contribution to be made by the various nations. In annex II to the bill, giving the budget for the first financial year, I read:

> The provisional budget for the first financial year shall be a sum of 2,500,000 U.S. dollars, the unspent balance of which shall constitute the nucleus of a capital fund.
>
> This sum shall be contributed by the member nations in the following proportions.

Then the different percentages are set out, and if my arithmetic is correct, Canada's contribution will be $126,500; Great Britain's, $375,000; and the United States' $625,000. Then it appears to be intimated that the over-all total required in the next year will be $5 million. While I do not find fault with that, I should like some explanation from the minister and an opportunity to go into the matter more thoroughly.

Mr. G. H. CASTLEDEN (Yorkton): I had not intended to rise on this second reading, since we are discussing only the principle of the bill, but in view of some of the statements which have been made, probably the position of the members of our party should be made clear.

First, since this bill aims to establish on an international level some controls whereby people throughout the world may be properly fed, we support the principle, as, I believe, do hon. members in every part of the house. A start has been made in real cooperation between the various peoples. Nations must learn to cooperate and look upon one another as brothers. Causes of wars are very closely related to problems of want. This international conference aims to do away with want. Modern science as exemplified in the atomic bomb has made it abundantly clear that, unless the world can end wars, wars will end us.

This conference also aims to do away with some obstacles which in the past have prevented the rank and file everywhere from receiving proper food. That is a great objective. We support these aims 100 per cent.

During the speech of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) this afternoon, he gave some figures which demonstrated the tremendous extent of malnutrition and undernourishment. I wondered whether he had

made any analysis of the causes of this condition. We in this great country of ours, composing nearly half a continent and containing only eleven and a half million people, and one of the greatest food producers in the world, find these conditions of malnutrition and want here at home. Coming from the western prairies, I have seen instances which illustrate this. A boy about twelve or thirteen years of age came to town and walked into a store with five or six pounds of butter which, by herding, feeding and milking cows, he had helped to produce. He was selling that butter. From his appearance one could see that he was undernourished. I asked him if he ever ate any butter, and he said, "no." "In fact," he said, "we have to sell our butter." I said, "Why?" "Well," he said, "I am sent into town this afternoon with this butter which we have produced, and the purpose of selling it is to buy machinery repairs." The prices of the things which the farmer must buy lie beyond his control. When he comes to purchase some commodity he must pay what he is told is the price, but when he comes to sell something he is told the price at which it shall be sold, and the incomes of those who actually produce the wealth of the nation are so low that they cannot afford adequate food. As has been said this afternoon, the cause of malnutrition and undernourishment is poverty; and I contend that this conference will have to make some basic changes in the world economy before it will succeed in feeding the worlds peoples. We support that objective.

The statement was made this afternoon by the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) that the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation group could not oppose the setting up of boards by orders in council. I deny that statement completely. This group has been maintaining that orders in council should never be used in peace time for establishing arbitrarily any boards. If any group in this house stands for democracy it is the C.C.F. group, the one group whose programme and policy and party are based on democratic annual conferences.

Mr. REID: Since when? Your party are more dictatorial in British Columbia than anybody else.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: You can tell your little story later. We have listened to you for many years. When did you hold your last convention, 1919?

Mr. REID: I do not need any convention.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. REID: It is just a waste of time.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Section 2 of this bill as it stands should be opposed by every person who objects to the granting of unlimited powers by order in council in the hands of the government. That section states:

> (1) The governor in council may make such appointments, establish such offices, make such orders in council and do such things as appear to him to be necessary for carrying out the provisions of the constitution set out in the schedule to this act or any recommendations of the conference of the food and agriculture organization of the united nations, or of its committees made pursuant to such provisions.

How can we be satisfied with the carrying out by order in council of any recommendation which may be presented by future organizations and future councils over which we have no control? We believe that under war conditions orders in council may be necessary, but whatever boards are set up and whatever actions are taken by order in council require to be ratified by this parliament. I wanted to make that point clear.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no other hon. member who wishes to speak on this motion, the mover, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) will have the floor, but it is understood that, as the mover, he will close the debate.

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I wish in the first place to thank all hon. members who have spoken for having taken the position that all are interested in seeing that this organization is established as soon as possible. Some have even gone so far as to criticize us for not having set it up at an earlier date. With regard to that I can only say that I have before me at the moment the resolution passed by the United States under the heading "Joint resolution providing for membership of the United States in the food and agricultural organizations of the United Nations." Then follows a resolution in five short sections, approved July 31, 1945. That is, the nation which is responsible for a greater part of the expense than any other nation involved, namely twenty-five per cent. The next largest contributor, the United Kingdom, is responsible for fifteen per cent. The United Kingdom, the second largest contributor to the expenses of the organization did not, so far as I have been able to find, pass legislation with regard to this matter. The British government apparently has much greater authority than the parliament of Canada has ever seen fit to give to the government of Canada; and I am not critical of the parliament of Canada when I make that statement. My understanding is that

in dealing with all matters of this kind the British government has authority to take executive action, and executive action is either by order in council or by a minute of council. Therefore all that we are proposing in this bill to do by legislation, they proceeded to do by order in council—a course which this house seems to be somewhat concerned about.

I am not offering any criticism of hon. members who have raised the question of the government doing things by order in council on this occasion, but the measure of 1922 has been quoted so often in this debate that I think I should place on *Hansard* the section we are presumed to have copied in drafting this legislation. Section 1, subsection 1, of chapter 49 of the statutes of 1922, assented to on June 28 of that year, reads:

> The governor in council may make such appointments, establish such offices, make such orders in council, and do such things as appear to him to be necessary for carrying out the said treaties and for giving effect to any of the provisions of the said treaties.

Then subsection 2 says:

> Any order in council made under this act may provide for the imposition by summary process or otherwise of penalties in respect of breaches of the provisions thereof, and shall be laid before parliament as soon as may be after it is made, and shall have effect as if enacted in this act, but may be varied or revoked by a subsequent order in council.

I submit that if we had copied that section; if we had attempted to have this house place a provision of that kind in this measure, we would have been guilty of doing in relation to a measure of this kind the things which some hon. members of the opposition have attributed to us on this occasion.

Having said that, I do not wish to-night to take so much of the time of the house as to place myself in the position of having made it impossible to have this bill passed at this sitting. In view of the remarks made by the leader of the Social Credit group, however, I propose to say a little more than perhaps otherwise I would have said. In introducing a measure into this house one always leaves himself open to one of two criticisms. The first is that he took so much time and covered so much ground that no one else had anything to say about it; the other is that he said so little that no one knew just what he meant when introducing the measure. I presume it was the latter of these criticisms which the leader of the Social Credit party (Mr. Low) intended to apply to my introduction of the bill this afternoon. After having listened to the discussion, however, I believe most hon. members thought I covered the subject as fully as it was necessary to cover it on second reading. It is true that I did not deal seriatim with the clauses of the bill, but as I understand the rules of the house I am not expected or permitted to do so. I simply dealt with the outstanding principles of the bill, expecting that all matters having to do with the individual sections would be dealt with in committee.

The question has been raised as to what we are prepared to do in committee. At the very beginning of my remarks in that connection may I say that we do not look upon this as a government measure. We do not look upon it as the duty of the government of this country to submit to the other nations of the world any measure with regard to this matter. We look upon it as the duty of the parliament of Canada, including the senate and the governor general, to do whatever is necessary in order to indicate that Canada is entering into this food conference unanimously and with no divisions whatsoever. I wish to say to my hon. friends of the opposition, whether they be in the Social Credit group, the C.C.F. group or the official opposition, that if they believe any of their members in association with any members on this side can draft anything which states more clearly what they all seem to think ought to be in this legislation—because it is exactly what we think ought to be in it—we are quite prepared to accept their assistance in doing so; and I do not know any place where that can be done more properly and more completely than in this chamber in the committee stage. Therefore I suggest that it is not the intention of the government to do anything with the public funds of this country which we would not be prepared to submit to this House of Commons and to parliament as a whole. As a matter of fact, I am convinced that under the constitution as it has been drawn, under the chairmanship of a gentleman who was very well described by the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Fleming) and who was quite capable of looking after the interests of Canada and at the same time considering the interests of all the countries involved, nothing has been taken away from any democratic institutions in any of the countries that have joined this conference, and nothing has been done to lessen the powers enjoyed under those democratic institutions within those countries. In order to emphasize what I am saying, I need only read the one section in this legislation giving us any powers at all which some might think could be used in a way which would lead to unnecessary expenditure. That provision is at the bottom of page 4, in article IV, and reads:

> The conference may by a two-thirds majority of the votes cast—

Not by a bare majority, but by a two-thirds majority.

—make recommendations concerning questions relating to food and agriculture to be submitted to member nations for consideration with a view to implementation by national action.

I do not know how it could be more clearly stated that the only function of this conference in regard to matters of this kind is first to bring together all the information it can with regard to such questions; then discuss it among themselves, and then make recommendations to the members, which means to the thirty different nations that have indicated their intention of being parties to the conference. Then it provides that when these recommendations have been made they are to be implemented nationally. In other words, no group of nations will force us to do any particular thing. We must do it in our own national way. At other points in the constitution it is indicated that it must be done legally or constitutionally, whichever term is required to indicate the manner in which these things are done. So that what I said in answer to some of the questions asked by the leader of the Social Credit group was absolutely true. This is a voluntary arrangement, and I submit that no other type of arrangement could be brought into being to carry out the intentions of the Hot Springs conference. Forty-four nations met together and drew up recommendations, many of which were read to the house this afternoon by the leader of the Social Credit group. These recommendations then were submitted to an interim conference, which was headed by the Canadian rperesentative to the conference at Hot Springs and that conference drew up a constitution which in turn was submitted to the forty-four nations which attended the meeting.

May I say to the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) that I know of no other reason for the Argentine not being a party to it than the fact that its name does not appear among the forty-four nations who first attended the conference at Hot Springs, nor does its name appear among the thirty nations which have indicated thier intention of joining the conference. In other words, I know of no way in which any compulsion can be brought to bear upon the Argentine in order to bring it into the conference. On the other hand, it has every right that any nation of the world has to become a member of the conference, and to associate itself with the other thirty nations who are now members. But what was decided there was that this constitution would be re-submitted to the forty-four nations that had attended, and that they in turn would then indicate their desires, if they had desires, to become parties to the conference.

Therefore we have now some thirty nations united, who are going to hold their first meeting at Quebec city next week. Let me repeat that those nations which indicate their desire to become members of the conference do so with the knowledge that they are joining for four years, and that at the end of that time they may give a year's notice of their intention to drop out. All they are bound to do is to pay their dues to the conference for the first twelve-month period after they have given their indication of a desire to withdraw.

I do not know how it could be any fairer than that, or on a more voluntary basis. While they may remain in, they are subject to the decisions made by the members of the conference with respect to a certain budget that may be set up. That budget is governed in the first year by the terms of the constitution where it is stated that the amount set cannot exceed $2,500,000. Then it goes on to estimate that it will not be more during the next five years than an average $5,000,000 a year. However, I would refer hon. members to a resolution passed in the united houses of the United States, in which they made it absolutely certain that the sum could not exceed that amount. They have said, in voting their amount, that it cannot exceed the percentages which are set down: Twenty-five per cent of the payment for the first year, and twenty-five per cent in the succeeding years. With that set down I think the provision covers the entire amount which will be expended, when the terms of the constitution as set out in these articles which are made a schedule to the bill are read.

With that information, may I repeat what I said a few minutes ago. We do not want this to be government legislation. We do not think it would serve the purpose which we have in mind if it were made government legislation. The government has no desire whatsoever to get any kudos from the passing of this legislation which would not come to every individual member of the house, to every member of the senate. On the contrary, we want that kudos to go to everyone, and we want it to include not only members of this house, but every person in Canada in so far as that is possible.

I would suggest again that if hon. members would give this bill its second reading now, and permit its going into committee, we will state at this stage that we will make hon. members as free as they possibly can be to assist in every way to make it absolutely certain that money cannot be spent under this

bill by order in council, without its first being passed upon by the House of Commons, in carrying out the recommendation made by this organization at any time.

I think all hon. members will agree that if we are to be a party to the conference, then provision ought to be made in the bill, and it ought to be understood, that in so far as making provision for the actual administration costs is concerned, we are to pay our share in accordance with the constitution which was set up. Are we to say to the other nations that are going into the organization at the present time that we are not prepared for the four years ahead of us to pay our share of the administration costs which have been set up in the articles which constitute the constitution I am sure hon. members would not wish so to state.

I agree with what was said by the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Wright), that the sum of money set up is a small sum, compared with the great amount of good which could come to Canada and to other nations of the world through the expenditure of $126,500 in the first year and a sum no greater than $253,000 in the years thereafter.

From what I have heard this afternoon and this evening I think the house will be quite prepared to have the undertaking given that that amount of money is available. I understand the intention of the house, and particularly that of the official opposition is that they do not desire to have any money made available by the government of Canada for the carrying out of the recommendations which may be made by the conference, in order to assist in any undertaking which they think should be proceeded with, without its first being passed upon by the parliament of Canada.

My understanding, too, is that they feel that when orders in council are passed they should be placed upon the table of the house at as early a day as possible. I think hon. members who have sat here during the ten years in which I have been a member will agree that in no case has the government refused to bring down orders in council and place them upon the table of the house, except in those comparatively few cases during the war period, when that was not possible. But as soon as it did become possible, under the conditions of war then existing, such orders in council were always placed upon the table of the house.

We have no reason whatsoever for taking any different action in connection with this particular matter. In so far as reports are concerned, we are quite prepared to have the section which deals with the making of returns to the house changed to read in almost any way hon. members of the opposition may desire to have it read. But in my own opinion —and that may not be worth much—I think it is much stronger now than it would be if we were to insert the terms suggested during the discussion.

For example, it says:

> As soon as practicable after the close of each fiscal year, the Secretary of State for External Affairs shall prepare and lay before parliament a report of operations under this act.

My understanding of the requirement related to most of the reports which have to do with my own department is that I must lay on the table of the house within fifteen days after the opening of the next session of parliament the last report brought out. Sometimes that is almost twelve months away. It may be six months, eight months or a longer period of time. But this section says:

> As soon as practicable after the close of each fiscal year, the Secretary of State for External Affairs shall prepare and lay before parliament a report of operations under this act.

I believe the house, under that section, could hold the department to bringing down a report just as soon as it is available. If someone wishes to suggest that the report should be down within fifteen days from the opening of the next session, I do not know why hon. members on this side of the house should object to it. Again I say we are in the hands of the committee, and without any difficulty we can draft these sections to satisfy everyone who is in the house. I want all hon. members to feel free to make suggestions when we are in committee.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2—Powers of governor in council to carry out agreement.

Mr. BRACKEN: I am sure the members of the committee have listened with interest to the remarks of the mover of this bill. Personally I wish to compliment him upon the attitude he has taken. Those of us on this side of the committee have to take the bill as we received it, and we criticized it because it did not provide for the presenting of a report or that orders in council be presented. We felt that section 2 gave wider powers than were necessary. I think the Minister of Agriculture has taken a fair attitude with respect to those criticisms. The hon. member (Mr. Diefenbaker) who sits behind me will have some amendments to

offer. These will be offered on their merits. I am sure that hon. members will look upon them, not as party measures but simply as amendments carrying out the suggestions which have been made. If they are considered on their merits we will accept the judgment of the committee with respect to them.

Mr. REID: The budget for the financial year is set out in the schedule and at the end is given the percentages which will be contributed by the different nations. Canada's contribution is to be 5·06 per cent; Australia's is to be 3·33 per cent; Russia's, 8 per cent; the United Kingdom, 15 per cent, and the United States of America, 25 per cent. How were those percentages arrived at? Why has a country such as Russia, which is as large as the United States, been asked to contribute only 8 per cent as against our five per cent?

Mr. GARDINER: The only answer I can give is that these matters were all discussed very fully by the representatives of all the nations who were present at the conference. In reply to something said a few moments ago by the hon. member for Broadview, I may say that the questions we discussed this afternoon were discussed in our own agriculture committee and in this house shortly after he Hot Springs gathering. I assume that the representatives of the forty-four nations who were at that conference came to the conclusion that these proportions were what should be asked from each of the nations gathered there at that time. Our representative, along with the others, agreed to the proportions. The United States bears the highest proportion of 25 per cent; the United Kingdom, 15 per cent; the U.S.S.R., 8 per cent; France, 5·69 per cent; China, 6·5 per cent, and then we come in with 5·06 per cent. The only answer I can give is that this was agreed to at the conference at Hot Springs and that we are committed to it by the suggestions that have been made.

Mr. REID: That does not answer my question. I think the committee is entitled to know just how these percentages were arrived at. There must have been some basis. Take China with 6·5 per cent. China has a large population but very little to give at the present time. The percentage for India is 4·25 per cent, while Canada's is 5·06 per cent, as against 8 per cent for Russia.

Mr. BRACKEN: Perhaps the hon. member for New Westminster would refer to section 129 of the first report of the interim commission where there is an explanation of the allocation of the costs. Perhaps that will supplement the minister's answer.

Mr. GREEN: The constitution of this international organization describes it as the food and agriculture organization of the united nations. In the preamble to bill No. 14 now before the committee we find the words:

> . . . to prepare a plan for a permanent international organization for food and agriculture. . . .

I point out that the reference there also is to food and agriculture; the same words are used throughout in both the constitution and the bill. However, in article XVI of the constitution we find:

> In this constitution the term "agriculture" and its derivatives include fisheries, marine products, forestry, and primary forestry products.

It would seem that by including forestry and forestry products the constitution goes far beyond what the public believe to be the purposes of this organization; that is, to deal with food and agriculture. It may be that careful consideration has been given to the extent of that definition, but this is of great importance to my province of British Columbia because forestry is our major industry. The provincial government deals primarily with that industry and the federal government has very little power over it. I should like to know whether this matter of including forestry and forestry products has been discussed with the provincial governments and why it is the constitution is so broad.

Mr. GARDINER: When the proposals came back from Hot Springs I raised the same question, and that was some two years ago. When the proposals came back this time I raised the same question. I am forced to the conclusion, by the explanations I got and by doing a little further thinking, that a very considerable part of the food of the world comes from what might be called forestry. If we think in terms of coconuts, bananas, oranges and all the different fruits that come from tree production; when we think of blights that attack trees and realize that they attack fruit trees as well as ordinary forest trees, that is apparent. It is the same staffs and individuals in all countries who deal with all matters that have to do with the destruction of insects that destroy trees and plants and everything of that kind.

I think that is the chief reason why forestry is brought in under this measure. Measures must be taken to protect food, and it was thought proper to extend the activities to forestry in its other meaning, as well as

forestry as related to food. The question of fisheries is self-evident because it is food practically altogether.

Mr. GREEN: Have there been any discussions with the provincial governments concerning the fact that this constitution covers forestry and forestry products which to the layman means primarily lumber and logs and not fruit trees?

Mr. GARDINER: The discussions with the provincial governments have been related only to food, but I think I am correct in saying that the discussions which will take place at this conference will be much broader because of the questions which the hon. member for Vancouver South knows have been put so often in the house in relation to the different insects that attack forest life in British Columbia and elsewhere. But it will be more definitely related to their effects upon food.

Mr. GREEN: If the minister will refer to sections 56, 57, 58 and 59 of the first report of the interim commission he will see that whoever drew up this report had in mind going a good deal further than just dealing with pests, and I suggest to the ministry that careful consideration should be given to these suggestions as to what can be done by this international organization with regard to our forests. I think there is a great deal of doubt whether it is wise to go that far.

Mr. FERGUSON: The amount of expenditure in support of a very worthy cause is nothing compared with that what we expect the returns will be, but when the sponsor of this bill was asked an important question, why a country of twelve millions of people should be paying five per cent against Russia's eight per cent—Russia, a country of one hundred and seventy millions of people—he told us that this subject was discussed in committees and in this house, and it did not seem to strike him that this was not a fair apportionment. He could not give a satisfactory answer. I think that point should be looked into before the bill is passed.

Mr. GARDINER: Probably I ought to read the section referred to by the leader of the opposition since hon. members seem to desire full information. It reads as follows:

> The commission has found it difficult to devise a wholly satisfactory scale of apportionment of expenses.

They seem to have had the same thought in mind as the hon. member, that it was difficult to apportion the expenses. They went on to say:

> It has considered whether such a scale might be formulated, based on such factors as capacity to pay modified, e.g., by the desirability of maximum and minimum limits to contributions, the importance of agricultural production, national income, foreign trade, etc. If this could have been done and if world conditions were normal, such a scale might have been adopted by the conference for an indefinite period, or, at least, for the five-year period referred to above. The abnormal circumstances created by war and enemy occupation, however, and the impossibility of knowing when they will terminate, render it impossible to formulate a scale which is likely to be regarded as satisfactory except for a very short period. During the first or second year the conference probably will wish to consider, in the light of the conditions then prevailing, the equity of the scale which the commission now recommends. This scale, recommended for temporary use, is based upon a relationship among the member nations growing out of that accepted by them in respect of pre-war international organizations, but adjusted as follows:
>
> (a) the assumption of 54·5 per cent of the allocations by the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and China.

I explained to the house in my opening remarks this afternoon that these four nations should not be asked to pay more than 54·5 per cent. Then (b):

> (b) The scaling down of the allocations, as a measure of temporary financial relief, for those countries that are occupied by the enemy, or that have, in consequence of the war, suffered from major economic disasters.

I do not think that there is any country that has suffered from more major economic and other disasters than Russia, and that may account for the fact that they determined on eight per cent as her contribution. They go on:

> (c) the placing of certain countries on a uniform minimum allocation.
>
> The result of (b) and (c) has been substantially to increase the temporary allocations to the remaining countries. When world conditions improve, the proportions allocated to these countries will have to be correspondingly reduced.

Those are the reasons they give. I gave that in general terms myself a few moments ago.

Mr. FRASER: What kind of committee is Canada going to set up to collect these foodstuffs in this country to be sent to other countries? Under Mutual Aid there was a committee that looked after the purchases and designated the firms to sell the stuff or give it to the other countries. What is in mind here?

Mr. GARDINER: Under Mutual Aid what happened in regard to food products was this. We entered into agreements, practically all with Britain, to take our surplus foods and utilize them in any way they thought fit in the prosecution of the war in Europe. That in general terms related to our surplus foods. The means taken were not to bring together

all these different products through any organization set up by us. We simply said to the people who were in the business, in connection with meat, for example, the packing plants, the drovers, and everybody else interested in bringing live stock together at certain places to have it processed: you just go ahead with the job as you did before, gather all this food in and have it processed and put in such a form that we can take it and have it delivered at certain ports. Then Britain sent her ships and took it away. That was the process followed in war. I do not expect that we shall require to follow any different procedure during the transition period covered by the next four or five years.

I should like to refer to a remark which was made a few moments ago to the effect that the government is for the first time planning. I think hon. members on both sides will agree when I say that we have never had a government in Canada that did not plan. It did not make any difference whether it was a Conservative or a Liberal government—and they have all been one or the other—we never had at any time a government that did not believe in planning. Every government has planned. This government has planned. We have done our planning all through this war, just as we did before the war. Some may differ as to the results we obtained from the planning, but all will agree that all governments have planned. For the period immediately following the war our plan has been that which was set out in what we call the floor price legislation passed by the last parliament. Under that legislation we say that so long as the people who are engaged in business can find markets for our products at reasonable prices, we are not going to interfere with them at all. That to all intents and purposes is what we say. We say that if the wheat board as now constituted, or some other organization if at some future time some government decides that wheat should be marketed in some other way and sets up an organization for the purpose, privately or through government, is able to find markets where the prices compare reasonably with the prices we have obtained, we shall not interfere. But if they are not able to do that; for example, if there are people starving in some parts of the world who are not able to pay for surplus food products that we are not able to dispose of, we say to them: We want that surplus disposed of in certain ways. They may say to us: We can handle that for you but we cannot handle it at a loss or we would go out of business. Then under the terms of that legislation we say to them: Well, you proceed to deliver the goods where they are required, and we will utilize the $200 million fund that has been made available under the legislation to take care of the difference between what you receive and what it was necessary to pay in order to maintain the price levels we think proper in this country. That is the method which I think would be followed in order to see to it that some of these countries, if conditions are such that they cannot pay, would be provided for. We would probably provide for some of their needs in some such way or through arranging credits with them under which they could buy our products under certain set prices.

Mr. FRASER: The minister said he would call in all producers. That is what was done under Mutual Aid. Under Mutual Aid you called in producers and you asked companies to submit prices although they had never even produced the goods. They had never produced the goods, had never even shipped to Britain, and I know that in the case of rolled oats you called in the different companies and some companies quoted prices although they had never shipped one ounce of rolled oats to Britain. They were asked to tender and they did tender and received contracts. Rolled oats were shipped to Britain, and instead of the government allowing one firm that had shipped to Britain practically all the rolled oats—packaged rolled oats—which Britain ever used, they allowed firms that had never sent over any to send inferior oats. To-day we in Canada have lost the British trade for these rolled oats. I will not mention the name, but one firm spent over $3 million in advertising before the war. They advertised their rolled oats in Britain, every sign board being plastered with their name, so that the people in Britain knew their product and knew there was nothing better in the world. But this government allowed other oats to go over and gave that firm a very small portion of the contract. That is what I am afraid of now under this arrangement, that we may lose other markets for other goods unless a great deal more consideration is given to the manufacturer and also the producer of food products here in Canada.

Mr. GARDINER: If I used the phrase "called in"—

Mr. FRASER: I think those are the words.

Mr. GARDINER: —I did not intend to use that phrase or to give that impression. What I thought I said was that we called upon those who were in the business to continue to purchase and supply products. I am quite sure the hon. member for Peter-

borough West will agree with me when I say that the government would be very much criticized if we started going around the country picking out different companies and asking them either to submit prices or to do certain things in relation to supplying food products. What we actually do is to submit the proposition to the people of the country generally. We say, we want everyone to assist in supplying food who can possibly assist. It may be true that a company may express its intention of trying to supply a product although probably it had never supplied it before, but I cannot think of many cases where that happened during war time. Take, for example, in connection with bacon products, which is the big item that has been handled in that way. We have a considerable number of packing plants in Canada but only a proportion of them, somewhat more than half of them, did supply bacon for Britain, and there was always a controversy as between two groups, as to whether those who were supplying only the home market and those who were supplying both the home market and the British market were getting equal treatment under the different regulations we had. Nevertheless they have gone on throughout the war, some of them without supplying bacon to Britain at all and others supplying the greater part of their product. As regards the company referred to, and I think I know which it is, their trouble was quite a different one. I do not remember their ever having made a complaint to me—and they discussed the situation with me many times—that they had difficulties with anyone in Canada who had supplied a product from here, but I understand that they had difficulties with some persons or some organizations who were supplying oatmeal on the other side, and they thought that market which had been built up by them in Britain was being utilized under war conditions by someone else who was supplying the product. My understanding was that that was a company not in Canada but elsewhere. I believe that difficulty was overcome in the latter part of the war. It developed only somewhere in the middle of it. A similar difficulty has arisen since the war was over, but that has nothing to do with any company in Canada, I understand, but with the desire of some organizations in Britain to have control of that market, if I understand the matter correctly. I would only say with regard to the direct question, that it would be very difficult for us to go around the country selecting concerns and saying, you are better at this than somebody else and therefore you do it. We must say to anyone who wishes to enter the trade that he can enter, but we must insist that he provide a commodity which is up to the standard.

[Mr. Gardiner.]

Mr. FRASER: That is the point I was trying to make, that the government should insist that we send over only the very best so that we can retain the markets we have already established, especially in bacon. The minister is just as much afraid as the farmers in Canada that Denmark will try to steal that trade from us again.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I listened with considerable interest to the speech of the Minister of Agriculture. There is one question he did not answer, and I should like to ask him a question before I propose to take advantage of the invitation he has given for suggestions regarding amendments. I asked him a question regarding the Argentine in view of the fact that that nation is one of the world's largest exporters of food products, and without that nation as a member of the nations comprised within this agreement, there might be obvious difficulties. The minister indicated that any nation could voluntarily assume membership in this organization, but that is not the position at all. Article II provides in subsection 2:

> Additional members may be admitted to the organization by a vote concurred in by a two-thirds majority of all the members of the conference and upon acceptance of this constitution as in force at the time of admission.

I wish to ask the minister now, first, has Argentina given any indication of its desire to join in this conference? Second, if so, what is to be the attitude of the Canadian government toward such application? After the minister has answered that, if I may, I intend to suggest an amendment to paragraph 2.

Mr. GARDINER: I tried to answer it in making my reply. I am not sure whether the hon. member for Lake Centre was in the house at the time.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Yes, I was here.

Mr. GARDINER: I take from his remarks, then, that he does not accept as a complete answer the suggestion that I presume the Argentine could have made application when the forty-four nations met. It is not within my memory as to whether it did or did not at that particular time.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Has it done so since?

Mr. GARDINER: I do not know that it has, since. I would assume that if the Argentine had expressed the desire to be there at that time, or had been there, it would have

been considered along with others. My statement a few minutes ago was that a nation would have voluntarily to indicate its desire to come in before anyone would expect them to come; there would be and could be no compulsion used. But I can understand why they might wish to have acceptance of a nation depend upon a two-thirds vote. I assume they anticipate that, as time goes on, some of the nations which we have been recently fighting will make application, and that others associated with them will make application. They may want to consider all the circumstances concerning those cases at that time, as to whether they shall admit them or not, and they may believe that they should have a two-thirds majority in order to bring that about. But I am sorry I cannot give any definite answer as to whether the Argentine did ask to be admitted, or as to whether it has asked since.

Mr. QUELCH: Under the agreement, every nation participating undertakes to maintain a high standard of living internally. That is one point of which I am very strongly in favour. How do we interpret that in Canada? Under the government's policy we are to try to maintain a high degree of employment, but I think we also realize that there are bound to be in this country a number of people unemployed, people who will not be covered by unemployment insurance. Just how does the minister interpret "high standard of living" in regard to such people? Are special measures to be adopted to ensure that every individual in Canada is able to obtain sufficient food to give him a decent standard of living? Is it the intention, for instance, to adopt such a procedure as the United States adopted under the food stamp plan? Is some measure of that kind contemplated?

Mr. GARDINER: I did not refer to some remarks which were made this afternoon with regard to the United States plan, and the other evening when we were discussing another matter I did not do so, because I hesitate at this moment to discuss United States plans as compared with our own. But I should like to point out, in view of the fact that the question is definitely raised, that under the United States plan as now operating, the parity price plan we discussed the other evening, upon part of which the resolution was based, ninety per cent of parity is provided for only on condition that certain provisions made for the limiting of production are agreed to and carried into effect by the persons who are involved, which means that there is a definite plan made for limiting production, in spite of what was said this afternoon to the effect that that idea has been dropped.

In Australia, on the other hand—and again I am speaking from memory and I would not want to give the exact figures—the price provided for wheat, for example, is something over seventy cents a bushel at the delivery point on the first 3,000 bushels, but if more than 3,000 bushels are delivered it is just something over fifty cents, I think fifty-three or fifty-four cents.

In other words, in quite a number of nations definite provisions are made that the prices established are established only on limited amounts, and there is no provision for the inducement of unlimited production. I think this country is one of the few exceptions to that. I think, in spite of what has been said, it is the only real exception among the nations which produce surpluses. We have never placed a restriction upon the amount of our product which can be sold. We have on occasion attempted to persuade our people by giving them acreage payments to shift from the production of one food product to another; but we have always said, in any regulations we have made with regard to the delivery of quotas—five bushels per acre for this month and ten for the next, and so on—those are there because of either a shortage of storage space or a lack of markets for the time being for the product. But we have never placed any limitation upon the price which is to be obtained for the product, provided that more of it is produced in a particular year than we have suggested it might be wise to produce. So, the other day, after it had been definitely said in this house last session that farmers would be permitted to deliver only fourteen bushels to the acre, when it was discovered that a market could be found or storage could be found somewhere in Canada for all the wheat they could deliver, that restriction was removed, and farmers who grow thirty or forty bushels to the acre can deliver it all this year.

That is the policy we have been following. It is the policy, I submit, which we said last session—and I hope we shall be able to carry it out—we intended to continue. For example, I do not feel that we would be dealing justly with people, whether farmers or others, if we had said to them, during the three or four year period we have just come through, yes, you have had big crops; you have had fine crops or you have had a big production, and we limited the amount that you could obtain for each unit of your production; but now that the war is over, if you have big production we are only going to take a fraction of it at a price similar to the price you got

before. The interpretation we placed upon our obligations in the last session was to the effect that the production during that period, as well as the price, must be still taken into consideration in the period after the war in establishing a reasonable return.

Our method of dealing with this situation has been this. Take butter as an illustration. The ceiling price of butter is thirty-five cents. Farmers in Canada cannot produce butter at thirty-five cents. We have been paying the farmer a subsidy on butter of from eight to ten cents a pound butterfat. It is all very well to say that this is a subsidy to the farmer, but the real consideration that was given was that consumers, under the present wage scales, and with the returns which they were obtaining during the last three years of the war, could not afford to pay more than thirty-five cents a pound for their butter. Therefore, we said, the price is to be thirty-five cents. I am speaking now on the basis of wholesale price at Montreal. Then we took the money out of the treasury to make possible the sale of the product at thirty-five cents. As a result of that, we in Canada are eating forty million pounds more butter a year than we were eating before the war; and we have had to ration butter, not because we are short of butter as compared with the period before the war, but in order to say to the fellow who used to put butter on his potatoes and everything else he was eating and thought he could afford to do so, you will have to forgo some of these luxuries in order to let every child in this country get a proportion of the butter. That is the principle on which we have been proceeding. I submit it is the principle on which we should proceed during this period in order to see to it that our own people are properly fed with the products we produce in this country.

Mr. QUELCH: I appreciate the minister's reply, but he did not answer the question I asked. Under this agreement we pledge ourselves to give the people of Canada a high standard of living. I am quite in accord with the minister that we can provide a high standard of living, that we can produce enough food for that, but this is what I am interested in. Do we merely mean a high standard on an average, or are we going to guarantee that every person in Canada has a high standard of living, at least in so far as food is concerned? If that is the intention, then what does the government plan to do in regard to people in this country who may be unemployed, who do not come under unemployment insurance, who have no purchasing power and therefore are not in a position to buy the food that is in abundance in this country? I asked the minister whether it was the intention, for instance, to adopt the United States food stamp plan they had before the war. What I want to know is whether this guarantee means we are going to maintain a high standard of living merely based upon the average, or whether that high standard of living is to be given to every individual in this country.

Mr. GARDINER: The only reason I did not definitely answer the question with regard to the stamp programme is that I do not want to condemn anything the Americans are doing.

Mr. QUELCH: Or any other plan.

Mr. GARDINER: I believe the plan I have just outlined will better meet our conditions than any stamp plan they have had in the United States; but the stamp plan may meet their conditions better than anything we have had here. I am not discussing United States conditions; I am discussing Canadian conditions. I think under Canadian conditions we have fed our people—and when I say "we" I mean all the people of Canada—just as well as those of any nation on the allied side during this war period, and I believe we shall be able to continue to do so in future.

Mr. COLDWELL: I imagine the hon. member for Acadia was not thinking particularly of the war period but rather of the near and actual starvation which existed in this country before the war and which may exist again after the war, and what the commitments were in that regard.

I presume, Mr. Chairman, that we shall be going through this schedule clause by clause when we come to the preamble, where it is mentioned, because I think we should understand what we are doing. We are making some definite commitments both in regard to our own country and in regard to other nations, and I think we should realize that these must be more than words. Under the united nations charter adopted at San Francisco not only nutrition but full employment is pledged by every nation signing that charter.

What I really rose to ask was this, following the question raised by the hon. member for Lake Centre. Under article XIII of the agreement this is provided:

> The organization shall, in accordance with the procedure provided for in the following paragraph, constitute a part of any general international organization to which may be entrusted the coordination of the actiivties of international organizations with specialized responsibiilties.
>
> 2. Arrangements for defining the relations between the organization and any such general organization shall be subject to the approval of the conference. Notwithstanding the provision of article XX . . .

Then it goes on to deal with the matter of amendment. What I was wondering was this. I take it that the general international organization is the united nations international organization which was established at San Francisco. Under that charter we have set up the social and economic council, and that social and economic council provides that certain specialized bodies shall be set up, of which it is anticipated this will be one. At San Francisco, Argentina was admitted as a signatory to the charter. I must say I did not approve that, and I am sorry Canada cast her vote in favour of it, but I am not going into that matter now. However, Argentina was admitted by the conference as a member nation. She accepts the charter drawn up. The charter includes a provision for the establishment of a social and economic council, of which there are to be specialized agencies. If one of the specialized agencies is this food and agriculture council, would it not follow that Argentina would be brought into this organization through membership in the social and economic council and in the united nations organization itself? That is what I was going to ask. Can the minister tell us whether that is so, whether that would follow?

Mr. GARDINER: When I was answering the other question it occurred to me that this might be involved in the decision made at San Francisco, but I would not like to undertake to answer that question. The Minister of Justice was at San Francisco; I do not know whether he would care to answer it. I would not like to undertake to say that Argentina would come in automatically because of anything done at San Francisco. From reading these articles I would judge that she would have to obtain admission through a two-thirds vote of those already in.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is the way it appears; yet if there is a specialized agency within the social and economic council, which is one of the chapters of the charter, and the nations agreed to the whole charter, can a nation exclude itself from one of the specialized agencies? That is the point I had in mind.

Mr. GARDINER: I do not feel competent to answer that.

Mr. COLDWELL: I cannot answer the question myself, and I do not know whether the Minister of Justice would care to do so.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I would not attempt to answer the question, but it would appear to me that this organization is being set up now in accordance with the terms of this constitution; and the united nations charter has not yet come into operation. When it does come into operation it will be dealing with the food and agriculture organization as an entity existing under its own constitution, and then some modifications may have to be made in order to adopt the food and agriculture organization as the specialized agency provided for under the united nations charter. I think, though, that for the time being this organization will come into existence if twenty nations file their acceptance; and from the time twenty nations will have filed their acceptance it will be an autonomous body. Then, because its members also will be members of the united nations, if it becomes the specialized agency there may have to be some modification in the constitution.

Mr. COLDWELL: As a matter of fact, that is provided for in the constitution itself.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Yes; but when it does in fact become integrated in the special agencies under the united nations, some modification may have to be made as a result of the terms of the charter adopted at San Francisco.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: We are now dealing with section 2, which is the operative section; and the gravamen of my remarks this afternoon was directed to the power there given to the governor in council to—

> . . . make such appointments, establish such offices, make such orders in council and do such things as appear to him to be necessary for carrying out the provisions of the constitution set out in the schedule to this act or any recommendations of the conference of the food and agriculture organization of the united nations, or of its committees, made pursuant to such provisions.

I am not going to repeat the arguments advanced this afternoon. In this section as it now stands there is in effect an abdication by parliament of the right to deal with any decisions or recommendations made by the conference and the food and agriculture organization when it is set up. The point I was making this afternoon was that matters concerned with the future of agriculture and agricultural and economic relationships for a period of five years should be submitted to parliament. I therefore submit a suggested amendment to section 2. Subsection 2 I think expresses the general feeling of the committee. Subsection 1 is the operative section, and, indeed, is the only section in the whole bill that affords any opportunity to approve the constitution, although there is

no reference therein to that fact. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Eglinton:

That section two, subsection (1) be stricken out and the following substituted therefor:

"2. (1) The constitution of the food and agriculture organization of the united nations as set out in the schedule to this act is hereby approved."

That subsection simply amounts to this, that it affords a direct operative approval by parliament of the constitution of the food and agriculture organization.

When speaking a while ago, the minister said that he desired, and what the government desired was that this house should unanimously approve the constitution. By using direct words to that effect I submit we attain that desire.

Then, so far as subsection 2 of section 2 is concerned, I move that the following be substituted therefor:

The governor in council may do such things as are necessary to carry out the provisions of the said constitution, subject to the approval of parliament within six months thereafter.

In other words, when recommendations are made by the nations comprising the conference of the food and agriculture organization, or by any of its committees, such matters shall be subject to the approval of parliament within six months.

Mr. COLDWELL: Does that mean that the recommendations could not be acted upon for six months?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: No.

The CHAIRMAN: May I point out that the hon. member cannot put two amendments to the committee at the same time.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That is correct. I was simply giving the whole picture. I realize full well the truth of what the Chairman has said. However, I wished to give the whole picture at once so that the purpose of my amendments would be before the committee. The first amendment is the one I now move.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I understood that it was one amendment.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Yes.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: It is an amendment to strike out subsection 1 of section two, and to substitute the two provisions the hon. member read.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Yes.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I do not think there can be any objection to the first part of that provision. While in my view it may not be absolutely necessary, once again this should appear to the Canadian people and to the people of the world at large as the action of the Canadian people through its representatives in parliament. As such it should be in such form as to deserve the hearty support of all members of parliament. There may appear to a good many to be some merit in a categorical declaration that the terms of the charter are approved by parliament. The first portion of the amendment would imply that.

Then, as to the second portion, I know the hon. member wishes to have something operative, and wishes Canada to become a member of the organization and to be recognized by the other members of the organization as having done so.

I would fear that the qualifying words: "subject to the approval of parliament within six months thereafter," would make it appear that Canada was accepting in an irrevocable way, because in order to adhere to the charter, instruments of acceptance have to be filed by the government. If that filing of the instrument of acceptance by the government was subject to approval within six months it might be regarded that in the meantime it was not an irrevocable acceptance.

I do not think the hon. member would wish any doubt to become possible as to the validity of the action taken by the government of Canada to make Canada a party of the organization. Moreover the terms used by the hon. member would, I suggest, be too restrictive. Under the charter, all that is necessary at a conference would be one member. Only one representative of a member can vote at the conference, and all that would be necessary to carry out the terms of the constitution would be to have one person there representing Canada.

It is intended, and I think this would be in accordance with the desire of all hon. members, that the delegate be accompanied by proper advisers. That is not necessary under the terms of the constitution, but I think the powers of the governor in council should be such as to do things mentioned in the preamble, such things as are expedient or proper to carry out the purposes of the constitution.

I would fear that with the language suggested by the hon. member it would have to be determined that the thing which was covered by an order in council was necessary, before it could be recognized as valid. I do not think the hon. member would wish to go that far. I suggest it is preferable that recommendations from the conference or from the committees require to be approved by parliament before being acted upon. That would be so under

the bill as drafted, in respect of everything requiring the expenditure of money. Before any money could be used to implement a recommendation, it would have to be appropriated by parliament.

But one can conceive that there might be recommendations which would not imply the expenditure of public money. If it were felt that such recommendations should be implemented by this country, they might have to be implemented by provincial legislatures, or they might be such as could be implemented by the dominion parliament. I think in any event they should be subject to the action of the proper legislative body, before being acted upon.

I do not think there would intervene any such delay as would be prejudicial to the effective operation of the organization; for after all, according to its constitution this is not an organization to collect and distribute food. It is an organization to gather statistical information and to make recommendations for the more efficient production and distribution of food. But it is not the instrument that would do the work. When such recommendations are made, if they imply imposing obligations upon Canadian citizens, then it is my personal view that it would be quite proper that they should have to go before the body competent to legislate, whether it be a provincial legislature or this parliament. Certainly we can anticipate that there would be recommendations requiring the action of provincial legislatures.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That is just what the bill as now constituted does not protect.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Does not in terms protect. But this parliament cannot give to the governor in council the right to do things that parliament itself would not have jurisdiction to do. Whatever delegation is made can only be of powers that are within the control of the one who makes the delegation. On that point I do not think there should be any quarrel between one group and another in this committee. I think we are all concerned with having this food and agriculture organization work to the best possible advantage for mankind generally and it probably would be sufficient to avoid any inconvenience that might result from delay to have the governor in council empowered to do the things proper or expedient to carry out the terms of the constitution. That may involve doing more than the language submitted by the hon. member would cover.

He uses the words "such things as are necessary," but once again all that is necessary for the conference would be the attendance of one member for Canada. That certainly would not be taking Canada's proper place in the conference. The delegate authorized to vote for Canada at any international conference should have with him quite a large group of technical advisers. What we are contemplating is a delegation that might amount to as many as thirty advisers to the official delegate. I think the language used in the statute should be broad enough to allow the things that are appropriate and expedient to carry out the terms and purposes of the constitution to be done.

I submit to the hon. member that if the language used in the bill were retained and cut off after the words "schedule to this act" in line 24, which would delete the words "or any recommendations of the conference of the food and agriculture organization of the united nations, or of its committees, made pursuant to such provision," taking the first part of his amendment as subsection 1 and having the language down to the words "schedule of the act" as subsection 2, and then numbering the present subsection 2 as subsection 3, we would have something that would correspond with what appears to be the unanimous desire of this committee; that is, that the governor in council do not go beyond performing the things which are proper and expedient to give effect to the constitution and that if there are any recommendations which have to be implemented, requiring the authority of law, whether it be provincial or federal, they go to the legislative body which by the constitution has the right to make law in that regard.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I think the minister has agreed with the contention I raised, that as this section stood it conveyed too great power to the governor in council. He suggests that that portion of section 2, subsection 1, which would empower the governor in council by order in council to carry out "any recommendations of the conference of the food and agriculture organization of the united nations, or of its committees, made pursuant to such provisions," be deleted. I think the section with the deletion of the portion referred to by the minister would be satisfactory. As it was originally drafted, it conveyed powers far and beyond any ever conveyed to a governor in council at any time. In view of the statement the minister has made I am agreeable to the amendment he suggests, provided that a later section—I take it this will be done, according to the Minister of Agriculture—it is provided that any orders in council made pursuant to section 2, subsection 1, if amended in the manner suggested by the Minister of Justice, will be tabled and made available to parliament.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: If I understand the hon. member correctly, he still wishes the first part of his amendment retained.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I understood the minister accepted it.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: There can be no objection to that. It is a positive declaration by the house, and there may be many who would find merit in having that expressly declared in the bill. That would be subsection 1 of section 2. What is here, down to the words "schedule to this act" would be subsection 2 of section 2 and the present subsection 2 would become subsection 3 of section 2.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That is right.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment moved by the hon. member for Lake Centre is before the committee, but he has intimated that he will accept the amendment suggested by the Minister of Justice. Is the hon. member for Lake Centre withdrawing his amendment?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Yes. We are getting together and accommodating ourselves to the suggestions.

Mr. GARDINER: One of you move it and the other second it.

The CHAIRMAN: It is moved by the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent), seconded by the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker):

That section 2 (1) be stricken out and the following substituted therefor:

"2. (1) The constitution of the food and agriculture organization of the united nations as set out in the schedule to this act is hereby approved.

2. (2) The governor in council may make such appointments, establish such offices, make such orders in council and do such things as appear to him to be necessary for carrying out the provisions of the constitution set out in the schedule of this act." And that subsection 2 be renumbered as subsection 3.

Mr. BRACKEN: Now that the lawyers have agreed as to how this section should appear, I, as a layman, would like to ask a question because it does not seem to cover one of the criticisms I have. Let me read section 2, subsection 2, as now proposed by the Minister of Justice and the hon. member for Lake Centre. It reads:

The governor in council may make such appointments, establish such offices, make such orders in council and do such things as appear to him to be necessary—

But it does not stop there. It says:

—as appears to him to be necessary for carrying out the provisions of the constitution.

One of the provisions of the constitution is that this food and agriculture organization may determine its own budget and may determine the portion of that budget that Canada will pay, and we have only one man on that organization. One of the reasons why I criticized this set-up was that by this bill we are approving the constitution. The constitution allows that organization to determine its own budget and to determine the portion Canada will pay. Then we are asked to give power to the governor in council to do all such things as appear to him to be necessary for carrying out the provisions of the constitution.

I ask this question of the Minister of Justice: Are we not committing ourselves now to further expenses than the 5·06 per cent of the present suggested budget in case the organization should ask for more? Does the minister get my point?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: The leader of the opposition has not overlooked the next subsection, which reads:

All expenditures incurred in carrying out the provisions of subsection 1—

That will now be subsection 2:

—of this section shall be defrayed out of moneys provided by parliament.

There is a requirement, in order to have the money available to the extent contemplated by the constitution, that it be appropriated by parliament, and if the hon. gentleman will look at article XVIII, which is the article under which the members undertake to contribute, he will see that it provides:

Each member nation undertakes, subject to the requirements of its constitutional procedure, to contribute to the organization promptly its share of the expenses so determined.

Mr. BRACKEN: That is the very point, as determined by these people, and they may raise the proportion we are now required to pay. Under this arrangement we are subscribing to that, and it is only after that, that we are requested to provide additional money.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: The constitution is before us. It requires us to accept it as it is and provides that the government undertakes, subject to the requirements of its constitutional procedure, to pay its share of the expenses, and in the authorization that is being given to file an instrument of acceptance there is this subsection 3 which provides that no expenditure by Canada can be made unless parliament appropriates the money. We place ourselves in a position where by filing the instrument of acceptance, whatever we may do here, we engage the honour of the Canadian nation to comply with the provisions of the constitution. It does not matter what we put into our statute. By filing the instrument of acceptance, that is what we undertake. We

undertake it, or the government of Canada undertakes it, subject to the requirements of its constitutional procedure, and one of the requirements of its constitutional procedure is that the government cannot dispose of money that has not been voted by parliament.

Mr. COLDWELL: But we have assumed a debt of honour, and I think any parliament will agree to pay.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I would hope so.

Mr. COLDWELL: The only recourse that we have, it seems to me, is under article XIX, which provides that if we are dissatisfied with the amount required from Canada, then four years from now, having had the experience, we may give notice of withdrawal from the organization at the end of the five years.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: There is this moral recourse as well. There is the implied declaration that the present budget is to be $2,500,000, and that it may go to $5,000,000, and if it were carried beyond that by action of which we disapproved we would have valid grounds for wishing to withdraw. But whatever we put into the legislation being considered by the committee at the present time, if it amounts to authority to the government of Canada to file an instrument of acceptance, we have to take the constitution as written and we assume on behalf of Canada a debt of honour to have parliament appropriate enough money to carry out the obligations implied.

Mr. COLDWELL: In other words, this has been agreed to by the nations and we cannot amend the constitution. We must either accept or reject it. That is the position.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Yes, and if we file an instrument of acceptance we accept it and undertake to have parliament appropriate the money required to implement that obligation.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I agree with what has been said as to complying with the constitution, but we may have gone too far with the amendment. By what clause in this bill have we power to implement recommendations that may come from the committees?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: The governor in council would not have the power to implement the recommendations, and I do not think it is the feeling of the committee that the governor in council should have that power. I think it is the feeling of the committees that when the recommendations come they should be like the recommendation, for example, of the international labour organization. They should require legislative action by the proper legislative body and that is what the amendment provides. I do not think the amendment cuts that down at all. It merely says that it will take the recommendations; then the legislative body competent to deal with them will consider them and, if they are thought to be proper, will enact the required legislation.

Mr. BRACKEN: I do not wish to labour this point any farther. Nobody has raised any question about approving the constitution. There has been no question of that. The only question is what the constitution does or what it means and what this organization may do under it. I think the Minister of Justice will agree that that body can determine the size of its own budget, can determine the percentage we pay, and may raise it, and the governor in council has power to do all such things as are necessary to carry that out. But if the Minister of Justice is satisfied I accept his word. But we are voting blindly to that extent. We may have to do it. But the point I wish to make is that we do not want the government to commit us further than the figures given, $2,500,000 the first year and $5,000,000 later on, with Canada's contribution being at the rate of 5·06 per cent, because if we were committed further, this committee will have been misled.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: If there was an appropriation bill being suggested there would no doubt be limitations inserted, as was done in the United States, where by joint resolution of the two houses of congress an express limitation was put on their contribution. They said that their obligations could not go beyond one million and a quarter.

Mr. BRACKEN: There is no limitation like that here.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Our appropriation is not being made by this legislation. This legislation requires that there be further action by parliament to appropriate the money to be expended.

Mr. BRACKEN: Can the minister state what the appropriation will be for the coming year?

Mr. GARDINER: I think the United States provision itself limits it. It is definitely stated that their proportion is twenty-five per cent, and that twenty-five per cent cannot exceed a certain figure. That in itself limits the amount which can be spent by the whole organization.

Mr. BRACKEN: We should not be tied by something they do.

Mr. GARDINER: We are tied by it under these provisions.

Mr. BLACKMORE: The leader of the opposition said there was no question whether we would accept the constitution. I am giving notice now that there is a question whether we ought to accept the constitution. We have to find out now whether the advantages we can derive from accepting the constitution are such as to recompense us for the dangers which we are likely to run into by accepting the constitution. I do not believe that the Minister of Agriculture or anyone else in this house to-day has shown us specifically any advantage which we can derive, either directly or indirectly, from accepting the constitution. If he can, I shall certainly be a ready listener. The problem which confronts us is, first of all, how to produce the goods, and second, how to distribute them. We have not been shown how we can produce goods any better or distribute them any better by accepting the constitution.

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

— —

Friday, October 12, 1945.

The house met at three o'clock.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

TAKING OVER OF BURNS PACKING PLANTS AND APPOINTMENT OF CONTROLLER

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): I wish to lay on the table copies of order in council P.C. 6481, passed on October 11, 1945, which provides that effective from twelve o'clock noon to-day, October 12, the dominion government has taken over control of the packing plants of Burns and Company at Winnipeg, Prince Albert, Regina, Edmonton and Vancouver.

Under the order the government has appointed Mr. J. G. Taggart, chairman of the meat board, as controller of these plants. The government made this decision because it was apparent that strike action was contemplated by the employees of these plants for Monday, October 15, and in view of the grave consequences which would result from any interruption of meat shipments to Britain and other European countries.

The reasons were explained to the management and to Mr. Fred Dowling of the united packinghouse workers of America, C.I.O., and to Mr. A. R. Mosher, president of the Canadian congress of labour.

The order in council requires that the company and the union shall proceed with negotiations towards a mutually satisfactory settlement of their dispute without delay, in accordance with regulations.

In all probability deputy controllers will be appointed for each branch plant. Provision for this is made in the order.

Even if Canada succeeds in keeping up the present rate of meat exports, there is a danger of many persons dying from starvation in Europe this winter. Break-down in negotiations between employers and employees in respect to working conditions in packing plants, to the point where it means a stoppage of work, creates a national emergency which under the circumstances I think would be considered by most Canadians as little short of criminal.

I am convinced that both parties to the dispute will accept the intervention of the government and that the plants will continue to operate.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Arising out of the minister's statement, may I ask a supplementary question? Were the provinces consulted in connection with the proposal he has made in the order in council? I ask the question because the minister says the provinces are involved in these matters. If the provinces were consulted, what were their replies?

Mr. MITCHELL: Communications were addressed to the provinces, but at the moment I have no knowledge of their replies.

Mr. COLDWELL: Has this been done without receiving their replies?

Mr. MITCHELL: I would not like to speak from memory. Frankly I would say that in view of the gravity of the situation and in the national interest I took the responsibility of making this recommendation to the government.

Mr. HOMUTH: Then might I interpret the minister's statement to mean that he has not received the acquiescence of the various provinces in the move he has made?

Mr. MITCHELL: I will say this to my hon. friend, that this action was taken under the War Measures Act, in the national interest. You cannot afford to fiddle while Rome is about to burn; that is the sensible way of looking at it.

ALBERTA AND BRITISH COLUMBIA COAL MINES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the motion to go into supply on Tuesday evening of this week, I stated, as will be noted on page 866 of *Hansard*, that I had been informed the 9,000 coal miners on strike in western Canada would return to work the next morning. That was the information which came to my office from Calgary.

The latest reports we have in connection with this matter are that following the decision of the district executive board at its meeting on Tuesday to recommend to the local unions a return to work, the members of the board returned to their own districts to place before the locals this recommendation. Meetings were held yesterday and to-day in various points, but no votes on the recommendation have yet been taken and it is not anticipated that these votes will be taken before Saturday or Sunday.

Although it cannot be forecast with any certainty, I am informed there is every indication that work will be resumed next Monday.

CRIMINAL CODE

AMENDMENT WITH RESPECT TO APPEALS FROM SUMMARY CONVICTIONS

Mr. WILLIAM BRYCE (Selkirk) moved for leave to introduce bill No. 18, to amend the criminal code.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. BRYCE: The proposed amendment deals with appeals from summary convictions under part XV of the criminal code. The present condition of the law works great hardship and injustice in the case of convicted persons who reside and are tried in remote and outlying localities, such as some in my own and other northern constituencies. Because of communication and transportation difficulties it is physically impossible to serve and file the notice of appeal within the statutory period of thirty days. The purpose of the amendment is to give the judge of the court appealed to a wider discretion in extending the time for serving and filing notice of appeal to three months, and in fixing the particular sitting of the court at which the appeal is to be heard, as the extended time may overrun the next sitting. The amendment will thus allow residents of remote areas who feel aggrieved by a conviction to have recourse to an appeal, which recourse now seems to be barred to them because of the transportation and communication difficulties I have mentioned. The proposed amendments are indicated by the added words underlined in the text.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

AERONAUTICS ACT

COMMERCIAL AIR OPERATIONS, HEARING OF APPLICATIONS, ETC.

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction) moved for leave to introduce bill No. 19, to amend the Aeronautics Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. HOWE: I am informed that this bill amends the Aeronautics Act in minor particulars. In the act, which I believe was passed at the last session, there are one or two obvious errors which will be corrected by this amendment. I am sorry I have not a memorandum on the subject, but I think hon. members will find it is not a very important matter.

Mr. HOMUTH: There is no change in the act?

Mr. HOWE: No material change.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

TRANS-CANADA AIR LINES

INCREASE OF CAPITAL—CREATION OF CORPORATION TO OPERATE SERVICES UNDER CONTRACT

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction) moved that the house go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to amend The Trans-Canada Air Lines Act 1937, to increase the capital from five to twenty-five million dollars and to authorize the Canadian National Railways to issue securities to twenty-five million dollars for acquiring the stock of the corporation; to provide authority in the governor in council to create corporations to operate and maintain air services under contract with Trans-Canada Air Lines such corporations to be controlled by Trans-Canada Air Lines;

also to make provision for the payment of subsidies to such corporations payable out of moneys to be appropriated by parliament, and with provision for the termination of the present contract for the transport of mails and for a new contract for mail transport.

He said: His Excellency the Administrator having been informed of the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the consideration of the house.

Motion agreed to.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

EXCHANGE OF DIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATION BETWEEN INDIA AND CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): Has the Canadian government been officially or unofficially approached by the government of India with a view to an exchange of high commissioners between the two countries? If so, when was such approach first made, and why has Canada so far not completed her part of the suggested diplomatic exchange? Is it anticipated that a move in this direction will be made by this government at an early date? I ask this question because on April 6 of this year I made a similar inquiry of the Prime Minister, based upon certain news dispatches, and at that time the Prime Minister replied that he intended very soon to have an exchange of diplomatic representation between India and Canada. Now that six months have elapsed I think we should have some indication as to the present position in the matter.

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs): I am not sure the summary the hon. gentleman gave of the reply on April 6 is quite complete. The note I have here is that the answer was:

> May I say in reply to my hon. friend that the matter of exchange of high commissioners between Canada and India has been under consideration for some little time. It is wholly correct to say that Canada intends to send a high commissioner to India and that India intends to send a high commisisoner to Canada. The exchange of high commissioners will be reciprocal. The government up to the moment have not been able to decide on the particular person to be appointed as high commissioner from Canada but I hope that an appointment may soon be made.

This was the answer given at that time. There has been some further informal discussion of the matter since then, and I am informed that probably it will not be long now before an announcement can be made.

[Mr. Howe.]

SHIPPING ACCOMMODATION

INQUIRY AS TO TRANSPORTATION TO CANADA OF WIVES OF SERVICE PERSONNEL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. S. HARKNESS (Calgary East): In view of the protest meeting held in London, England, by wives of Canadian servicemen in regard to their transportation to Canada, and meetings of ex-servicemen in Canada to protest the delay in bringing their wives to this country, is the government in a position to make a statement as to when these women and their children may expect to obtain transportation to Canada?

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of National Defence): There is a similar question on the order paper already. Replying to my hon. friend may I say that every effort is being made to obtain additional shipping to bring wives and dependents back to Canada, but priority is being given to returning servicemen, for obvious reasons. Up to V-E day approximately 5,000 wives and 3,500 children had been repatriated to Canada. Since V-E day, as at the end of August an additional 7,000 wives and 4,600 children have been repatriated, making a total of some 20,000 odd. But there are a great many servicemen overseas who have been away from their wives for a number of years.

Mr. GREEN: Arising out of the last question, has the Minister of National Defence seen the reports in to-day's press to the effect that the *Queen Elizabeth* and the *Aquitania* are being taken out of the troop movement service? If so it might be possible to have representations made to the end that these ships continue to do this work.

Mr. ABBOTT: I have seen the reports to which the hon. member has referred. They are newspaper reports. We are in close touch with the shipping situation. Every effort is being made to obtain every available ship to bring our people back. I think that up to the present we have done very well—better, I may say, than we had anticipated we would be able to do last July. I must be cautious in making any predictions, but I have every reason to believe that the results in the future will not be out of proportion to what we have been able to do in the past.

Mr. ADAMSON: Does the British ministry of shipping control shipping on the North Atlantic?

Mr. ABBOTT: My understanding is that all the shipping is subject to the control of the united nations shipping pool, and that from

that pool we get our proportion. I am told that up to the present we have had our fair proportion of the available shipping. As the house knows, there are a very large number of troops, dependents, prisoners of war and others who have to be repatriated from the far east. These are composed of British, Americans and others. I am informed we are getting, and I am sure we will continue to get, our fair share of all available shipping.

UNITED NATIONS

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION

The house resumed from Thursday, October 11, consideration in committee of bill No. 14, for carrying into effect the agreement for a food and agriculture organization of the united nations between Canada and certain other nations and authorities—Mr. Gardiner—Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

On section 2—Powers of governor in council to carry out agreement.

Mr. CASE: Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that the amendment now before the committee seeks to commit us to the articles of agreement. As I read it, we approve those articles of agreement. However, before I could vote I would want to have an explanation from the Minister of Agriculture with respect to article XIV, which deals with supervision of other organizations. It says:

> The conference may approve arrangements placing other public international organizations dealing with questions relating to food and agriculture under the general authority of the organization on such terms as may be agreed with the competent authorities of the organization concerned.

Would this in any way interfere with empire trade agreements or with the British preference? I am convinced that in Canada we have made remarkable progress as a result of the British preference and empire trade agreements, and I should like to feel that we are secure in that regard.

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): Before answering the question asked might I be permitted to read to the committee the suggested amendments, some of which were agreed to last night, and others of which were drafted following a meeting last night with some who had raised the objections to the form of the bill as it then stood.

I am sorry that the bill as now printed is not in the hands of every hon. member, although I had understood it would be here at three o'clock. However, it is not here because in the rush between the time we adjourned last night and this morning some things were put into the bill which were not intended to be there. That is, some of the motions, rather than sections of the bill, were reprinted, with the result that we had to have it printed over again. The reprinted copies will be available in a short time.

I would refer to section 2 of the bill, which was under discussion last night. The new subsection 1 is as follows:

> (1) The constitution of the food and agriculture organization is hereby approved.

I think that is the amendment to which reference has just been made.

Then, subsection 2 is amended to read:

> (2) The governor in council may make such appointments, establish such offices, make such orders in council and do such things as appear to him to be necessary for carrying out the provisions of the constitution set out in the schedule to this act.

That is word for word with the first part of subsection 1 as it appears in the bill as first printed. In the new subsection, however, the remainder of the section is left out. The effect is that the new section takes in all those words down to the word "act" in line 24 of the old bill. Then the remainder of the subsection is struck out as was agreed last night.

Subsection 2 in the bill as we had it yesterday will remain the same as it appears in the copy now before us, with the exception that the word "one" in the second line of the subsection becomes the word "two." The subsection would now read:

> All expenditures incurred in carrying out the provisions of subsection two of this section shall be defrayed out of moneys provided by parliament.

I have not yet had an opportunity to ask the Minister of Justice, and also to confer with those who have made this suggestion, as to whether I should not include the words "one" and "two." It would then read:

> All expenditures incurred in carrying out the provisions of subsections one and two of this section shall be defrayed out of moneys provided by parliament.

In my view both words should be included. I may be wrong, and I am asking for information on the point.

I shall discuss other points when we reach later sections.

Replying to the question asked by the hon. member for Grey North, may I point out that article XIV reads:

> The conference may approve arrangements placing other public international organizations dealing with questions relating to food and agriculture under the general authority of the organization on such terms as may be agreed with the competent authorities of the organization concerned.

I am just giving my own opinion on the matter, but I would think that any decision

that is made would have no influence whatsoever upon or relate to any decision that might be made in connection with such matters as preferences. This is simply an arrangement whereby this organization can work in cooperation with other organizations, all of which come under the general council, as I understand it, as set up at San Francisco.

Mr. CASE: The minister says "as I understand it," but is there any absolute authority for his view? We are going to pass something which will delegate to them the power to do as they see fit, but subject to certain limitations.

Mr. GARDINER: I read it very carefully and I did not see anything in the article which would give any such authority over this organization.

Mr. FLEMING: In view of the fact that the amendments agreed to last night propose the addition of a further subsection, I suggest that the minister read the subsection so that the committee may have the complete proposed section before it.

Mr. GARDINER: Subsection 2 of the old section becomes subsection 3, and then there will be a subsection 4, which reads:

> Any order in council made under this act shall be forthwith published in the *Canada Gazette* and laid before parliament as soon as may be after it is made.

Mr. LOW: I think this is just as good a place as any to follow up what I said yesterday I might do, namely, ask for answers to certain questions. It is well known to hon. members that the delegation which went from this parliament to San Francisco did not include a member of this group. That being so we are somewhat in the dark as to the whole mechanism of the specialized agencies and so on that were discussed at the San Francisco conference.

I indicated yesterday that I was in sympathy with the two objectives that are set out in this measure, first, to see to it that Canada's house is set in order as a nation, and, second, to put ourselves in such a position as to be of the greatest assistance in the furnishing of food or whatever we can produce in this country to help the war ravaged and worthy nations to rehabilitate themselves and to raise the standard of living of their peoples. I am in sympathy with those two objectives. I want it known definitely that we are not opposed to helping as far as we can these other nations, to reaching out the hand of brotherhood to them; but inasmuch as the Social Credit movement was not represented at the conference I am anxious to settle in my own mind the relationship of this measure to other international measures which will be before this house and which obviously were discussed at San Francisco.

I did ask certain questions, but in the light of information that has been brought out before the committee since those questions were asked I have reworded some of them and have perhaps deleted others. I am quite sure the minister will not mind answering these questions to-day so far as he is able to do so. I am sincere and earnest in trying to get this information and I do not mean to embarrass him or anyone else.

I think it is vital that the people of this country should know what Canada can do if she becomes a part of this permanent world food and agriculture organization, first, about setting her own house in order that she could not do without becoming a member. I should like to have that question answered, because I am not quite clear that she could do anything more with membership in this organization than she could do without it.

Mr. GARDINER: I think it is agreed by everyone that thirty nations working in cooperation can do more, for themselves individually, for the whole group of thirty nations and for the world in general, than any one nation can do working by itself. All this bill really does is to make it possible for thirty nations at the present time, and possibly in the end forty-four or forty-five nations, to meet together from time to time—it is presumed they will meet at least once a year—to discuss problems that may arise and endeavour to help one another to work out some solution for problems that relate to food. I do not think any one nation, and particularly Canada with 12,000,000 people only, in a world of nations like China with 450,000,000 people, can do as much by itself as it could working along with thirty other nations.

Mr. LOW: I do not want to debate the question at this time, except to say that we have a very fine example to the south of us which could be placed before the committee. Hon. members should think about it. There we have a nation of forty-eight states known as the United States of America. Each state is capable of a certain production; they have a great variety of productions, they have tremendous possibilities. They have no trade barriers; they have no restrictions whatever as to the passage of goods from one to the other. They have no tariffs; they have no exchange problems. They are united in purpose, and yet I would remind the minister that those free forty-eight united states, with all their vast possibilities, operating under the present financial system, in close cooperation

and collaboration, have failed to achieve a high standard of living for all their peoples. There is no other nation in the world so nearly self-sustaining as those forty-eight states of the United States of America. I fail to see how a united states of the world will assure any greater success in obtaining a higher standard of living for the various peoples of the world than has been achieved by the United States of America, for the people of the various states of that nation, so long as we continue to operate under our present vicious financial set-up.

Mr. LESAGE: It is clear that they need social credit prophets in the United States.

Mr. LOW. The young man is beginning to understand a little. My second question is this: If Canada does become part of the permanent world food and agriculture organization, what can she do about assisting other nations to raise their standard of living that she could not do without becoming a member?

Mr. GARDINER: The answer is not very different from the answer to the first question. She can do far more working in cooperation with them to help other nations than she can by simply operating from Ottawa as a government in order to look after her own interests. These people will meet together, they will discuss these matters cooperatively and then they will make recommendations to us. We will consider those recommendations and act upon them if we see fit, or otherwise. I think we can accomplish more, both for ourselves and for other nations, by acting cooperatively than we can by acting individually, for the same reason that forty-eight states acting cooperatively under the one government can perhaps accomplish more for that great mass of people than they could if they were acting as forty-eight different states.

Mr. LOW: The Falk Foundation report states that they expect by July, 1946, to have 20,000,000 unemployed in those forty-eight states.

Mr. MITCHELL: Who said it?

Mr. LOW: The Falk Foundation report. I go to the next point. I should like to ask the question I asked yesterday because it is important to me, and I believe to the people, that we should know. Is this measure before us designed to set up one of the various specialized agencies established by intergovernmental agreement and having wide international responsibility as mentioned in article 57 of chapter 9 of the united nations charter? I have quoted almost the exact wording of article 57.

Mr. GARDINER: Has the hon. member got the article there? Will he read it?

Mr. LOW: I will send and get it, but I have quoted exactly from it. It says: the various specialized agencies established by inter-governmental agreement and having wide international responsibility as mentioned in article 57 of chapter 9 of the united nations charter.

While I am waiting for the text of the article I should like to refer to a statement that was made by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar last night as recorded at page 969 of *Hansard*. This is what he said, following a question asked, I think, by the hon. member for Acadia:

> What I was wondering was this. I take it that the general international organization is the united nations international organization which was established at San Francisco. Under that charter we have set up the social and economic council, and that social and economic council provides that certain specialized bodies shall be set up, of which it is anticipated this will be one.

That seemed to throw some light on the matter, and because of that statement and the further statement made by the Minister for Justice as recorded on the same page at the bottom of column 1 and the top of column 2, I asked my question. This is what the Minister of Justice said:

> . . . it would appear to me that this organization is being set up now in accordance with the terms of this constitution—

Referring to the constitution in the schedule. It goes on:

> —and the united nations charter has not yet come into operation. When it does come into operation it will be dealing with the food and agriculture organization as an entity existing under its own constitution, and then some modifications may have to be made in order to adopt the food and agriculture organization as the specialized agency provided for under the united nations charter.

Those two quotations, one from the member for Rosetown-Biggar and the other from the Minister of Justice, seem to indicate that this is one of the specialized agencies referred to in article 57 of the united nations charter. Would the minister say at this time whether that is so?

Mr. GARDINER: I think perhaps the Minister of Justice or the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar had better answer that.

Mr. COLDWELL: It is anticipated, as I said last night, that a number of specialized agencies will be set up. When we were at San Francisco there were several specialized agencies already in existence and recognized by governments. This was one. Another was the international labour organization;

another the secretariat of the league of nations on economics and finance. It does not necessarily follow that any of these organizations will be the specialized agency to be brought into relationship with social and economic council. That is a matter for future agreement. But it is anticipated that those inter-governmental agencies that are in existence and have performed a useful function, such as the ones I have mentioned, may become the specialized agencies under the charter. We are not dealing here with the charter of the united nations, but, as the Minister of Justice said last night, with an organization that has its own constitution and is self-governing in every respect, which may or may not come under the social and economic council as the specialized agency. It seems to me that it would be better to leave the united nations charter out of the discussion until we come to deal with it on the resolution now on the order paper.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: So that the hon. member may have no misgivings of there being any possibility of divergence of view between the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar and myself, in view of the fact that we were both at San Francisco, I wish to add that although it was not expressly stated in the charter, all those who discussed with me the terms of article 57 anticipated that this organization would likely become one of the specialized organizations referred to, and article 57 was, by those who talked to me about it, accepted as being something which would enable that to be done if agreement were reached afterwards.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is right.

Mr. GARDINER: I think the answer to the question is to be found in articles XII and XIII of the schedule to the bill. Article XII reads:

1. In order to provide for close cooperation between the organization and other public international organizations with related responsibilities, the conference may, subject to the provisions of Article XIII, enter into agreements with the competent authorities of such organizations defining the distribution of responsibilities and methods of cooperation.

They may do that. Then the second paragraph reads:

2. The director-general may, subject to any decisions of the conference, enter into agreements with other public international organizations for the maintenance of common services, for common arrangements in regard to recruitment, training, conditions of service, and other related matters, and for interchanges of staff.

That is, they may cooperate in administration. Article XIII reads:

1. The organization shall, in accordance with the procedure provided for in the following paragraph, constitute a part of any general international organization to which may be entrusted the coordination of the activities of international organizations with specialized responsibilities.

2. Arrangements for defining the relations between the organization and any such general organization shall be subject to the approval of the conference. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article XX.

That does make provision for this organization working in cooperation with any other world organization in order to bring about the objective set out in these articles.

Mr. LOW: Yes, all of which, it seems to me, indicates that it was unfortunate that someone from the Social Credit group was not down there to make sure whether this food and agricultural commission was or was not designed to be a part of the united nations charter.

Mr. COLDWELL: You should have joined us. But there was trouble trying to get the I.L.O. organization recognized.

Mr. LOW: I do not doubt that there was a lot of trouble; I can understand that. May I set my hon. friends' minds at rest by saying that I am not attempting here to discuss the united nations charter. I quite realize that that will come up in due course, and I realize the impropriety of bringing it up here, except that I am trying to establish whether this is one of the specialized agencies mentioned and closely related to the united nations charter. Of course the united nations charter has not yet been adopted so far as Canada is concerned. I have now before me article 57 of chapter 9 of the united nations charter, which reads:

The various specialized agencies established by intergovernmental agreement and having wide international responsibilities, as defined in their basic instruments, in economic, social, cultural, educational, health, and related fields shall be brought into relationship with the united nations in accordance with the provisions of article 63.

That is the reason I asked the question.

Growing out of that is another question which I think it is wise for us to consider and upon which we ought to have some information. This question arose in my mind as a result of something said by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) last evening as reported in *Hansard*, page 969, and immediately following the quotation which I placed on *Hansard* a moment ago. He said this:

At San Francisco, Argentina was admitted as a signatory to the charter. I must say I did not approve that, and I am sorry Canada cast her vote in favour of it, but I am not going into that matter now.

In my thinking that indicates that there may be some penalty—or perhaps I should modify that and say, some disadvantage—which might accrue to a nation if it fails to become a member of this permanent world commission. What I wish to ask is, what penalty or disadvantage would accrue to Canada in her efforts, first, to raise the standard of living of her own people, and second, to extend help towards needy countries, if she should not become a member?

Mr. GARDINER. Mr. Chairman, I have not been able to read into the articles of this constitution any suggestion that anyone is going to inflict penalties on anybody. That is not the intention of this kind of arrangement. It is simply that a group of nations are asked to come together and try by discussion to find some way in which they can help one another and help the world. I do not see that any harm can come out of that. I do not think any country is going to be punished if it does not attend, and nobody is likely to be penalized if he does attend. Simply an effort is being made on the part of a group of nations to help one another and help themselves while they help one another. I do not think there is any penalty which Canada would incur by being out, other than we might not get all the benefits of cooperation if we were to stay out, and I imagine that any other nation which stayed out would suffer from the same absence of benefits.

Mr. COLDWELL: May I say that the hon. member for Peace River is reading something into the remarks I made last night regarding Argentina which should not be read into them. I felt sorry that Canada cast her vote in favour of the admission of Argentina, because of the situation in that country. It was a fascist power under a dictatorship, with all the leading democrats in goal, including outstanding professors and newspaper men, with a police controlled press, and all the rest of it and I thought it was rather a pity that Canada recognized Argentina as among the peace-loving nations. But I realized that there was probably another side to the argument; and while I feel very strongly about it still, there are others who feel just as strongly that there would be considerable advantage to the world organization and to the hemisphere in bringing Argentina in. That, I believe, was the point of view of the United States State Department, and I think it was the view which prevailed in our own delegation. On balance I feel very strongly that it should not have been done—but not in the sense in which the hon. gentleman raises the question on this particular bill.

Mr. LOW: Just in that connection I wish it to be made perfectly clear that my point would have been the same had the nation in question been Bulgaria or any other state. The point was simply that there seemed to be some indication in that action that there might be a disadvantage or penalty or something of the kind, active or passive, which would grow out of not becoming a member. I did not want to impute any motives to the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar.

Mr. COLDWELL: I do not wish to have something read into my words which should not be read into them. I think the Minister of Agriculture has given the answer—that there is advantage in cooperation.

Mr. LOW: Another question grows out of this. I do not wish to cut anybody else out of the discussion, but I do want to know these things. Has the minister assured himself that if Canada should fail to satisfy the permanent commission that she has done her best to put into effect any of the commission's recommendations, some other agency under the united nations charter will not be called upon to invoke sanctions of one kind or another which will or might contribute to the ruination of our whole economy, and with it, the solidarity of the British empire?

Mr. GARDINER: I am not going to try to predict what will be included in all the articles which may be drawn up in an attempt to bring about a friendly relationship among the nations of the world, but I feel confident that no group of men meeting for the purpose of trying to bring about better relationships among the world's peoples would inflict upon the world ideas of that kind. I do not anticipate any such thing, and it is certainly not to be found in this document. Nothing in this constitution would make it possible for anyone to dictate to anyone else, and it is this document that we are dealing with at the moment.

Mr. LOW: That may be correct, but we must not overlook the point that this may become an agency under the united nations charter, and if it does become an agency, we have to consider the possibilities which should arise in that event. I will not labour the point at this stage. I have one other question. Has the minister assured himself that this measure is not a step towards a world coupon or rationing system? I asked the question yesterday, and with the answer to it I will let my case rest.

Mr. GARDINER: Well, I am convinced, myself, that it is not.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: There is one question to which I did not get an answer yesterday, no doubt through inadvertence on the part of the minister. It had to do with the Argentine, which was mentioned here again this afternoon, and which is not a member of the signatory countries or among those which were represented when the constitution was drawn. Yesterday the minister pointed out the position in which Argentina stands by reason of her tremendous export potentialities—a position of danger as far as concerns any international organization designed to adopt international policies with respect to agricultural commodity arrangements, which is referred to as one of the functions of the organization.

I asked whether the Argentine had made any application, and the minister's answer was in the negative. One question I asked to which he has not given an answer is this: if the Argentine—necessary as it is to the success of any hemispheric or world organization respecting agricultural production—makes an application for membership in this organization, what will Canada's vote be? What consideration is being given to the attitude which Canada's delegation to the Quebec conference should take? As the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar points out, there was some division of opinion, and the Prime Minister, casting a vote on behalf of Canada, did so in favour of the admission of Argentina. I for one agreed with the stand taken by the Prime Minister, for two reasons. One was the necessity of mobilizing the support of all the South American and Central American republics at the united nations conference, thus assuring in return their support to Soviet Russia having three representatives. Second, the United States had agreed at Chapultepec, Mexico City, to the admission of Argentina provided that it did certain things and declared war on Germany. Besides, Canada was in this position: had she voted against the admission of Argentina she would have been the only nation in North or South America that had done so, and instead of being the interpreter as between Great Britain and the United States, both of whom were supporting Argentina's application for admission, she would have found herself not the instrument joining these two nations together but actually the very reverse.

While I feel very strongly, as does the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar, that Argentina's whole attitude throughout the period of the war was one destructive of the united nations, nevertheless, now that this nation is a member of the united nations, everything should be done to support her application, provided that she makes an application to become a member under this constitution.

As it requires a two-thirds majority for any nation who was not a member at the time of the Hot Springs conference to become a member of this organization, will the minister tell us whether or not the Canadian delegation will in fact support Argentina's application in that regard?

Mr. GARDINER: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member for Lake Centre has given the best reasons that I can think of why delegates should not go to the conference instructed. The reasons which he gave—and I am not stating that they are the reasons which were in the minds of the delegates who were there; I am not in a position to know—for the vote that was cast at San Francisco by Canada would necessitate the delegates being in possession of all the facts, as they were at that time and at that place.

I believe that any delegate going to this conference must be just as free to consider all the facts as they then are as were the other delegates. I would hope that the thirty nations, which have indicated their intention of meeting at a certain place to discuss our different problems, are not going to be tied up before they hear those problems discussed from one another's point of view, and that the decision will be reached only after they are discussed and when all the facts are known.

Since the hon. member for Lake Centre is still satisfied with the vote cast at San Francisco after all the facts were heard, I am sure that he will be just as well satisfied with any vote that will be cast by representatives of Canada at any conference that is held under this set of articles. I am not stating here or anywhere else on behalf either of myself as Minister of Agriculture or of the government, and I do not think any other member of the government would state, that this goverment is going to commit its delegates, in advance of the application being made, as to how the delegates should vote.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Does the minister admit that unless Argentina is a member of this organization it is going to be very difficult, if not impossible, to establish international relationships in regard to agricultural production and the like that will be effective all over the world?

Mr. GARDINER: I would say this; the more nations that are great producers of agricultural products, as Argentina is, that come into this conference the better it will be for all of us.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: And the greater the prospects for success.

Mr. GARDINER: The more that come in, the easier it will be to get the arrangements that we are all looking forward to in this conference. As to what the proper time is for nations to come in, that will pretty much be decided by those who make their applications; and the members of the conference will have to consider the applications on their merits as they are made. If two-thirds of them vote to allow them to enter, they will enter.

Mr. COLDWELL: Conditions too have changed to some extent, because lately the dictator Peron has been overthrown, and the people who were imprisoned because of their progressive and democratic views have been largely liberated. We may find an entirely different Argentina government from the goverment that was in power at the time of the San Francisco conference.

Mr. GRAYDON: There is an election in April.

Mr. REID: There is one more question I should like to put to the Minister of Agriculture, but before doing so may I say that while I believe every hon. member agrees with the object of this agreement and the setting up of this organization, I for one, Mr. Chairman, am not so sanguine of its outcome. I ask any hon. member to read over the international agreements, and the story of international agreements, of the past few years, and then ask himself what has been accomplished to date that is really worth while.

Mr. HERRIDGE: We won the war by international agreements.

Mr. REID: That does not enter into the picture. It is a question that can be debated at another time. Be that as it may, I repeat we have only to read the history of international agreements and what has taken place—I leave out the war for the moment—and ask ourselves what has really been accomplished.

I notice that when we come to fish and forest products we find that they are placed under agriculture. There is no more important food in the world to-day than fishery products. There is no more controversial subject among nations to-day than fishery products; because, as many hon. members realize, prior to the war with Germany and Japan the Japanese government had fishing boats along the Pacific which were a source of irritation. The Japanese, of all people, were not preservers of food products. There are only two countries in the world that have set out to preserve and conserve and build up the fisheries, namely, the United States and Canada. Personally I should like to see fisheries predominantly mentioned in the constitution of this organization, because if they are to deal with the conservation of natural resources, especially the natural resources of the sea outside of the three-mile limit, they are going to run into a controversial question among the various nations that are gathered together when they begin to talk of fishing and of fishing rights outside the three-mile limit. I intend to deal with that later.

I rose particularly to ask this question. If my memory serves me rightly, there were many signatories to the league of nations, but very few nations paid their contributions. If nations that are signatories to this agrement do not pay, who is to be responsible for the expenses? That is a practical question, and I should like an answer.

Mr. GARDINER: I think the only answer that can be given is the one that is found in the articles which are on the desk of every hon. member. Section XVIII reads as follows:

1. Subject to the provisions of article XXV, the director general shall submit to the conference an annual budget covering the anticipated expenses of the organization. Upon approval of a budget the total amount approved shall be allocated among the member nations in proportions determined, from time to time, by the conference. Each member nation undertakes, subject to the requirements of its constitutional procedure, to contribute to the organization promptly its share of the expenses so determined.

2. Each member nation shall, upon its acceptance of this constitution, pay as its first contribution its proportion of the annual budget for the current financial year.

So for one year it will be taken care of: these thirty nations who have indicated their acceptance must send their money along with their membership.

3. The financial year of the organization shall be July 1 to June 30 unless the conference should otherwise determine.

As I said a moment ago, as far as I know no real penalties can be imposed in an organization of this kind, but it is assumed that these nations will carry out their obligation, which is that having made the first payment they will continue to make the four additional payments. Then if at the end of that time they are not satisfied with the way the money has been expended or with the activities of the organization generally, any nation can give twelve months' notice that it is withdrawing, the definite understanding being, as stated here, that it will pay its fees for twelve months. I quite agree that if some of the greater nations were to say, "Well, we are out of this thing," they could blow it to pieces in the interval. But I do not believe anyone anticipates this happening, and I

would expect that the terms here laid down will be carried out. We must remember that forty-four nations met and set up this interim commission. The interim commission drew up these articles of constitution, and those who have come into the organization have agreed to this constitution. They have all said they are prepared to make these payments, and, barring unforeseen accidents such as none of us expect at the moment, I believe the payments will be made.

Mr. GREEN: This food and agriculture organization of the united nations is to have certain jurisdiction over fisheries and forestry, and I think it would be very helpful if the Minister of Fisheries would make a statement to the committee outlining generally the effect of the organization on Canadian fisheries, and if the Minister of Mines and Resources would do the same in respect to forestry.

Dealing first with fisheries, questions such as this come to mind. We have certain conventions between Canada and other nations; for example, there is the whaling convention, which I think is a multilateral agreement, and we have conventions between Canada and the United States, as the hon. member for New Wetsminster has said. For instance, we have a convention under which was set up the international Pacific salmon fisheries commission, of which the hon. member for New Westminster is a distinguished and very useful member. I believe the Minister of Fisheries should tell us just what will be the effect of this new organization as far as the international Pacific salmon fisheries commission is concerned. Which organization is to be preeminent in the fisheries field? These are questions that come to mind, and I think they should be carefully considered by hon. members of the committee.

In the first report to the governments of the united nations made by the interim commission on food and agriculture, the present body which will pass out of exitsence when the new food and agriculture organization is set up, we find on page 16 certain statements with regard to fisheries. For instance it says that the plan is to encourage systematic exploration for virgin marine resources, and to evaluate the possibilities for their development. Does this mean that this international organization can send men into our coastal waters or into waters beyond the three-mile limit, to which the hon. member for New Westminster referred, in order to make these explorations? That, too, I think is an important question to the Canadian people. Reference is also made to the new organization performing certain functions in relation to credit. What is the idea? To whom is this credit to be given? Is it to be given to the fisheries industry in certain nations? Would credit be available to the fisheries industry of Canada, or what is the plan?

Then with regard to forestry, it does seem to me that the delegates who drew up this convention were a little over-anxious to obtain powers. They have included forestry in agriculture, though someone had to stretch his or her imagination a bit in order to do so. From what the Minister of Agriculture said last evening when I questioned him on this subject, I am quite sure he feels that they went rather far. The problems of forestry, speaking of forestry in the accepted sense; the problems of getting out lumber and the problems of the associated industries, are so different from those of agriculture that there is really no connection whatever between them. Yet this international organization is given very wide powers over forestry; and the unfortunate part of it is that this has not been done directly by calling this a food, agriculture and forestry organization. The only place in which we find forestry mentioned in the whole convention is in article XVI, which says that the term "agriculture" includes forestry and primary forest products. I am quite sure the provincial governments of Canada and the people engaged in the forest industries do not realize that such extensive powers are being given to this international organization. Last evening the minister said the provinces had not been consulted about that control, and I do suggest that the Canadian delegates should try to have an amendment put through deleting the words "forestry and primary forest products." Unfortunately we cannot change it here. As I understand it we have to take the whole convention or none at all; we cannot qualify our acceptance of it, and I would not be in favour of attempting to do so. But I do suggest that the ministry give consideration to having the Canadian delegate or delegates propose that an amendment be put through removing jurisdiction over forestry.

I believe it would be helpful if the committee could be given a statement now by the Minister of Fisheries and the Minister of Mines and Resources, who are the ministers concerned.

Mr. GARDINER: I have just suggested to the ministers mentioned that if they care to make statements it will be quite all right, but I should like to say a word in regard to the general statements that have been made. I think some hon. members are reading far too much into this constitution. No powers are given to anyone to provide credits. No powers are given to anyone to do any of these

particular things. The powers given are to explore the possibilities in different countries and under different forms, then to make recommendations to the governments of the different countries as to what they think would be a good way to provide credits. They do not undertake themselves to provide any credits. They do not undertake to determine finally anything that is to be done in connection with any of these matters. They simply say, "We are going to study them all and, after a full study, we are going to make certain recommendations to the different members as to how we think they can solve some of their problems." Then it is up to the nation itself to find ways and means of putting such recommendations into effect, or to decide not to adopt them at all. Having said that, I think the ministers will be prepared to say a word.

Mr. GREEN: I think the minister is not entirely correct. Let us, for example, take paragraph 54 of the first report to which I referred. It states:

It should also perform functions in relation to credit which will be needed for the development, expansion and rehabilitation of many fisheries enterprises, similar to the functions suggested elsewhere in this report in connection with agriculture.

Then, in the convention itself we find this in article I, paragraph 2:

The organization shall promote and, where appropriate, shall recommend—

The minister will see there is both the power to promote and the power to recommend. Then at a later point in the paragraph we find this:

(c) The conservation of natural resources and the adoption of improved methods of agriculture production.

This, of course, also means fisheries and forestry production, under the defining article. Then it refers to—

(d) The improvement of the processing, marketing and distribution of food and agricultural products;—

Which of course means fisheries and forestry products.

Then it also provides in paragraph 3 of article I:

3. It shall also be the function of the organization:

(a) To furnish such technical assistance as governments may request;

(b) To organize, in cooperation with the governments concerned such missions as may be needed to assist them to fulfil the obligations arising from their acceptance of the recommendations of the united nations conference on food and agriculture;

And then:

(c) Generally to take all necessary and appropriate action to implement the purposes of the organization as set forth in the preamble.

So that I think it was the intention of those who drew up the constitution that this international body would go a good deal farther than merely making recommendations, as the minister has suggested. At this time I am not arguing whether that is a good or a bad thing; but it is the fact. In any event the constitution can be read in that way.

Mr. GLEN: In answer to the hon. member for Vancouver South, as to why forestry was brought into the constitution, may I say that some of the reasons are given as follows:

In the attainment of freedom from want, shelter is the complement of food. Wood is the largest single item in the provision of shelter.

Forestry is a form of land use complementary to agriculture. Forests regulate stream flow and thus stabilize water tables and prevent erosion. They also have a modifying effect on climatic extremes, which is favourable to agriculture.

In many sections of the world the farm woodlot makes an important contribution to farm income, besides providing for the farmers' fuel requirements.

In connection with the world situation today, investigations being made in Germany disclose that apparently in that country processes have been developed in connection with the making of sugar from wood. These are some of the considerations which were in the minds of those who framed the convention when they included forestry.

I believe those reasons are given very fully and completely, and they have already been set out by the Minister of Agriculture. I would refer the committee particularly to page 16 of the first report to the governments of the united nations by the interim commission on food and agriculture. We will find there the reason why forestry was included in agriculture. In paragraph 56 we find this:

56. Forests occupy approximately 22 per cent of the land surface of the earth. They play so important a part in the conservation and building up of soil and water resources that it is impossible to plan conservation measures on any extensive scale without including forest management—and frequently afforestation—in the plans. In most countries forestry and farming or grazing constitute possible alternative uses of much of the land, and a significant part of the forest land in many countries is owned or operated by farmers. Indeed, forests are perennial crops, natural or man-made, and their products complete with or supplement other farm products for certain important uses. Farmers are among the larger users of forest products, especially for fuel, buildings, and equipment.

Mr. GREEN: We all use forest products for fuel, buildings and equipment.

Mr. GLEN: Yes, that is so. The paragraph continues:

For these reasons many countries include forestry as a part of agriculture in their governmental organization.

Paragraphs 57 and 58 read as follows:

57. World forest supplies have been altered by the war. New supply problems have been created and new uses developed. In some countries progress in improved methods of forest management and utilization is being made at a faster rate than ever before. Thus there are now especially urgent reasons to consider forestry in world terms and to take concerted action to bring about more efficient growing, processing, and distribution of forest products, the balancing of production and distribution with needs on a world scale, and the prevention of disastrous overuse of forest resources in some countries while those of other countries go to waste for lack of effective demand, to the end that the world's forest resources may make their full contribution to the needs and the well-being of the people of every nation.

58. As in the case of food and other agricultural products discussed in this Report, these objectives would be accomplished through international cooperation in bringing all branches of science to bear upon the biological, technological, economic, social, and other problems involved in the production, distribution, and use of primary forest products; in establishing a factual basis upon which nations, individually and in concert, could build policies and programmes; in helping to work out such programmes; and in promoting widespread education and public understanding of forestry problems. The organization's work in forestry would thus closely parallel that in other fields.

The hon. member for Vancouver South is concerned about the effect that may have upon Canada. I refer him to article IV of the constitution, and the functions set out therein. Paragraphs 3 and 4 are of importance in this connection, and particularly paragraph 4 which states that:

The conference shall make rules laying down the procedure to be followed to secure:

(a) proper consultation with governments and adequate technical preparation prior to consideration by the conference of proposed recommendations and conventions;

These are the words to which my hon. friend referred when he was speaking a few moments ago. Then paragraph (b) of article IV continues:

Proper consultation with governments in regard to relations between the organization and national institutions or private persons.

And then follow paragraphs 5 and 6, which are most important:

5. The conference may make recommendations to any public international organization regarding any matter pertaining to the purpose of the organization.

6. The conference may by a two-thirds majority of the votes cast agree to discharge any other functions consistent with the purposes of the organization which may be assigned to it by governments or provided for by any arrangement between the organization and any other public international organization.

[Mr. Green.]

If I read this convention correctly, any conclusions that are based upon these recommendations are not binding upon any country unless that country through its recognized form of government shall accede to them. I fail to see what danger there could be in the recommendations, and in their including forestry, if they have to be ratified and approved by the government of Canada. It seems to me that article IV meets the objection raised by the hon. member.

Mr. GREEN: What about the provincial governments? They are primarily concerned.

Mr. GLEN: My personal view would be that the dominion government certainly would not come to any conclusions in connection with including forestry within the definition of agriculture without consultation with the provinces. In fact we are doing that to-day. All matters concerned with natural resources of the dominion are considered after consultation and cooperation with the provinces.

Mr. GREEN: That is one complaint. It is not being done with regard to forestry. The dominion government has not consulted any provincial governments about the fact that the convention covers forestry. The Minister of Agriculture said that last night.

Mr. GARDINER: The constitution of the dominion settles that point.

Mr. GLEN: I am quite sure that any recommendation that will be made at this conference will have to be subject to the jurisdiction of the dominion, and any action would be taken only after consultation with the provinces. Otherwise we could not get unanimity of opinion; there would be no unanimous consent with regard to any of the proposals affecting all the provinces. These proposals will affect not only individual provinces, but all of them. I do not think the hon. member need be alarmed that the rights and privileges of the parliament of Canada are likely to be infringed upon by commitments made at the international organization which would be binding on Canada without any reference to the jurisdiction and powers of parliament.

Mr. GREEN: I may be wrong, but I venture the guess that the Department of Mines and Resources, which is the department responsible for forestry in so far as the dominion government is concerned, has had very little to do with this convention or with the negotiations that led up to the submission of this convention. Forestry is one of the major industries of Canada, and surely steps should be taken to see that some of the Canadian delegates understand the forestry

industry of this country and that proper provisions are made to protect it. If some international direction or assistance is to be given to forestry, perhaps it would be wiser to set up another international organization which would have that as its main job. I am afraid the two objectives cannot be met by the one international organization. I would ask the Minister of Mines and Resources to give consideration to these two suggestions: first, that Canada should have delegates or representatives who understand forestry, and, second, that a separate international organization be set up to deal with forestry.

Mr. GARDINER: The gentleman who has been nominated to represent us, and whose nomination will go forward immediately this legislation is passed, is Mr. D. Roy Cameron, dominion forester. He is one of the delegates to the conference who has been appointed by the minister, and he will deal with forestry as related to the production of food.

Mr. GREEN: It does not say that.

Mr. GARDINER: That is really what it is, as is indicated in the document quoted from, and it is being discussed from that point of view. I agree with the minister when he says that no matter what is discussed, the recommendations will be referred to the national government of Canada. Then if the matter involves provincial jurisdiction, it would require to be referred by the government of Canada to the provinces. It could not be done any other way under our jurisdiction. The terms used in the articles are "legally," "constitutionally" and so on. The matters will be dealt with in whatever is the proper manner.

Mr. BRIDGES: Mr. Chairman, little did I think when I left Germany on the first day of May last that I would be called upon within a few months to stand up in the House of Commons to answer questions regarding such an important bill as this. Surely I can say, to use the words of another, that the whirligig of political fortune has hurled me into high office in a very short time.

The hon. member for Vancouver South was kind enough to advise me this morning that he was going to ask some questions along the lines of those he has already asked. I appreciate his courtesy. So far as the bill is concerned, the preamble to the constitution—I do not intend to read it all—sets out four purposes, as follows:

(1) Raising levels of nutrition and standards of living of the peoples under their respective jurisdictions,

(2) securing improvements in the efficiency of the production and distribution of all food and agricultural products,

(3) bettering the conditions of rural populations, and

(4) thus contributing toward an expanding world economy.

It can be seen that these functions are phrased in very general language, are idealistic in their nature, and there can be no doubt that everyone in the world, not alone in Canada, would welcome their achievement.

So far as fisheries are concerned, it is realized that these broad idealistic conceptions must be reduced to something which can be practically applied to the bettering of the livelihood of fishermen, which is in turn tied up with the welfare of the people to whom they sell their goods.

It is felt that before such practical aims can be realized there must be a full and free interchange of thought and consideration on the part of any and all nations that will be affected. The food and agriculture organization furnishes a means of bringing together the experts in fisheries marketing and nutrition to consider the problem and to explore for the terms in which practical approaches may be recommended to their respective governments.

Under the interim commission, certain interchanges of ideas between the nations signatory to the final act of the Hot Springs conference have already taken place, and so far as fisheries go there have been certain recommendations made which will be considered at the Quebec conference.

It is realized that an approach to the fishery problem from the international point of view will have to be slow and that there will be many difficult and contentious problems to discuss. It is felt, however, there are certain of these in which there can be obtained measures of agreement; they are:

1. The developing of comparable statistics by fish producing and consuming nations which must be the basis for any intelligent consideration of the position of any nation in its economy, and it is expected that one of the aims of the organization will be to form a clearing house of world statistics.

2. It is also expected that they would act to collect, analyse, and disseminate world information relating to fisheries and fisheries products.

3. It is expected that it would foster the improvement of education relating to the fisheries and the spread of knowledge of fisheries science and practice.

4. It is also expected that it would play a very important part in bringing the fisheries nations of the world together with respect to

the conservation of fisheries in international waters. A very large percentage of the thirty-seven billion pounds of fish that are yielded annually by the world come from international waters where every nation has a right to fish, and it is highly essential that nations come together in such a way as to see that the limited resources of the sea are not exhausted or wiped out. It is expected that from the deliberations which will occur under the food and agriculture organization certain recommendations will be made to governments concerning the desirability of their coming to an agreement, one with the other, with respect to conservation on the high seas. The existing agreements between nations—I think this is what my friend is most interested in—would, of course, continue to be effective, such agreements as are embodied in the various fisheries treaties between the United States and Canada, and which have meant so much benefit to our two peoples. It is the hope and the purpose of the food and agriculture organization to bring nations of the world together to consider whether an expansion of this method of approach to a common fisheries problem would be desirable and possible of recommendation to their respective governments.

I can go further and say that before we can arrive at a practical way of realizing the ideals and objectives as set forth in this bill there must be international discussion, and the purpose of this organization is to provide the means for that international discussion. I think we should all keep in mind that this organization—I think I am right in this; if not, the Minister of Justice can correct me—can only make recommendations to their respective governments for their consideration. This organization cannot bind their respective governments.

I do not know whether I have answered in their entirety the questions asked by the hon. member for Vancouver South, but I think I have dealt with what he has in mind in so far as existing international agreements are concerned. I think I am correct in saying, although I am not an authority on international law, that the present agreements will be paramount over any other agreements that may be made at a later date.

Mr. GREEN: Did the minister say that the present agreements would be paramount, or the new organization?

Mr. BRIDGES: I would say that the present agreements would be paramount.

Mr. GREEN: In other words, there is no intention that the food and agriculture organization of the united nations should take over the administration of the convention between Canada and the United States with regard to the international Pacific salmon fisheries convention?

Mr. BRIDGES: That is my understanding.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: If the hon. member wishes me to express the understanding which has been that of the Department of Justice, it has been that this organization would have no mandatory powers at all. Its function would be, as the Minister of Fisheries has pointed out, to gather information and co-ordinate it and make recommendations, but it has no power at all to interfere with the sovereignty of any nation. Those recommendations, in order to be implemented, would have to be considered by the legislative body competent to deal with the subject matter of the recommendation. It might be parliament; it might be provincial legislatures. The existing agreements between this country and other countries with respect to fisheries will not be affected in any way until action is taken by the competent bodies to affect them. The food and agriculture organization would be competent only to make recommendations.

Mr. GREEN: I thank the ministers for their statements. They have been very helpful. There is one other question: What about the future? Suppose Canada wants to make an agreement with the United States next year concerning some other aspect of the fisheries; would she be free to do so without having first to get the approval of this united nations organization?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Our understanding is that she would be perfectly free to make any kind of agreement in that regard. It might be considered more courteous to the members of the food and agriculture organization to apprise them beforehand of what Canada's intentions were in that regard, but our understanding is that there would be no legal requirement to do so.

Mr. GREEN: If we advised them through courtesy, the result would be that a procedure would then be initiated that would have to be followed in all other cases, and the practical effect would be that every one of these agreements would have to go first to the united nations organization. Does the minister not agree that that would probably be the result?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: No, I would not fully agree with the suggestion of the hon. member. My understanding is that this organization is designed to furnish a forum where information can be pooled and from

which recommendations can be made. If it were performing the function that we all hope it will be competent to perform it would seem natural that in making any arrangements which were going to have a substantial effect upon the production of food supplies, the information would be available to the organization and an effort would be made to have that fit into the general plan for the attainment of the purposes set out in the charter.

Mr. FERGUSON: There is one thing that has struck me, as I am sure it must have most of the other new members. The subject matter of this bill an international matter, was discussed in 1943, and apparently a tremendous amount of time has been spent on it, and yet this government waits until after the war to call a dominion-provincial conference to discuss matters that vitally affect this country. To-day there is hardly a man or a woman in Canada who has not grave doubts as to the future for some years to come. That is true of the soldier, of the farmer, and of men in all lines of business. I think that if more attention were given to national affairs and the affairs of the provinces, this country would not be in the state in which it is to-day and we would not find the government taking over the Burns company or see the chaos now existing in the automobile industry at Windsor. As I said, this international matter has been under discussion since 1943, and even yet full preparations do not seem to have been made.

Mr. GARDINER: While this matter was discussed in 1943, the bill itself was not discussed in 1943. The first report of the interim commission is dated Washington, August 1, 1944.

Mr. FERGUSON: But there was a body called together before that.

Mr. GARDINER: That body set up an interim commission, and the interim commission made its first report on August 1, 1944. This government as such had nothing more to do with that than that we had a delegate as one of the forty-four nations represented. We did not call together the conference at Quebec. The interim commission made suggestions as to the holding of a conference, and we extended an invitation to them to hold the conference in Canada at Quebec. As a result of that invitation they decided to come to Canada and to Quebec. They might have gone to any other of the countries represented, but they are coming to Canada. That is not the action of this government but of the group with its headquarters in Washington representing forty-four nations. The constitution which is here before us is not a product of ours at all, but a product of that organization set up by the forty-four nations. We are simply asked to accept it. I just wanted to make that clear in view of the hon. member's remarks.

Mr. FERGUSON: It probably would have been better to extend an invitation to the provinces to meet with the dominion government to discuss national affairs.

Section agreed to.

Section 3 agreed to.

Mr. JAQUES: Before the bill passes I should like to ask a question arising out of a statement that was made in the British House of Commons by Mr. Robert Boothby, M.P. He said:

> Why do we repose such childlike faith in what it is now fashionable to call economic "experts"? They have seldom been right in the past. After the last war they put us back on a gold standard, at the pre-war parity of exchange. The results were catastrophic. We emerged from that war potentially a rich country. We had fine capital equipment, the best skilled workers in the world, a prosperous agriculture. It took the "experts" less than ten years to turn us into a country which, in terms of real wealth, was poor. Upon industrial output they imposed deliberate restrictions. They reduced wages, and with them the purchasing power of our people. They forced our skilled workers to migrate. They scrapped the factories, the machinery and the shipbuilding yards with which we might have achieved a greaer prosperity than we have ever known. They put 2,500,000 acres of cultivated land down to grass, and drove a quarter of a million agricultural workers from the countryside to swell the growing numbers of unemployed in the towns. They doubled the real burden of our national debt. By linking us rigidly to Wall Street they ensured that if Wall Street crashed we crashed too. And that is precisely what happened in 1929. In the circumstances, their credentials for tendering advice as to the monetary policy we ought to pursue after this war are, to say the least of it, doubtful.

Can the minister give the house any good reason to believe that these experts will be any better able to bring prosperity after this war than they did after the last?

Mr. GARDINER: All I wish to say in that regard is this: I am sure that even if I were to give any guarantee it would not be taken very seriously. After all, I am only one minister in a government of twenty, and we are a country of only twelve million people in a world of many millions. I do not know that it would be taken very seriously if I were to say that our passing this bill is going to give prosperity to the whole world.

Mr. JAQUES: No; that was not quite the point, Mr. Chairman. There is no doubt that, although they may not be the same lot of experts, they hold the same ideas as those held by the experts of 1929. The question I asked was, what reasons are there for believing that present-day experts can bring any better results than experts holding the same ideas were able to bring in 1929? Why should they be able to solve the problem, merely by making it bigger, by making it international instead of national, any better than they did in 1929? What is the purpose of it all?

Mr. GARDINER: I think the only answer I can give to that is that all of us have changed our minds considerably since the end of the last war. I think even the experts have done that. Sometimes I am inclined to think that we on this side of the house have been converted a little by our friends who sit in your corner.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Let us hope so.

Mr. GARDINER: Family allowances, for example, have in them an element of an idea which was advocated some years ago by the Social Crediters.

Mr. BLACKMORE: That is right.

Mr. GARDINER: And we all change. We do so by listening to experts talk, whether we agree with them or not—that is, provided that experts can get together and do some talking as is provided by this measure; and I hope they may convert us to some more advanced points of view than some of us hold.

Mr. FOURNIER (Hull) moved:

That section 4 of the bill be deleted, and that the bill come into force after assent.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: What is that amendment?

Mr. GARDINER: Section 4, which merely says that the bill is to come in by proclamation, is being dropped, in order that it may come into force immediately upon its having been given the royal assent.

Mr. BRACKEN: Does the minister know what expenditures have been made already in connection with this food and agriculture organization?

Mr. GARDINER: I think that all that has been expended is any necessary expenses, and I assume they are subject to this bill being passed. For example, we are making arrangements under subsection 2 of section 2 for offices and persons to go down as advisers to Quebec City. Naturally this had to be done in advance, and it has been arranged for, but it will be paid for under this bill.

[Mr. Gardiner.]

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Possibly the minister is now in a position to give the list of the advisers and officials who are going.

Mr. GARDINER: I will give the list of those whom we intend to recommend immediately this legislation goes through. Would this committee like to have it read or have it tabled?

Mr. BLACKMORE: Have it read.

Mr. GARDINER: I think probably I should read it. This is the recommendation made to council for the passing of an order in council to provide for the appointments, and the active part of it is as follows:

1. That the Honourable J. G. Gardiner, Minister of Agriculture, be the member of the conference for Canada and that Doctor G. S. H. Barton, deputy minister of agriculture, be appointed as his alternate;

2. That the following be appointed as associate members of the Canadian delegation:

Department of External Affairs: Mr. L. B. Pearson, Canadian ambassador, Washington;

Department of Agriculture: Doctor George Bouchard, assistant deputy minister of agriculture; Doctor E. S. Archibald, director, experimental farms service; Mr. J. G. Taggart, chairman, agricultural prices support board;

Department of Fisheries: Doctor D. B. Finn, deputy minister of fisheries; Professor A. F. Cameron, chairman, fisheries research board;

Department of National Health and Welfare: Doctor F. S. Parney, chief, industrial hygiene division;

Department of Trade and Commerce: Mr. George McIvor, chairman, Canadian wheat board; Doctor S. A. Cudmore, dominion statistician;

Department of Mines and Resources (Forestry): Mr. D. Roy Cameron, dominion forester;

Wartime Prices and Trade Board: Mr. K. W. Taylor, coordinator, foods administration;

Canadian Federation of Agriculture: Mr. H. H. Hannam, president, Canadian federation of agriculture.

3. That the following advisers be assigned to the delegation:

Department of Agriculture: Doctor J. F. Booth, associate director of marketing, agricultural economics alternating: Mr. R. S. Hamer, director production service;

Department of Agriculture: Mr. A. M. Shaw, director marketing service, Department of Agriculture;

Department of Fisheries: chief, economics division, Department of Fisheries; Doctor Georges Prefontaine, department of biology, University of Montreal;

Department of National Health and Welfare: Doctor L. B. Pett, chief, nutrition division; Doctor C. A. Norrell, assistant chief dominion analyst;

Department of Trade and Commerce: Mr. G. R. Paterson, executive officer, combined food board; Mr. J. B. Rutherford, chief, agricultural branch, Dominion Bureau of Statistics;

Department of Mines and Resources (Forestry): Mr. J. D. B. Harrison, chief, forest economics division; Mr. T. A. McElhanney, superintendent, forest products laboratory;

Canadian Federation of Agriculture: Mr. W. J. Parker, vice-president; Mr. J. A. Marion, vice-president;

British Columbia Lumber and Shingle Manufacturing Association: Mr. L. R. Andrews, Ottawa representative;

Pulp and Paper Research Industries: Mr. A. Koroleff, director of woodlands research;

Fisheries Council of Canada: Mr. C. J. Morrow, president; Mr. S. K. Murray;

Press Relations: Mr. Bruce West, Canadian representative, Washington office of the Canadian information service;

Joint Secretaries: Mr. Mark McClung, Privy Council office; Mr. Jean Louis Delisle, Department of External Affairs.

Amendment agreed to.

On the schedule:

Mr. BRACKEN: I wish to ask one more question. Under this head has the government made any contribution to the interim commission?

Mr. GARDINER: I am not aware that they have, although I would not be certain. I would think some contribution would have to be made by someone at some time.

Mr. BRACKEN: The reason I ask, Mr. Chairman, is this. Paragraph (b) of article XXV reads as follows:

The amounts to be contributed by the member nations shall be in the proportions set forth in annex II to this constitution: Provided that each member nation may deduct therefrom the amount already contributed by it toward the expenses of the interim commission.

Mr. GARDINER: I should have said there have been votes of money put through in the estimates of previous sessions to provide for the expenses of all officials going to the Hot Springs conference and to the setting up of the organization at Washington.

Mr. BRACKEN: That brings up the next point I wish to raise. Under what authority were such expenditures made?

Mr. GARDINER: The expenses that were paid were paid under the authority of previous estimates passed here.

Mr. BRACKEN: Could the minister be more specific than that?

Mr. GARDINER: I would have to get the estimates and go through them and find out the different items, if that is what is required. A vote will be found in some of the past estimates to cover those items.

Mr. GREEN: War appropriation?

Mr. GARDINER: It would be under the War Measures Act, yes.

Mr. BRACKEN: The minister read a long list of delegates who are to go to the conference next week. Will the cost of sending those delegates be in addition to the contribution we are asked by this bill to make to the food and agriculture organization?

Mr. GARDINER: I had better read what it says:

That the expenses incurred by the members of the Canadian delegation be paid out of funds to be appropriated by parliament for the purpose of Canadian participation in the above-mentioned organization.

I presume those funds will be voted this session.

Mr. BRACKEN: There is as yet no estimate in any of the supply bills brought down.

Mr. GARDINER: I think there will be an estimate, probably under the war appropriation vote; it will come in there somewhere. Those expenses are not itemized in the sense that the supply votes are usually itemized.

Mr. BRACKEN: Could the minister say what the total expenditures will be for any fiscal or calendar year as a result of the passage of this bill? I refer to the contribution to the organization and the supplementary expenditures. I think that item should be set out by itself somewhere in the estimates and not distributed through other expenditures, so that the house can see exactly what this measure is to cost us.

Mr. GARDINER: When my estimates are up I shall be pleased to answer all these questions. The item will be in our estimates in some form if it is going through the house this session. I shall be glad to make at that time all the explanations that are required with regard to it. The total amount is as has been set out here two or three times. All that it could amount to in the first twelve months is $126,500.

Mr. BRACKEN: That does not give the answer, because the minister is planning to send a large delegation to this conference. This apparently would be in addition to what is being offered the organization.

Mr. GARDINER: I would not like to say it would be an addition.

Mr. BRACKEN: With all deference to the minister, I think he ought to put himself in a position to be a little more definite.

Mr. GARDINER: Judging by what the leader of the opposition has just said, I would say that this should be made a part of the charges. I am not taking for granted—

Mr. BRACKEN: With all deference, the minister ought to be more definite when he is asking the house to approve a measure which requires these large expenditures.

Schedule agreed to.

On the preamble:

Mr. BRACKEN: I wish to refer to article XVIII of this measure, which reads as follows:

Subject to the provisions of article XXV, the director general . . .

Of this new organization.

. . . shall submit to the conference . . .

That is, the conference of the organization.

. . . an annual budget covering the anticipated expenses of the organization.

If that means anything it means that the conference works out its own budget. I continue:

Upon approval of a budget the total amount approved shall be allocated among the member nations in proportions determined, from time to time, . . .

If that means anything it means that the 5·06 per cent is not a fixed percentage for Canada.

. . . by the conference. Each member nation undertakes, subject to the requirements of its constitutional procedure, . . .

That clause does not mean anything because money could not be obtained from this country in any other way than by constitutional procedure.

. . . to contribute to the organization promptly its share of the expenses so determined.

The only point I wish to make is by the passage of this bill we are in effect issuing a blank cheque to this organization, because as the Minister of Justice pointed out last night, and as others have done to-day, once we accept this constitution we are in honour bound to carry it out. I am not very much afraid that they are going to run away with us in the matter of expenditures, even though we have only one man on that body; but I suggest it is not a businesslike procedure to have us voting on a bill—which is a money bill—which is not specific as to what our obligations under it may be. That is my criticism; that was the burden of my criticism yesterday. The only defence we have is in the instructions given or the action taken by our representatives on that organization to see to it that they do not commit themselves to larger expenditures without first having the approval of parliament.

I make these observations in passing. I am not very much afraid that the expenditures are going to be multiplied, but I repeat, it is not good businesslike procedure. I suggest to the government that our representative, whoever he may be—I gather for the present he is to be the Minister of Agriculture—should let this organization know that a larger contribution by Canada ought not to be expected until this parliament at least approves of making it.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill reported.

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

Mr. MACKENZIE: Now, with the consent of the house.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Next sitting.

Mr. GARDINER moved the third reading of the bill.

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (Macleod): Before the motion is put, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a word. I am not going to take up very much time, but it may appear to some that this group does not want this bill to pass. So far as I am concerned, speaking for myself only, that is not altogether the case. With me the point is that I do not want it to pass too rapidly.

In that connection I want to say only one thing. When measures are brought into this house concerning matters which affect the entire world, as this measure does because it has to do with other nations in the world, we should proceed with some care. I make that statement for the reason that those responsible for world movements, whether or not we should personify them, do not view things as to how they are going to affect the world to-day or next week or next month. They look at these things as to how they are going to affect civilization, or perhaps their own interests, in generations or centuries to come. What may appear to us to-day to be perfectly plausible and perfectly safe in generations or ages to come may prove to have worked to the detriment of civilization. That is why I say that the greatest possible care should be taken in all measures of this kind.

Let no one be under the impression that we want to oppose anything. We are in favour of anything we believe to be in the interests of this country or of civilization; but we do believe we should proceed with some measure of care in respect to anything affecting the world at large. For that reason we desire not to rush into things we do not altogether understand the possibility of future implications, or the significance of which may not be fully obvious to all.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I should like the minister to explain why it is necessary to give this bill third reading to-day.

Mr. GARDINER: I did explain that last week, when I said I was very sorry the situation this session had not made it possible for us to bring down this bill earlier. I repeat that I am very sorry we did not have

sufficient time, as our experiences up to the moment have indicated, to have this bill and the resolution preceding it go through all the regular stages, which would have permitted discussion on two or three different occasions instead of trying to have it all at one time. We were further delayed, of course, by the fact that another resolution came in ahead of this matter on Tuesday. I am not criticizing anyone for bringing in the other resolution; it was considered important and it was brought in, but it took the day we had all arranged should be given to a discussion of this measure. Monday next of course is private members' day, when measures of this kind are not considered. The conference is meeting on Tuesday. I understand that if this bill goes to the senate and is passed there before a quarter to six, it can be given the royal assent. That is just half an hour from now, and that royal assent should be given before we ask our delegates to appear at the conference next Tuesday.

I believe the bill has been very fully discussed, and I thank hon. members for the cooperation they have shown. I am sure our friends of the Social Credit group will agree that we have tried, though perhaps not very successfully, to answer any questions or objections they have raised in connection with the legislation, and I would only ask their cooperation in having the bill pass now so that it may go to the senate and be assented to this evening, in order that we may be able to take our legal part in the conference.

Mr. NORMAN JAQUES (Wetaskiwin): I just want to make my position clear in this matter. If this bill means that Canada is to lose the power to determine our standards of living; if that power is to go under international control, then I am opposed to the bill. If on the other hand the minister guarantees that Canada will retain control of our economic policies and of our standards of living, then I have no objection to the bill passing. Otherwise, speaking for myself, I am opposed to it.

Mr. GARDINER: It has been repeated on many occasions that there is nothing mandatory about this bill. No right is taken away from Canada; no authority of any kind is taken away. It is simply an effort to get the cooperation of other nations to help us deal with our own problems, and offering our cooperation to them. I think I can assure my hon. friend, without any fear of contradiction from anyone, that his fears are not well founded. If that assists him in any way in deciding to support the measure, I am most happy to be able to make this statement.

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

HEALTH AND WELFARE

AMENDMENT OF ACT OF 1944-45

Hon. BROOKE CLAXTON (Minister of National Health and Welfare) moved the second reading of bill No. 9, to amend the Department of National Health and Welfare Act.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Golding in the chair.

On section 1—Substitution of department, minister and deputy minister in certain other acts.

Mr. CLAXTON: Perhaps I might repeat the explanation I gave on the first reading of the bill. It is designed to correct a typographical error which appeared in the bill and act as passed in 1944. This measure would substitute for the word "nine" the word "eight" in the reference to the act setting up the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Upon inquiry I found that the error occurred through one of the sections of the bill which intends to establish the Department of Veterans Affairs having been struck out when in committee. The persons responsible for proof reading, or doing whatever was necessary, had not observed this error in printing the bill. This bill is designed purely to correct that error.

Mr. GRAYDON: Is no other change suggested in the measure? This is the only alteration in the proposed legislation?

Mr. CLAXTON: Yes.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I notice that the change is made retroactive to October, 1944. Are the rights of any individuals interfered with by this change?

Mr. CLAXTON: None whatsoever, or at least certainly none of whom I have heard, and I cannot conceive of any.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

AMENDMENT OF CAPITAL REVISION ACT, 1937—SECURITIES TRUST

Hon. LIONEL CHEVRIER (Minister of Transport) moved the second reading of bill No. 11, to amend the Canadian National Railways Capital Revision Act, 1937.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): Mr. Speaker, before this measure is given second reading, it would seem to me that the amendments are of sufficient importance to call

upon the minister for a statement giving the full purport of the changes he proposes to make. My suggestion would be that the minister should speak now.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Mr. Speaker, when first reading of the bill was moved I explained that the only amendment suggested was that having to do with section 12. The amendment is, not for a different set-up in the trustees of the Canadian National Railways securities trust, but a different method of appointing the two trustees representing the railways.

When the bill was introduced I stated that the position of vice-president of finance and accounting had been abolished. I find since, however, that I was in error when I made that statement, and that Mr. D. C. Grant, who was formerly vice-president of finance and accounting recently retired on superannuation, and that two new positions have been created, one of vice-president and treasurer, and the other of vice-president and comptroller.

Mr. MacNICOL: One more than there was before.

Mr. CHEVRIER: With reference to section 12, the Canadian National Railways now seeks to appoint their two trustees by resolution, of the board of directors rather than as set out in the original section. The section states first of all that the trustees shall be three deputy ministers, and then it proceeds to state that the other two trustees shall be the chairman of the board of directors of the national railways, and the vice-president of finance. The former vice-president of finance, Mr. D. C. Grant, has retired and two new positions have been created. But it is not sought by this amendment to create three rather than two trustees. In the event of a reorganization in the future, the Canadian National Railways would be able to appoint their two trustees by way of resolution.

Then, I believe the amendment respecting the three deputy ministers is only technical. If hon. members will look at the act they will see that the section as it reads to-day is as follows:

> There shall be a corporation to be known as the Canadian National Railways Securities Trust, hereinafter referred to as the "Securities Trust", consisting of five trustees, being the deputy minister of finance, the deputy minister of transport, the deputy minister of justice—

And so on. The section now seeks to enact that the three trustees shall be those persons who respectively hold the offices of the deputy minister of finance, the deputy minister of transport, and the deputy minister of justice. It is just a technical amendment, and does not in any way change the substance of the section as it now stands.

Mr. GRAYDON: Does the minister think the suggested amendment brings about any clarification?

Mr. CHEVRIER: The Department of Justice advises us that that is the manner in which we should proceed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

On Section 1—Corporation securities trust; constitution.

Mr. GRAYDON: The Canadian National Railways securities trust, which was set up by section 12 of the Canadian National Railways Capital Revision Act, 1937, is described in section 13 of the act as the corporation which shall take over and hold, as authorized by the act, the indebtedness to His Majesty, together with the collateral securities held by the minister in respect thereof, as set out in schedule A of the act. In other words, the responsibilities and powers of the securities trust are very important.

Could the minister indicate whether there is any representation of the railroad brotherhoods or the workers on that board and whether or not under this bill the railway workers will have any say in so far as the securities trust is concerned? As I see it, this securities trust constitutes a link between the financing by the government and the operation of the railways. It is a vital part of the constitution of the railway set-up, and I should like to know whether any provision has been made whereby the workers will have a say in regard to this matter or others of a like nature.

Mr. CHEVRIER: The only provision having to do with the question asked by the hon. member for Peel is that contained in the section itself, namely, that the trustees shall be the three deputy ministers and such two officers of the railway as may be appointed by resolution of the board of directors. I do not know whom the resolution will appoint. If the resolution appoints those who have been appointed in the past, I presume the representatives of the railways will be the president of the board of directors and perhaps the vice-president and treasurer, one of the new positions set up, or the vice-president and comptroller. So far as representation of

the brotherhoods is concerned I shall be glad to bring the suggestion of my hon. friend to the attention of the board of directors of the railway.

Mr. GRAYDON: That does not quite answer my question. As I see it, the present amendment, as well as the original act, apparently confine and restrict the appointment to certain officers of the corporation. I want to know whether among those officers who may be appointed under the terms and provisions of this amended legislation there will be anyone who may be said to be a representative of the railway workers.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I would not think so.

Mr. COLDWELL: I think this may be an opportune time to ask a question I have in mind. The securities of the Canadian National Railways under this board of trustees include, I take it, securities which have been repatriated from Great Britain during the war. Grand Trunk securities and others amounting to some hundreds of millions of dollars were brought back to Canada. I want to seize this opportunity to ask if they are still held by the government or by the railways under this trust, or perhaps by some other similar body. I should like to know what disposition has been made of them.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I cannot tell the hon. gentleman whether any securities have been repatriated from Great Britain. All I can say is that the annual report of the Canadian National securities trust for the year ended December 31, 1944, which is the last one, sets out a detailed list of the indebtedness transferred from the government to the securities trust. Whether securities have been repatriated since this statement was compiled, I am not in position to say.

Mr. COLDWELL: I think it was two years ago, or possibly three, that provision was made for the repatriation of a large block of Grand Trunk bonds and I was wondering what has become of them.

Mr. HOWE: The bonds were repatriated by the Bank of Canada and the cost of acquisition stands on the books of the Canadian National Railways as a loan from the dominion government. The dominion government lent the railway money to repatriate the bonds which are lodged with the Bank of Canada as security.

Mr. COLDWELL: They have not been disposed of otherwise?

Mr. HOWE: No.

Mr. MacNICOL: I should like a little further clarification of the question asked by the hon. member for Peel. Is there anything in the act that would prevent the Canadian National Railways from appointing to one of these offices the head or some member of the railway employees unions?

Mr. CHEVRIER: I do not think there is.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

APPOINTMENT OF GEORGE A. TOUCHE AND COMPANY AS AUDITORS

Hon. LIONEL CHEVRIER (Minister of Transport) moved the second reading of bill No. 12, respecting the appointment of auditors for national railways.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

On section 1—Appointment of auditors.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Perhaps I should say a word in connection with this section. This is the annual bill appointing auditors for the Canadian National Railways and it takes the same form as it has taken over a period of some twelve years or more. It seeks to appoint this year the firm of George A. Touche and Company of Toronto and Montreal.

Mr. COLDWELL: Has this firm been the auditors for a number of years and, if so, how many?

Mr. CHEVRIER: This firm has been the auditors for practically all the years since 1932, except perhaps one or two.

Mr. COLDWELL: I know this is a most reputable firm and I do not want my remarks to be construed as criticizing them in any particular, but I think it is sometimes advisable to change the auditors in connection with public bodies. I know that from experience I have had in public affairs. I recall when I was a member of the Regina city council we had a firm of auditors in whom we had every confidence. They were doing a good job, but over a long period of years they had become, shall I say, a little careless. The result was that when a new firm of auditors went in they were able to see things which perhaps the other firm had not been able to see up to that time. I am not suggesting that we change the auditors to-day, but I am placing these thoughts before the minister so that, when the matter is again considered, some thought

may be given to the advisability of continuing for such a very long period of time—it will be now almost a quarter of a century—

Mr. CHEVRIER: If my hon. friend will permit me, the appointment was made in 1932 and they have continued to be the auditors since that time with the exception of perhaps one or two years.

Mr. COLDWELL: I thought my hon. friend said that they had been auditors since the organization of the Canadian National Railways, which would be about a quarter of a century ago. The minister's statement makes a difference to my argument.

Mr. GRAYDON: My memory may not be very good, but I rather thought George A. Touche and Company were appointed auditors for the Canadian National Railways in the special legislation brought down by the then Minister of Transport, now the minister of several departments, one of which is munitions and supply. I thought the appointment first took place in 1936 and I should like the confirmation of the minister, who just mentioned 1932.

Mr. CHEVRIER: They were appointed in 1936, but this bill has been before the house in one form or another since 1932. I think it was the government of the Right Hon. Mr. Bennett which appointed this firm, and then for a period of one or two years another firm was appointed. I would say that since 1932, with the exception of one or two years, the firm of George Touche and Company have been acting.

Mr. HOWE: Perhaps I can straighten this out by drawing on my memory. The firm of George A. Touche and Company were auditors for the Canadian National Railways up until 1932. The act providing for a change in the management of Canadian National Railways and the replacing of directors by trustees was put through in 1932, and the firm of Clarkson, Gordon, Dilworth and Nash were appointed auditors. In 1936 there was a change in auditors; George A. Touche and Company were appointed and they have been the auditors since.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CANADA PRIZE ACT

PRIZE COURTS AND PRIZE LAW—EXCHEQUER COURT JURISDICTION

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of Bill No. 10, to provide for a prize court and prize law in Canada.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill is necessary for the following among other reasons.

[Mr. Coldwell.]

Prior to this war all prize courts in Canada were established under imperial legislation and acquired their authority and jurisdicton under imperial legislation. In the last war the Exchequer Court of Canada as a Colonial Court of Admiralty, under the Imperial Colonial Courts of Admiralty Act, 1891, had prize jurisdiction under the Imperial Colonial Prize Courts Act, 1894. After the Statute of Westminster, Canada enacted the Admiralty Act of 1934, which made the exchequer court on its admiralty side a Canadian admiralty court. The Imperial Colonial Prize Court Act of 1894 does not therefore apply to it now as it has ceased to be a colonial court of admiralty, and there was no provision made in the statute of 1934 to give the exchequer court, admiralty side, jurisdiction in prize. There was, therefore, at the beginning of this war no prize court in Canada under Canadian legislation and no imperial legislation applicable to establish a prize court in Canada.

By order in council P.C. 2489 of September 5, 1939, under the War Measures Act, the exchequer court was first constituted a prize court. Prize court rules were made by order in council P.C. 2682 of September 14, 1939. Then a slight modification was made on September 27, 1939, by P.C. 2892. These orders in council were respectively published in volume 1 of Proclamations and Orders in Council, the first one at page 28, the next one I have referred to at page 61, and the third one I have referred to at page 107. These orders in council were made under the authority of the War Measures Act, and it is hoped that the authority of the War Measures Act will not now long remain a basis for the provisions in question.

The purpose of the bill is to give to the exchequer court jurisdiction in prize and to declare what is the prize law in Canada.

There have been twelve prize cases instituted in Canada since the beginning of the war, only two of which have been finally disposed of. The proceedings in the prize court were in most cases taken for the purpose of clearing title to ships and were allowed to remain in abeyance as soon as that purpose had been served and the ships made available to the allied nations. That is perhaps all I need say on the principle of the bill. There probably will be explanations that members will wish to have in committee, and I shall be glad if I can to answer any questions that may then be asked.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

A message was delivered by Charles H. Larose, Esquire, Acting Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, His Honour, the Deputy Administrator, desires the immediate attendance of this honourable house in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly the house went up to the senate.

And having returned.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the house that the Deputy Administrator had been pleased to give in His Majesty's name the royal assent to the following bills:

An act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1946.

An act for carrying into effect the agreement for a food and agricultural organization of the united nations between Canada and certain other nations and authorities.

CANADA PRIZE ACT

PRIZE COURTS AND PRIZE LAW—EXCHEQUER COURT JURISDICTION

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. St. Laurent for the second reading of Bill No. 10, to provide for a prize court and prize law in Canada.

On motion of Mr. Hackett the debate was adjourned.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

THE BUDGET

ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance) moved:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair for the house to go into committee of ways and means.

He said:

I

FINANCIAL REVIEW

Mr. Speaker, in presenting to the house tonight the government's proposals for meeting the financial requirements of the present fiscal year in a budget, which is the first to follow the cessation of hostilities both in Europe and in the Pacific, I am reminded that six years and one month ago, on September 12, 1939, I presented at the special session of parliament, on behalf of the then Minister of Finance, the first budget following the outbreak of war.

I was impelled to warn at that time against expecting the war "to be a short and only moderately expensive one" and said further, "We must make our plans now with the full realization that we may be in for years of strenuous national effort". Though we foresaw the kind of problems we would have to meet and something of the magnitude of the effort, none of us realized how strenuous or how long those years would be.

It is a matter for great thankfulness that we have accomplished the task and that we can now confront, in good order and in good heart, a future which is filled with problems and difficulties but also with promise.

It was helpful to me in preparing this budget, and I think it will be helpful to the house, to take a glance back over the rugged path which we have travelled before turning our attention to the road ahead.

In the budget speech of September 1939, certain broad principles of war finance were laid down. The first one was that we should "follow as far as may be practicable a pay-as-you-go policy". It was explained that in the view of the government this meant a rapid increase in the level of taxation as our war effort and national income expanded, having due regard to the needs of war, the necessity of preserving incentive, and the need for allowing individual savings to be made. In the course of the war, the government was seldom criticized for not pressing forward rapidly enough on this policy.

The income tax was increased by 20 per cent in 1939 and moved in three more swift steps to the full war level established in the budget of 1942. The increase to this level of income taxation with the provision for refundable taxes was made possible by the withdrawal of the provincial governments from the income tax fields under the agreements of 1941. In 1943, without increasing the general level of the personal income tax, the pay-as-you-earn system was adopted and collections put on a current basis. In the course of these changes, by advancing the dates of payment we were able to augment the revenue of the war years substantially. With the exception of the cancellation of the refundable feature of the personal income tax in 1944 and of minor amendments, the taxation of personal incomes remains at the level established in 1942.

The Excess Profits Tax Act, provisionally enacted in the fall of 1939, was given its present form in 1940, and in 1942 the rate on the "excess profits" was increased to 100 per cent of which 20 per cent is to be refunded. Succession duties were first imposed in 1941 and have not been changed since except in minor degree.

In 1940 and 1941 new and increased commodity taxes were imposed for exchange reasons, to encourage transfer to war production and for revenue. Since 1942 the main increases in taxation have been in indirect taxes applying to commodities and services which were not necessaries of life and of which frequent purchase gave some evidence of ability to pay.

By about the middle of the war we had thus reached nearly the full war-time level of taxation. By previous Canadian standards, the level of taxes was enormously high. It was, however, by no means the highest tax level among comparable countries and, generally speaking, the taxation of the lower incomes was less severe than in other countries.

The result of the balance we endeavoured to keep between taxation and borrowing has been that up to March 31, 1945, after meeting all other expenditures, we covered about 45 per cent of our war expenditures out of current revenues.

The second principle enunciated in September 1939 was that, after an initial credit expansion, designed to facilitate a rapid increase in production, we should endeavour to limit our borrowings as closely as possible to the genuine savings of the country. In pursuit of this principle, our initial borrowing was from the chartered banks, followed by a war loan offered to the public but not distributed among individuals by the intensive effort which has characterized the victory loans. In May 1940, war savings certificates were instituted and the campaign to increase savings which is still being carried on was begun. With the first victory loan of May 1941, full emphasis was given to borrowing the savings of individuals, and the organization which later became the national war finance committee began the notable and patriotic work which they are still carrying on with such great initiative and thoroughness. In the first victory loan the number of individual cash subscriptions was 946,549. In the eighth victory loan of last May, the number of individual subscriptions was 3,178,275. I trust that in the ninth victory loan which is being offered to the public this month this great number will be maintained or exceeded. It is difficult to estimate the importance for the future of the very large savings now held by individuals in this country. It is possible to make a rough estimate only of the savings held by Canadian individuals in certain liquid forms. Such an estimate, which cannot be too wide of the mark, indicates that as of May 31, 1945, in currency, bank deposits, refundable taxes and Dominion government securities, Canadian individuals held savings of more than nine and a half bilion dollars and that these savings had increased by more than six and a half billions since the end of 1938. The major item in these savings is dominion government securities estimated at five and a quarter billion dollars. These figures do not, of course, include all the savings of individuals but only savings held in the liquid forms specified. They do not include savings in the form of insurance, pensions, homes, or corporate securities.

The third principle which we set out at the beginning of the war was that in our borrowings we would endeavour to set the rates of interest as low as possible. We began our public borrowings in January 1940 with the issue of a 3¼ per cent bond having an average maturity of ten years. The long-term issue which is being offered in the ninth victory loan has a term of twenty years and ten months and carries a rate of 3 per cent. At the rates now obtaining, a ten-year bond such as was issued at 3¼ per cent in January 1940 could now be issued at 2·59 per cent. As of March 31, 1939, the average rate of interest paid on the funded debt was 3·52 per cent. On March 31, 1945, the average rate had fallen to 2·51 per cent.

The fourth principle laid down for war-time financial policy was part and parcel of the other principles. It was a definite rejection of the methods of inflationary finance. That principle has affected all our operations in the fields of taxation and borrowing but its pursuit has also led us to many major decisions in other fields. It emerged in its most comprehensive form in the historic decision of October 1941, to consolidate our wage controls, institute salary control and impose a comprehensive price ceiling as of that period. The progressive development of many additional controls over the supply and distribution of goods lent support to this structure.

These simple principles have led us a long way. They have permeated war-time financial and economic policies and have given them solidity and coherence. The carrying out of these policies throughout the fields of finance and economic stabilization has been recog-

nized, I think, as one of the most substantial of our war-time achievements and one most appreciated by the people of this country.

I have recalled briefly some of these points of war-time policy as foreshadowed in the first war-time budget because we now stand at the beginning of a new period and face new conditions and new problems. The policies which we have followed during the war have an important bearing on the choices which now confront us.

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTS AND FINANCING, 1944-45

It is only right that I should say something concerning the financial results of the fiscal year ending March 31, 1945, but I shall confine myself to a few brief statement since the present fiscal year is already half gone and the final figures for 1944-45 are given in some detail in the budget papers which I shall table before sitting down. Further, the full public accounts for the past fiscal year will, I hope, be presented to the house shortly.

In the year 1944-45, total revenues, including refundable taxes, amounted to somewhat more than $2,900 million, a slight decrease from the revenues of the previous year. Total tax revenues, including refundable taxes, were somewhat down from the previous year, at $2,374 million. This moderate reduction in tax revenues occurred mainly in the yields of the personal income tax and the corporation tax, and to a less extent the excess profits tax. Among commodity taxes, the revenues from spirits and malt, cigars, cigarettes and tobacco, and gasoline, all showed substantial increases.

Ordinary expenditures for the year were $767 million compared with $630 million in the previous year. More than half of this increase was the result of increased public debt charges. The other major increase was in the expenditures of the Department of Veterans Affairs. War expenditures, including Mutual Aid, were $4,400 million, or slightly lower than in the previous year. The grand total expenditure was $5,246 million, about $75 million less than the previous year. Since total revenue, exclusive of refundable taxes, was $2,687 million, the over-all deficit for the year was $2,558 million, or approximately $1 million greater than in the previous year. This amount is the extent of the increase in the net debt during the year.

Other financial requirements for loans and advances and investments are set out in some detail in the budget papers which I shall table and I shall not attempt to review them here except to say that the amounts have turned out to be smaller than I anticipated in the budget of last year. Total borrowings for the year, including refundable taxes, amounted to approximately $3,360 million. Of this, $219 million was obtained in refundable taxes and $2,948 million through the sale of victory bonds and war savings certificates. I should say here that, as explained in the budget papers, the amount set aside for refundable taxes is abnormally high. It has been found as returns are assessed that taxpayers have tended to credit too much of their payments to the corporation tax and too little to the excess profits tax or not to distinguish between them. It has become necessary therefore to increase the liability for refundable taxes. The remaining borrowings were obtained by an increase in treasury bills and deposit certificates outstanding, and in the floating debt. The total amount borrowed, $3,360 million, was used to meet maturities of $252 million, to increase holdings of cash by $152 million, and to finance the cash deficiency of $2,955 million arising from the budgetary deficit and the loans, advances and investments made during the year.

As at March 31, 1945, the total unmatured funded debt, including refundable taxes, amounted to $13,984 million. The net debt was $11,298 million, having increased during the year by the amount of the budgetary deficit. The funded debt carried annual interest charges of $351,590,000. The average rate of interest was 2·51 per cent as compared with 2·54 per cent as at March 31, 1944.

The most notable financial operations of the year were the successful conclusion of the two great victory loan campaigns. The achievements of the national war finance committee in the sixth and seventh victory loans in the fiscal year 1944-45 were exceeded only by their later success early in this fiscal year in carrying out the eighth victory loan.

II

BUDGET FORECAST 1945-46 AND FINANCIAL PROPOSALS

The financial proposals which I have to lay before the house are for the requirements of the current fiscal year 1945-46 but I realize that with six months of the fiscal year gone by and with hostilities ended I shall be expected to look further forward than the end of March next. The budget which I am presenting is a war budget in that, as I have already told the house, war and demobilization expenditures will continue for a short time at high levels even though hostilities have ended and though the demands of the armed services on men and materials have

fallen and are falling rapidly. The financial needs of war and demobilization are still very great in this as in every other country. On the other hand, this is also the first peace-time budget and its effects on employment and income must be accepted as of major importance.

The expenditure estimates for this fiscal year are known to the house. The main estimates covering non-war expenditures require $1,024 million. The war estimates stand at $3,365 million. The expected expenditures for war service gratuities and reestablishment credits as authorized by statute are $240 million. We expect that we shall need to ask about $30 million by way of supplementary estimates. Our total expenditures for the year are therefore estimated to be approximately $4,650 million.

On the revenue side it is estimated that under our present tax laws, revenues in 1945-46, not including the refundable portion of the taxes, will be $2,515 million, as compared with $2,687 million in the previous year. I shall place on *Hansard* a statement showing the details of this estimate in comparison with the revenues of 1944-45:

	1945-46 (millions)	1944-45 (millions)
Customs duties	$ 120	$ 115
Excise duties	175	152
Sales tax (net)	225	210
War exchange tax	75	98
Other excise taxes	250	236
Income taxes:		
Personal	725	768
Corporate and excess profits tax	710	742
Interest and dividends	29	28
Succession duties	20	17
Miscellaneous	8	8
Total tax revenue	$2,337	$2,374
Less refundable taxes	72	219
Net tax revenue	$2,265	$2,155
Non-tax revenue	150	145
Total ordinary revenue	$2,415	$2,300
Special receipts	100*	387
Total revenue	$2,515	$2,687

* Arbitrary estimate.

It is indicated in the table that under the present tax laws we anticipate some declines in the sales tax and the war exchange tax, though the declines will be partly offset by the reduction of refunds on purchases for other governments. We anticipate some increase in revenues from excise duties and from excise taxes on tobacco. We likewise anticipate that there will be moderate increases in the revenues from excise taxes on retail purchases, gasoline, amusements and similar taxes. Personal income tax would be expected to decline somewhat were it not for the channelling back through this tax of repayments of the portion of family allowances which duplicates the tax credits allowed to taxpayers in respect of dependent children. We look for some substantial decline in the combined revenue from the corporation income tax and excess profits tax.

On these estimates there will be a decline of about $150 million in our revenues this year, though this decline is to be attributed to the distribution of rebates and refunds as between this year and last year. Taking approximate figures, expenditures of $4,650 million and revenues of $2,500 million would result in a budgetary deficit for 1945-46 of $2,150 million, or approximately $350 million less than the deficit last year.

I have explained to the house on an earlier occasion that, as in other years, we will have substantial financial requirements outside the budget. It will be necessary in the reconstruction period to extend credits to allied countries for the financing of their needs and of our export trade. On a later occasion the house will be asked to approve a very large increase in the amount already provided under the Export Credits Insurance Act and to make such provision for other loans and investments as may be required. Though these amounts cannot be fully estimated at this time, it is anticipated that to provide such credits and to make loans to the foreign exchange control board may require in the neighbourhood of $800 million this year, bringing our total financial requirements for the year to about $5,400 million, an amount which is $300 million less than the total cash requirements of the past fiscal year. No provision has been included in these figures for subscriptions to the international monetary fund or the international bank for reconstruction and development, to which, if the house approves the legislation to be introduced, only token contributions would be made this year.

These are our requirements up to March 31, 1946 and, while they represent a reduction from the previous year and some shift from expenditures to loans, they are, as the house will see, at a very high level. These requirements in themselves do not suggest that the Minister of Finance is in a position to forgo any revenue which he might otherwise obtain.

In thinking over the financial problems of an initial peace-time budget, I had occasion to look back to the budgets of 1919 and 1920 following the first world war. I found that

in June, 1919, seven months after the end of hostilities, the then Minister of Finance estimated an increase in expenditures for 1919-20 and that in fact his estimate proved to be much too low. I found that the income tax, which was then admittedly at very low levels by present day standards, was increased in that budget by amounts ranging from about a third to 100 per cent of the existing rates and that the corporation tax was increased. In May, 1920, the personal income tax was again increased by adding 5 per cent to the rates in all brackets above $5,000 and an imposing array of luxury taxes was proposed, although some of them were later withdrawn. The business war profits tax was extended for another year, though its effect was alleviated somewhat by raising the exempted rate of earnings from 7 per cent to 10 per cent. The 7½ per cent customs war duty was removed from all imports. In 1921 the business war profits tax was discontinued but the sales tax was instituted and there was some increase in excise duties.

I have not referred to these budgets of my predecessors to make any unfavourable comparison or to question the judgment which they applied to the circumstances of their time. It is, however, I think, important to realize that the rapid increase in taxation which we were able to accomplish during the war and to which the people of this country gave such loyal support has left us less restricted in our choices to-day than were the ministers of finance at the end of the last war. I would further point out that, while they found as I have found that war expenditures do not drop as quickly as do war activities, nevertheless most of the increase in government expenditures following the first world war was the direct result of the wartime and post-war inflation which drove up prices and with them unavoidably government expenditures. No one is more impatient than the Minister of Finance at the slowness with which war expenditures decline. Nevertheless, they did in fact begin to decline this year as soon as hostilities ceased and our stabilization policy has so far saved us from facing that post-war increase in expendtiures which was so great and disruptive a fact in 1919 and 1920. It is essential that we maintain our stabilization policy until the danger lessens.

BASIC CONSIDERATIONS

The most obvious consideration in the mind of a Minister of Finance in framing budget proposals is the financial requirement of the future. I have already pointed out that our financial requirements for the present fiscal year will be at a high level, though reduced from the level of the previous fiscal year and very substantially reduced from those which we anticipated in the budget of 1944.

In speaking on the resolution introducing the war expenditures and demobilization bill, I intimated that our requirements over the twelve months from November 1, for which funds are being borrowed from the public in the ninth victory loan, would probably be in the neighbourhood of $4,000 million. This will be still a large requirement but it will represent an accelerating decline in government expenditures from the time of the cessation of hostilities in Europe. I have already explained to the house the chief factors which retard the more rapid decline of expenditures —the lag in payments for supplies and services delivered in the past, the length of time covered by the payment of pay and allowances, deferred pay, war service gratuities and reestablishment credits for members of the armed services being demobilized, and the necessity of financing relief through our contributions to UNRRA and of extending export credits to allied countries who must feed their populations, replenish their stocks and reconstruct their industries, if, as we anticipate, they are to be valued customers and trusted friends in the future.

Looking further into the future, there are too many uncertainties in the currents of world events which affect Canadian trade and industry for me to venture a definite estimate of our financial requirements for the whole of the fiscal year 1946-47. The lag in payments for war supplies will be overcome and the payments cease. As the peak of demobilization is passed, demobilization costs will decline rapidly. The industries of allied countries will be rehabilitated and they will find in their own exports increasing sources from which to finance their import trade. Some of the remaining need may be met by the international monetary fund and the international bank. If reconstruction proceeds steadily in the world outside, we can anticipate further substantial reductions in expenditure in 1946-47.

Faced with the present fact of a very large deficit in a fiscal year of which five months had passed before hostilities had ended, and with the prospect of declining expenditures, it may well seem prudent to maintain our revenues, reduce our borrowings and extinguish our deficit as rapidly as possible. Such a policy is not without its attractions to a Minister of Finance but there are other considerations which claim attention.

The second consideration is economic. The government has adopted, as a major aim of government policy, the maintenance of a high and stable level of income and employment. Accordingly, it becomes a major consideration in budget policy. The present condition, as I see it, is that the outflow of war workers from war plants has been pretty well completed. The demobilization of the armed services is proceeding rapidly and will continue at a high level for some time. Civilian industry and employment are expanding rapidly. There are many projects in contemplation or under way for extended capacity and employment. Capital is plentiful. Consumers have unprecedented liquid savings, some substantial part of which they hope to spend as soon as their requirements can be met and met at reasonable cost. The urgent demand for housing needs no emphasis on my part. Deferred maintenance and other urgent and necessary works of railways, public utilities and governments are awaiting execution.

It is urgently necessary that the construction of houses proceed at the maximum possible rate. It is desirable that investment, which will lead to increased employment, should be made as quickly as supply conditions warrant. It is desirable that, as rapidly as finished goods can come on the market, consumers' needs should be met. It is not desirable that the government should through its expenditures compete with these demands for labour and materials, except for the most urgent needs.

During the war, there has been built up a system of taxation which is discouraging to investment, to enterprise and to consumer expenditures. In many of its aspects it was designed to be discouraging and restrictive to all activities not necessary to the prosecution of war. Some taxes were intended to restrict trade. Others have had the effect of increasing costs. I recognize that in the course of six years, war-time taxation has begun to blunt incentives and if continued indefinitely will paralyse the development of industry and trade.

This is a consideration of the greatest national importance. In such modifications as it is possible to make in taxation, it is imperative that we do what we can to reduce costs, restore incentives, encourage investment in the expansion of the employing-capacity of our industries whether in small or large enterprises and promote efficiency in production and export.

I probably do not need to elaborate on the third major consideration. We must maintain for some months yet the economic stabilization policy. It has been a sheet anchor during the war and is not to be cast off while there is still danger that what we have gained should be quickly lost. Recalling the course of events after the first world war, we must recognize the danger that the rush of consumers to buy, of traders to replenish their stocks and of producers to enlarge their capacity may easily result in an inflationary boom. In avoiding the rock on one side, we could be swallowed up in the whirlpool on the other. Our tax changes must be such as to contribute to employment and income, not merely to inflation and speculation.

There is another set of considerations of which there is not time to speak as fully as their importance warrants. Following the budget of 1941, the government entered into agreements with the provincial governments for the exclusive use of the corporation and personal income tax fields. By their terms, those agreements expire near the end of 1946. In August of this year the government laid before the representatives of the provincial governments comprehensive proposals for new agreements covering taxation and dominion-provincial relations generally. If they should be accepted, these proposals will, to an important degree, affect the continuing financial requirements of the government and the considerations under which it must frame its tax laws. If no agreement is reached, and the present agreements expire, the dominion is bound then to reduce the taxation of corporations by 10 per cent and to revise its personal income tax downward. In these circumstances, it would clearly not be prudent to take now hasty and irretrievable steps in the modification and reorganization of our tax structure.

It is in the light of these considerations that the proposals which I am about to make have been framed. We have fortunately reached the time when, despite our large requirements, we can contemplate some reduction in taxes. In doing so, we should bear in mind the paramount importance of assisting speedy reconversion, of restoring incentives, and of encouraging enlarged and efficient production and export on which our employment, income, and welfare depend. There are many and varied demands of the moment for tax reduction or elimination but it is necessary for all of us to think not of the moment but of the future, and of the interests of the nation as a whole.

THE WAR EXCHANGE TAX

A war exchange tax of ten per cent on all imports from non-empire countries was imposed in 1940. I am proposing that this tax should now be discontinued.

There were sound reasons for imposing this tax but the reasons for removing it have now become compelling. Though the tax affects many consumer items, its major impact is on producers. We are in a period when production, both primary and secondary, is changing over from a war market to a non-war market both at home and abroad. Export markets will become increasingly competitive. Primary producers must to a considerable extent reequip themselves. Industry must be extensively modernized. An important part of the equipment and supplies for production will be imported and it would be shortsighted policy not to assist producers in reaching the lowest possible cost of expansion, modernization and operation. It is undesirable that this tax should be capitalized into the costs of the future.

The removal of the tax will have some immediate benefit for the consumer particularly in increasing the availability of supplies. Its ultimate benefit to the consumer will be very great. The removal will ease the problem of readjusting the somewhat higher prices of our neighbours to the price level which we have maintained in this country.

The imposition of this tax was fully justified by the circumstances of war and by the acute scarcity of United States dollars. It was recognized, however, that the tax was discriminatory and could not be justified under conditions of normal trade. I am glad that under present circumstances it is both desirable and possible to remove the tax and it will be discontinued as from midnight to-night.

It has been estimated that this tax would yield us in the present fiscal year $75 million. This sum, however, is subject to very substantial refunds on purchases for other governments, and it is swollen by the extensive purchase of war supplies in the United States. Though it is difficult to make an estimate, it seems probable that the loss of revenue will be about $60 million in a full year and not more than $30 million in the current fiscal year.

THE SALES TAX

I have been impressed also with the extent to which the sales tax is having a discouraging effect on the rapid and efficient modernization of our productive equipment. Whereas the war exchange tax affected imported equipment only, the sales tax applies to imports and home production alike. It is highly important in this period when the transition is being made from war to civilian production and when extensive investments in plant, machinery, tools and dies are necessarily being made, and when primary producers are replacing and improving their equipment, that we should wherever possible remove taxes which result in higher costs. Particularly we should remove those taxes which, imposed far back in the production process, increase costs out of proportion to the contribution which they make to the revenue. It is especially important that if such reductions in taxation are to be made, they should be made now so that industries should not face the future with inflated costs of construction and equipment. It is of importance further that in the expansion of our peace-time exports and in the entry of the new industries into the export field this handicap to competition in world markets should be removed.

It is proposed to exempt from sales tax machinery and apparatus (not including office equipment or motor vehicles) which, in the opinion of the Minister of National Revenue, are to be used directly in the manufacture or production of goods. This exemption from sales tax will be effective as from midnight to-night.

The house will note that the sales tax is being removed from machinery and apparatus used in the manufacture or production of goods but not those used in distribution or in the rendering of services. The principle which we are endeavouring to follow is to remove the sales tax from the costs of those industries which bear sales tax on their products, including also those whose products have been deliberately exempted as in the case of food products. The sales tax will be imposed still on machinery and apparatus used in distribution and in service industries on which no sales tax is levied.

Nearly all the machinery used by primary producers is already specifically exempt from sales tax but the provision which is now being proposed will extend the exemption somewhat further.

It is estimated that in a full year this exemption from sales tax will result in a loss of revenue of about $30 million, of which about half will be suffered in the current fiscal year.

There are some amendments to the Special War Revenue Act which are of less importance and I shall do no more than mention them. It is proposed to simplify the present unsatis-

factory taxation on furs. At present there is a twenty-five per cent excise on furs, levied at the point of dressing and dyeing, and no sales tax on furs as such. The sales tax is, however, imposed on fur-trimmed garments. It is now proposed to reduce the excise tax to ten per cent and to subject all garments and articles of fur as well as fur-trimmed garments to the eight per cent sales tax. The main result of this change will be simplification and uniformity of tax treatment but there will also be some slight reduction in the tax on furs generally and a more substantial reduction in the tax on furs used in the trimming of cloth garments. The time of reclassifying manufacturers of fur garments as manufacturers for sales tax purposes will be announced by the Minister of National Revenue after a survey of the inventory position.

At the present time Canadian tourists returning from the United States are given an exemption on purchases up to $100 which they bring in with them. Under the present law the retail excise tax is levied on articles included in such purchases. The tax is difficult to collect and it is felt that its collection is an unnecessary reduction of the tourist privilege which has been reciprocally extended between ourselves and the United States. It is therefore proposed to exempt these purchases from the retail excise tax.

The considerations, which we have had in mind in framing the budget proposals, indicate that tax reductions should be concentrated on the most vital points and should not extend to the taxation of consumer commodities in general. There are other and more appropriate ways of stimulating consumer buying to the extent that it requires stimulation beyond its present high level. There will be later periods when reduction of taxes on the classes of consumer commodities subject to tax will be more necessary and will have a more beneficial effect than now.

THE EXCESS PROFITS TAX

The Excess Profits Tax Act is a war measure which has commanded overwhelming support as an important and necessary instrument of war finance. Unmodified, it seriously weakens the stimulus toward the investment of capital and the efficient operation of enterprises. In this period of reconstruction it is becoming a barrier to expanding employment.

I have therefore three major modifications to propose. The first has to do with sole proprietorships and partnerships. The incomes of these firms are also subject to the personal income tax and the excess profits tax has perhaps been particularly severe on them, particularly on some smaller firms which have experienced no great increase in profits during the war. I am conscious of the fact that in the United States the excess profits tax has never been imposed on such firms. It is now proposed to remove from all sole proprietorships and partnerships the 15 per cent rate on total profits but to leave them for the time being subject to the excess rate. In the other proposals which I have to make there will also be additional relief to this class of firms.

The second proposal is concerned with small firms whether incorporated or not. It has been argued that such small firms have suffered more than most by reason of the fact that they could be reasonably expected to grow proportionately more than the larger firms. Many of these firms have only the minimum rate of standard profits of $5,000. Many have expanded during the war and it is represented that they can be a very great factor in providing employment in the post-war period. The position of such firms has been substantially relieved both in the United Kingdom and in the United States. It is accordingly proposed to increase the standard profits of all firms by half the difference between their present standard profits and $25,000. This will have the effect of raising the minimum standard profits from $5,000 to $15,000. Further, in the case of a firm whose present standard is $13,000, its new standard will be $19,000. Firms which have a standard profit of $25,000 or more will not be affected by this proposal.

Under this and previous recommendations, upwards of 12,000 businesses will be released entirely from excess profits and many others will experience some diminution of tax.

The government has reached the conclusion that in a period when we wish to encourage the fullest expansion of employment and income the 100 per cent rate under the Excess Profits Tax Act cannot reasonably be maintained. Now that we are moving from war to peace its undesirable effects become greater. The Excess Profits Tax Act has been in operation from the beginning of the war and the standard profits established on the basis of average profits before the war are becoming more and more out of date. There is widespread evidence that incentive is being stifled and that ordinary prudence in the making of business expenditures has been seriously weakened.

As an interim step towards the ultimate abolition of the excess profits tax, it is pro-

posed (a) to abolish the twenty per cent refundable portion of the excess profits tax; and (b) to reduce the rate on excess profits to sixty per cent. The simple effect of the proposed legislation will be that all corporate profits will bear a rate of forty per cent, and corporate profits in excess of 116⅔ per cent of standard profits will bear an additional tax of twenty per cent. In the case of sole proprietorships and partnerships, the rate on profits in excess of approximately 117 per cent of standard will be sixty per cent. It is proposed that these changes in the Excess Profits Tax Act should be effective as from January 1, 1946.

It is estimated that as a result of these changes the government will lose its source of borrowing $72 million as the refundable portion of the excess profits tax; that the reduction of the excess rate to sixty per cent will result in a loss of revenue of $72 million in a full year; that the raising of the standard profits for small firms and the exemption of unincorporated firms from the fifteen per cent rate will cost $22 million.

Confronted as we are by continuing war expenditures and with business profits still extremely buoyant as a result of high government spending and rising private expenditures, I have reached the conclusion that it is not in the interest of the country and of an orderly and rapid transition to a peace-time economy to remove the excess profits tax entirely at this time. In stating this conclusion, I do not in any way qualify the previous assurances that have been given that the excess profits tax will not be retained indefinitely.

Nor is it possible in my view at present to modify the 40 per cent rate on corporations. If the present tax agreements with the provinces lapse without being replaced by new agreements, the government is bound to reduce the corporation rate by ten per cent. If new agreements are reached the rate can be reduced promptly but to reduce the rate now by any substantial percentage and be bound to reduce it by ten per cent more at the end of 1946, would, in my view, establish too rigid a programme of tax reduction. There are, I have no doubt, substantial arguments for some reduction but the considerations stated have appeared to the government conclusive. I am bound to add further that only a very small proportion of the complaints received by the Department of Finance concerning business taxation have referred to the 40 per cent rate.

There are certain less important changes which it is proposed to make in the Excess Profits Tax Act. Now that the 100 per cent rate is being reduced to 60 per cent, it is proposed to remove the limitation which has hitherto been imposed by administrative regulation on expenditures in advertising. Its removal will of course date as from January 1, 1946.

There has been a provision of some importance to the mining industry under which the profits of new base metal or strategic mineral mines have been exempted from excess profits tax for the first three years of their operation. This exemption is due to expire on December 31, 1945. It is proposed now to extend it and to include thereunder the profits from gold mines and from certain industrial-mineral mines.

It is proposed also to extend for another year the tax credits allowed to mining and oil companies for off-property expenditures on exploration and in the case of oil companies for expenditures on deep-test wells.

In respect of forest industries, it is proposed to allow by administrative regulation the amortization of any unamortized portion of capital expenditures where, as a result of fire, insects, disease, or storm, operations in a particular area are abandoned.

In the budget of last year provision was made to allow the writing back to the profits of a war year of one-half the maintenance and repair expenditure incurred in a designated post-war year. In view of the continuing shortage of certain materials and the large amount of construction work to be done, the period has not as yet been designated but continuing consideration will be given to the matter.

THE PERSONAL INCOME TAX

I turn now to the personal income tax from which currently about one-third of our tax revenue is derived. I think there is no doubt that the personal income tax in the post-war period will continue to occupy a major place in our taxation structure. The extent and nature of the requirements of the government will necessitate dependence on the personal income tax as a major element in the taxation system. It should be, however, an income tax carefully revised to ensure its efficiency and its suitability to the post-war requirements.

As I have recalled to the house earlier, the present personal income tax was built up to its war-time level and system of collection at the source between 1939 and 1943. Many devices, including a somewhat elaborate system of refundable taxes, were adopted in order to make severe taxation tolerable in

the varying circumstances of different groups. As a general rule, very high taxation must be complicated unless parliament is willing to be ruthless in the face of the hardship of individual situations. I would go further and state that the longer very high taxation remains in force, the more complicated it will become through acceding to demands for special alleviation. In 1944, provision for the refundable portion of our personal income tax was rescinded though its calculation still enters into the calculation of the tax payable. This contributes what is now an unnecessary complication to the tax.

There are clear and obvious reasons for as early a reorganization and simplification of this tax as is practicable. These reasons have been very actively in mind. As I studied the matter, however, I became aware of other important considerations. A thorough and workmanlike overhaul of the whole personal income tax structure can be undertaken most effectively in the light of a realistic post-war level of taxation. In presenting the budget a few weeks after the cessation of hostilities, a budget for a fiscal year which is already half gone, the Minister of Finance cannot, with assurance, project his estimates so far ahead. The government has made certain financial and other proposals to the provinces. If they are accepted, the government will bring forward legislation for extended social security measures involving a contribution, which, whatever its form, will have an important bearing on the equitable distribution of income tax rates. If the proposals are rejected by the provinces and no general agreement is reached, the dominion is obligated to make some reduction in its tax rates and will have to consider what responsibilities it can assume, in those circumstances, in respect to any or all of the proposals.

Any reorganization of the personal income tax must be so carefully and thoroughly done that it will not have to be re-done in the early future. I have somewhat reluctantly reached the conclusion that, at this early date and in view of the contingencies involved in our discussions with the provinces, it is wise not to attempt to combine an immediate revision of the whole personal income tax structure with reduction of the tax.

My colleague, the Minister of National Revenue, has found, however, that it is possible, even though the law is not simplified, to introduce administratively a great simplification for the taxpayer himself. When the returns for 1945 are due it will be found that a greatly simplified system of calculation has been introduced. This is not a matter of legislation but more specific information can be given the house on a convenient occasion.

The considerations which are important in contemplating some reduction of the personal income tax are those which I emphasized earlier. It is not possible, at this early date and with high continuing commitments, for a responsible Minister of Finance to propose lavish reductions in any major tax. He has to reckon with a future in which our commitments vis-a-vis the provinces are unknown. He has to plan for reasonable contraction of the budgetary deficit. I am impressed, however, with the great and harmful effect which our present high personal income tax is having in discouraging work and initiative in all groups at a time when we need a rapid expansion of employment and a willing mobility of labour. I laid great stress on these harmful effects in 1944 when the refundable portion of the tax affecting mainly the lower-income groups was removed. Conversely, I am convinced that a reduction in the personal income tax can make a major contribution to the stimulation of initiative and employment.

REDUCTION IN TAX PAYABLE

I think it wise therefore to recommend an interim measure of prompt and unquestionable relief. It is proposed that the tax levied shall be abated by 16 per cent dating from October 1, 1945. This abatement of 16 per cent will be applied to the current tax deductions at the source just as soon as the necessary change can be made. Since the change is applicable from October 1, the abatement on the whole tax liability for 1945 will amount to 4 per cent. For a full year, the abatement will be 16 per cent of the tax liability.

This is an interim measure to be applied immediately and to continue until it is possible to combine further abatement with a thorough overhaul of the whole rate structure of the personal income tax. I would hope that new arrangements with the provinces and further progress in the transition to peace-time conditions would have so clarified the outlook that it would be possible in the budget of 1946 to propose such a comprehensive revision.

ADJUSTMENT FOR FAMILY ALLOWANCES

In addition to the major change which I have just explained, there are a number of further important amendments being proposed. On the coming in force of the Family Allowances Act it was necessary, to implement the provision of that act, that steps

should be taken under the Income War Tax Act to adjust the deduction from income tax on account of dependent children in order to avoid duplication where family allowances were being paid in respect of such children. A table was issued at that time showing the adjustment of tax deductions at the source in accordance with this principle. For the sake of simplicity, the table was in the form of a recapture of a stated percentage of the family allowance according to the taxable income of the taxpayer. Its effect, however, was to reduce or eliminate the tax credit allowed for children dependent on the taxpayer and on behalf of whom family allowances had been received during the year. For the sake of simplicity also, the adjustment was approximate, care being exercised that no one was penalized and that on the whole taxable persons in the lower income groups retained some net gain as the combined result of family allowances and tax credits under the Income Tax Act. In view of the proposed tax abatement, it is necessary to provide a new scale of adjustments for 1946.

In the budget of last year I announced that there were certain complicated tax problems which I felt required more concentrated attention and more public consideration than the Department of Finance was able to give to them, and that I should recommend the appointment of two special commissions to report on these problems. These commissions were appointed, have conducted extensive inquiries and both of them have now reported.

ANNUITIES AND FAMILY CORPORATIONS

The report of the commission on the taxation of annuities and family corporations under the chairmanship of Mr. Justice Ives presented its report last spring and the report has been printed and made public. I have no doubt that members of the house are familiar with its recommendations. The government is prepared to accept all the main recommendations of this commission and I am proposing that, in so far as legislation is required, the necessary amendments should be introduced. Without entering into the arguments by which the commission supported its recommendations, I will state very briefly what the government's proposals are. It is proposed that in respect of contractual annuities, the capital element in such annuities should not be taxed. It is recommended that annual or periodic payments under wills or trusts should be subject to income tax only to the extent that they are paid out of income. In respect of pensions, the resolutions will provide for the taxation of all pensions except that, where an employee has not in the past been entitled to a deduction from taxable income in respect of his contributions, an appropriate portion of the pension shall be exempt from tax when received by him or by his dependents. Earnings in the hands of trustees of pension funds are to be made exempt from income tax. The commission recommended that the present limits placed on deductions from income in respect of employers' and employees' contributions to an approved pension fund or plan should be removed. It is fair enough to exempt reasonable contributions to moderate pensions from tax and to tax the pensions as paid. There may, I think, however, be some danger in giving unlimited freedom in respect of really large contributions to pensions which may represent a major form of investment. I have noted that one of the particular concerns of the commission was that present allowances were too low in view of the fact, which the commission reported, that under present low rates of interest it might require as high as a nine per cent contribution from the employer and an equal amount from the employee to provide a pension equal to half the employee's salary. So as not to grant an undue amount of freedom before bringing all pension funds under continuing supervision, I am recommending that the deduction to be allowed to an employee annually in respect of his current contributions to a pension fund or to an employer in respect of any employee should not exceed $900. Further, it is proposed to take steps to implement the recommendation of the commission that pension funds should be subject not only to the approval of the tax authorities but to continuing supervision.

The second main subject on which the Ives commission reported was concerned with the distribution of surpluses which had been accumulated by private closely-held companies from 1917 to 1939. The problem before the commission was to determine what, if any, abatement of income tax should be made on the distribution of such surpluses in the event of the death of a principal shareholder and for the payment of succession duties. In respect of private closely-held companies, the government proposes to implement the main recommendation of the commission on this point. It is proposed that surplus accumulated from 1917 to 1939 by such companies should be free from tax in the hands of the shareholders if the company pays a tax thereon as provided in the schedule recommended by the commission and if the company elects before December 31, 1947, to pay such tax.

The commission made a further recommendation to the effect that on the reorganization, winding-up or discontinuance of business of any private company, the undistributed income deemed to be a payment of dividend under the present law should be reduced by an amount equal to twenty per cent of the income after tax earned in 1940 and subsequent years. This is a very drastic modification of existing practice and of the basic view of income established in our tax laws. This particular recommendation did not carry the unanimous judgment of the commissioners and it is the government's view that it ought not to be implemented immediately but should be subjected to further study.

TAXATION OF COOPERATIVES

The second royal commission was directed to report on the taxation of cooperatives. Its report has been received only very recently and it is now being printed for tabling in the house and distribution. There has not as yet been time to give full study to the report but, if it is possible to do so, I shall introduce in the committee on ways and means further resolutions for such changes in taxation as seem desirable after consideration of the recommendations of this commission.

Several less important amendments which are being proposed in respect of personal income tax I shall mention only briefly. It is proposed to drop the requirement by which those disbursing dividends, registered interest and royalties are required to deduct at the source seven per cent on behalf of the taxpayer. This requirement is of little value in obtaining current payment of taxes which the taxpayer himself is required to pay in instalments. The requirement that the disbursers of these payments must report the amount of the payments to the inspector of income tax will of course be retained and it is this which is the important provision as far as ensuring the reporting of income is concerned. The elimination of the seven per cent deduction at the source will save a very considerable amount of clerical work and some confusion to small taxpayers.

MEDICAL EXPENSES

The house will recall that we have had in the income tax law for some time an allowance on account of unusual medical expenses which was introduced in order to provide some alleviation under circumstances which frequently gave rise to hardship. The alleviation is one, I believe, which has been much appreciated. It is proposed to enlarge the provision somewhat to allow in the event of the death of the taxpayer the expenses paid by the estate of the deceased to qualify for the allowance and to allow the deduction from taxable income to be taken in the year prior to the death of the deceased.

ARMED FORCES

There has been a special exemption in the Income Tax Act for those members of the armed forces whose duties were performed afloat or in aircraft, and a similar exemption was allowed to civilians employed in flying by the Royal Air Force Transport Command. Now that active hostilities have ceased, the occasion for the exemption has disappeared and the exemption is being withdrawn.

ALBERTA BONDS

Last spring in connection with plans which were being worked out for the repayment of Alberta bonds and in an attempt to forestall any speculative gain on the part of those who might trade in Alberta bonds, I undertook to recommend a special tax of 100 per cent on profits made through the purchase of such bonds. I shall therefore recommend the imposition of a 100 per cent tax on any profits made on Alberta bonds purchased between January 31, 1945, and August 7, 1945. By the latter date the full terms of the offer of the Alberta government had been made known and time had been given for full publicity.

I have received strong representations in favour of a change in the law which would allow the acceptance of the average income over a period of years as the taxable income of farmers and fishermen whose incomes are subject to great variability on account of weather as well as of markets. I have been impressed with the reasonableness of the requests, though hitherto the proposals made have involved collecting a tax from farmers and fishermen in bad years in which they might actually have had a loss. I am hopeful, however, that a solution can be found to the problem and I am prepared to give the most sympathetic consideration to the inclusion of a provision of this sort in a revised income tax law.

There have been a considerable number of inquiries as to when the refundable portion of the personal income tax is to be returned to the taxpayer. It is provided in the act that in the case of taxes paid on income for the 1942 taxation period, repayment shall be made not later than the end of the second fiscal period commencing after the cessation of hostilities. That means that refunds on 1942 taxes must be paid not later than March 31, 1948. Refundable taxes for 1943 must be re-

paid not later than March 31, 1949, and those for the six months of 1944 not later than March 31, 1950. These are the latest dates at which the refunds can be made. It is open to the governor in council to make refunds at earlier dates but there is no provision for the return of these funds selectively to some individuals and not to others. The present time does not appear to the government to be a period in which such a general refunding of these sums is desirable owing to the strong inflationary pressures which still exist. Under changed conditions, the government would give consideration to the payment of these refunds without necessarily waiting till the dates specified.

SUCCESSION DUTIES

There are two simple amendments to the Succession Duty Act which I shall propose. In accordance with the recommendation of the Ives commission, it will be recommended that no succession duty shall be levied on the value of any pension receivable as taxable income with appropriate apportionment in the event of a pension being partly taxable and partly non-taxable. There has not hitherto been in our Succession Duty Act any provision for alleviation of succession duties in respect of so-called quick successions. Having examined the legislation in the United Kingdom and the United States on this matter, I am recommending provision for a percentage reduction in succession duties where the same property passes again as a result of a second death within a period of five years from the first death on which the property became subject to succession duties.

There is quite a number of amendments to the Customs Tariff Act but most of them are matters of redefinition and administrative convenience rather than of major importance. I shall defer my explanations of them until the resolutions are before the house.

CONCLUSION

This completes the proposals which are being put forward in this budget. The expected effects on the revenue are summarized in a table which I shall place on *Hansard:*

Loss of Revenue Resulting from Budget Proposals
(millions of dollars)

	Full year	Current fiscal year
War exchange tax.....	60	30
Sales tax.....	30	15
Excess profits tax.....	95	10
Personal income tax....	115	45
	300	100
Loss of refundable portion of excess profits tax	72	7

On a full year the loss of revenue from these interim tax reductions will amount to approximately $300 million. In the current fiscal year, the reduction in the excess profits tax which dates from January 1 next will have only nominal effect as even firms operating on a calendar year basis will not have remitted taxes on the new schedule before March 31. The loss of revenue from the personal income tax will be somewhat less than half of the annual loss since some payments on 1945 income are not due until April 30. The estimated loss of revenue in 1945-46 is therefore $100 million. This will reduce our estimated net tax revenues from $2,265 million to $2,165 million and increase the probable deficit from $2,150 million to $2,250 million.

In recommending these interim tax reductions, my major concern has not been the financial results of the current fiscal year. I have been concerned with making such reductions as would speed up the transition to peace-time conditions and contribute promptly to the expansion of enterprise and employment. I have been willing therefore to look beyond the end of this fiscal year and, despite uncertainty as to the tax fields which we can occupy exclusively in the future, recommend these immediate steps which will have the effect of maintaining the incomes from which all government revenues are derived.

In a period when the transition to peace-time employment is proceeding rapidly and government expenditures are being replaced by the expenditures of the public on investment and consumption, the right course seems to me to encourage that shift by tax reduction and endeavour in the months ahead to reduce our war expenditure as rapidly as possible.

There is another word to be said. By reducing taxes, we are leaving a somewhat larger deficit than otherwise to be covered by borrowing. As I have said before, our total requirements over the next twelve months are likely to be as much as $4,000 million. With these tax reductions, we cannot expect to cover more than about $2,000 million by revenues. A victory loan campaign is being launched this month to obtain from the public the funds necessary to finance most of the remainder. No other victory loan will be offered in the next twelve months. The public will be asked to subscribe their accumulated savings and to pledge their savings over the next twelve months in the purchase of bonds. I cannot emphasize too strongly the continuing need for savings. There will be over the

months ahead some legitimate and increasing expenditure of war-time savings by individuals in acquiring houses and in making some of the purchases deferred for the war. As one who has had some responsibility for encouraging war-time savings, I am anxious that they should meet the real needs of the individual whether those be improved housing, better standards of living or better provision for old age. I do not want to see them dissipated as were savings after the first world war in unnecessary spending at inflated prices. There is still great national need for systematic saving and prudent spending. Hostilities have ended but men have still to be brought home and reintroduced to civil employment. Our world trade must be reestablished and our customers temporarily financed. The appeal of the government for this victory loan is still urgent and it is a national appeal.

I referred earlier in this speech to the road which we have travelled in financial and economic policy during the war. The recommendations of this Budget are that we now begin to direct our course toward the needs and requirements of a peaceful future. We are making good progress in the transition. There are difficulties and there will be setbacks, but they are proving less rather than more than we anticipated. If we move in good order and with the interest of the nation as a whole at heart, we can carry the achievements of the war into the achievements of peace in the months and years to come.

RESOLUTIONS

Income War Tax Act

Resolved that it is expedient to amend the Income War Tax Act, and to provide

1. That for 1945 and subsequent taxation years the capital element in contractual annuities be exempt from tax;

2. That for 1945 and subsequent taxation years annual or periodic payments received under the provisions of a will or trust be considered taxable income to the extent only that they are paid or deemed to be paid out of the income of the estate or trust;

3. That the income of all approved superannuation or pension funds or plans in 1946 and subsequent taxation years be exempt from tax in the hands of the trustees;

4. That all payments of superannuation or pension to former employees or their dependents in 1946 or subsequent taxation years be taxable income, provided that, where a former employee has not in the past been entitled to a deduction from income in respect of his contribution to an approved fund or plan, only a proportionate part shall be taxable;

5. That the limitations on deductions for contributions in 1946 or subsequent taxation years by an employer or an employee to a superannuation or pension fund or plan be increased to $900, and that the percentage limitation in respect of the employer's contribution be removed;

6. That the exemptions and deductions for 1946 and subsequent taxation years in respect of a superannuation or pension fund or plan be conditional upon the continuing approval of the fund or plan by the Minister of National Revenue;

7. That a payment on or after October 13, 1945, to an employee in respect of loss of office be deemed to be income of such employee over a period of five years;

8. That, in lieu of the taxes otherwise payable by shareholders of a private closely-held company in respect of earned surplus accumulated by the company from the beginning of its 1917 fiscal period to the end of its 1939 fiscal period, the company be allowed to elect to pay a tax equal to the aggregate of the taxes calculated in respect of the allocable portion of each shareholder determined in accordance with the following table:

On the first $25,000, or any portion thereof, 15 per cent,

$3,750 on an allocable portion of $25,000 and 18 per cent on the amount by which the portion exceeds $25,000 and does not exceed $50,000,

$8,250 on an allocable portion of $50,000 and 21 per cent on the amount by which the portion exceeds $50,000 and does not exceed $100,000,

$18,750 on an allocable portion of $100,000 and 24 per cent on the amount by which the portion exceeds $100,000 and does not exceed $200,000,

$42,750 on an allocable portion of $200,000 and 27 per cent on the amount by which the portion exceeds $200,000 and does not exceed $300,000,

$69,750 on an allocable portion of $300,000 and 30 per cent on the amount by which the portion exceeds $300,000 and does not exceed $400,000,

$99,750 on an allocable portion of $400,000 and 33 per cent on the amount by which the portion exceeds $400,000;

9. That the provision contemplated by Resolution 8 be applicable only if the company elect on or before December 31, 1947, and that the tax be payable in four annual instalments, the first one being due on December 31, 1947, with interest at 4 per centum per annum on each instalment from December 31, 1946, until due and thereafter until paid at 7 per centum per annum;

10. That for 1944 and subsequent taxation years the provision for deductions of unusual medical expenses be extended in the event of the death of the taxpayer either in the taxation year or subsequently to include expenses incurred and paid either by him or by his estate in a 12-month period commencing in the taxation year;

11. That the requirement to deduct 7 per cent tax at source on payment of interest, dividends or royalties be discontinued after December 31, 1945;

12. That for 1946 and subsequent taxation years the exemption of the service pay and allowances of members of the Canadian naval,

military and air forces while on active service in Canada or anywhere in the western hemisphere whose duties are of such a character as are required normally to be performed afloat or in aircraft be rescinded;

13. That for 1946 and subsequent taxation years the exemption of one-third of the remuneration paid to the civilian officers or employees of the Royal Airforce Transport Command whose duties are of such a character as are required normally to be performed in aircraft be rescinded;

14. That the exemption of limited dividend housing corporations be broadened to include institutional housing corporations and institutional holding companies as defined by The National Housing Act, 1944;

15. That a special tax be imposed equal to 100 per cent of the profits made by persons who between January 31, 1945, and August 7, 1945, purchased bonds or debentures of or guaranteed by the province of Alberta which were outstanding on January 31, 1945, and were included in the debt reorganization proposal of the provincial government, dated July 16, 1945, such profits to be the difference between the purchase price and the selling price of the bonds or debentures, if sold by such purchasers, or the difference between the purchase price and the total value of rights accruing to the purchasers on implementation of the provincial government conversion plan, as the case may be;

16. That the right of a corporation whose principal business is the production, refining, or marketing of petroleum or petroleum products to deduct 40 per centum of the exploration costs and drilling costs of oil wells which prove to be unproductive be extended to wells spudded in before the thirty-first day of December, 1946;

17. That the right of a corporation, association, syndicate or exploration partnership, formed for the purpose of exploring and drilling for oil, to deduct 26⅔ per centum of exploration and drilling expenses be extended to expenses incurred in 1946;

18. That the right of a corporation, association, syndicate or exploration partnership, formed for the purpose of exploring and drilling for natural gas, to deduct 30 per centum of exploration and drilling expenses be extended to expenses incurred in 1946;

19. That a corporation whose chief business is that of mining or exploring for minerals be allowed to deduct 26⅔ per centum of prospecting, exploration and development expenses incurred in 1946 in searching for minerals;

20. That the right of corporations, associations, syndicates or exploration partnerships whose principal business is production, refining or marketing of petroleum or exploration or drilling for petroleum to deduct 50 per centum of expenditures made directly or indirectly in connection with deep test oil wells which prove to be unproductive be extended to wells spudded in before the thirty-first day of December, 1946.

21 (a) That in respect of persons other than corporations the tax for 1945 be reduced by 4 per cent of the aggregate of the normal tax, the graduated tax and the investment surtax;

(b) That in respect of persons other than corporations the tax for 1946 be reduced by 16 per cent of the aggregate of the normal tax, the graduated tax and the investment surtax;

22. To provide for an appropriate additional tax dependent on the income of the taxpayer in cases where family allowance payments are received in order to adjust the benefits in respect of dependent children.

Excess Profits Tax Act

Resolved that it is expedient to amend the Excess Profits Tax Act, 1940, and to provide

1. That individuals and partnerships be exempt from the 15 per cent tax on total profits of 1946;

2. That the tax on excess profits of individuals and partnerships in 1946 be reduced from 100 per cent of the excess profits to 60 per cent of that portion of the excess profits which are in excess of 117·647 per cent of the standard profits, and that the provision for refund of a portion of the tax be repealed;

3. That for 1946 the following rates of tax apply to corporations:

(a) 22 per cent of the profits of corporations and joint stock companies before deduction therefrom of any tax paid thereon under the Income War Tax Act;

(b) in the case of corporations and joint stock companies which have filed consolidated returns, 20 per cent of the profits which are in excess of 117·241 per cent of the standard profits of such consolidated companies;

(c) in the case of other corporations and joint stock companies 20 per cent of the profits which are in excess of 116·66 per cent of the standard profits;

and that the provision for refund of a portion of the tax be repealed;

4. That on the profits of 1946 and subsequent years the minimum standard profits of taxpayers be increased from $5,000 to $15,000, and that where a taxpayer's standard profits are on January 1, 1946, in excess of $5,000 but less than $25,000 they be increased by one-half the difference between their present amount and $25,000;

5. That the special rate of tax applicable to businesses commencing after June 24, 1944, not apply to cases where in the opinion of the Minister there has been no *bona fide* commencement of a new or substantially different business;

6. That the exemption of the profits of corporations derived from the operation of any base metal or strategic mineral mines be extended to the profits of corporations derived from the operation of gold mines and industrial mineral mines, and that such exemption be extended to the profits of such mines which come into production after January 1, 1946.

Dominion Succession Duty Act

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend The Dominion Succession Duty Act, and to provide

1. That no duty shall be leviable on the value of any pension or portion thereof which is receivable as taxable income within the meaning of The Income War Tax Act.

2. Where the minister is satisfied that succession duty has become payable upon or with respect to the succession to any property and that subsequently within five years succession duty has again become payable upon or with

respect to the succession to the same property or any part thereof, on the death of the person to whom the property passed on the first death, the amount of succesison duty payable on the second death with respect to the succession to such property shall be reduced as follows:

(a) where the second death occurs within one year of the first death, by fifty per centum;

(b) where the second death occurs within two years of the first death, by forty per centum;

(c) where the second death occurs within three years of the first death, by thirty per centum;

(d) where the second death occurs within four years of the first death, by twenty per centum;

(e) where the second death occurs within five years of the first death, by ten per centum.

Special War Revenue Act

Resolved that it is expedient to amend the Special War Revenue Act, and to provide

1. That the consumption or sales tax shall not apply to machinery and apparatus and complete parts thereof which, in the opinion of the Minister of National Revenue, are to be used directly in the process of manufacture or production of goods; provided that this exemption shall not apply to office equipment or motor vehicles;

2. That the retail purchase tax shall not apply to goods valued at not more than $100 included in baggage accompanying residents returning from abroad after an absence of not less than 48 hours such as is presently allowed in the case of other excise taxes;

3. That the 10 per cent war exchange tax be rescinded;

4. That the excise tax of 25 per centum imposed on fur and furs be reduced to 10 per centum, and that on a date to be determined by the Minister of National Revenue the existing exemption from sales tax of fur garment manufacturers as small manufacturers be withdrawn;

5. That the net premium tax on insurance companies be reduced by a credit for premium tax paid in any other country;

6. That enactments founded on these resolutions come into force on the thirteenth day of October, 1945.

The Customs Tariff

1. Resolved, that Schedule A to the Customs Tariff be amended by striking thereout tariff items 72e, 186, 192b, 197d, 208, 216a, 219e, 272b, 326e, 386(p), 398, 399, 438b, 438c, 438d, 438i, 445o, 445p, 446c, 454, 462a, 616(iii), 648a, 653, 669, 670, 700a, 703 and 756, the several enumerations of goods respectively and the several rates of duties of customs, if any, set opposite each of the said items, and by inserting the following items, enumerations and rates of duty in said Schedule A:

Tariff Item	—	British Preferential Tariff	Intermediate Tariff	General Tariff	Present Rates		
					B. P. Tariff	Intermediate Tariff	General Tariff
72e	Bent grass seed, not to include red-top grass seed.....	15 p.c.	30 p.c.	30 p.c.	15 p.c.	30 p.c.	30 p.c.
90e	Vegetables, frozen.....	10 p.c.	25 p.c.	30 p.c.	15 p.c.	32½ p.c.	35 p.c.
186	Paper calendered to between ·006 and ·0085-inch thickness adapted for the manufacture of shot shells, when imported by manufacturers of shot shells for use exclusively in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories; and felt board sized and hydraulic pressed, and covered with paper or uncovered, adapted for the manufacture of gun wads.....	Free	Free	Free	Free 15 p.c.	Free 22½ p.c.	Free 25 p.c.
197d	Tissue paper, not coated nor impregnated, when imported by manufacturers of stencils for duplicating machines for use exclusively in the manufacture of such stencils in their own factories.....	Free	10 p.c.	25 p.c.	Free 15 p.c.	10 p.c. 22½ p.c.	25 p.c. 25 p.c.
208	Boracic acid and borax in packages of not less than twenty-five pounds weight; hydrofluosilicic acid; tannic acid; ammonia, sulphate of; cyanide of potassium; cyanide of sodium and cyanogen bromide; antimony salts, viz.: tartar emetic, chloride and lactate (antimonine); arsenous oxide; precipitate of copper (crude); verdigris or sub-acetate of copper, dry; sulphur and brimstone, crude or in roll or flour; argols; iodine, crude; bromine; sulphide of arsenic; carbon bisulphide, n.o.p.....	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free
219e	Chloropicrin, ethylene oxide, methyl bromide, methyl formate, cyanides, carbon bisulphide, acrylonitrile, or mixtures containing any of these, for use in combating destructive insects and pests.....	Free	Free	Free	Free Free	Free 20 p.c.	Free 25 p.c.
272b	Paraffin wax, n.o.p.....	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
272c	Paraffin wax when imported for use exclusively in the manufacture of candles.....	10 p.c.	12½ p.c.	25 p.c.	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.

Tariff Item	—	British Preferential Tariff	Intermediate Tariff	General Tariff	Present Rates		
					B. P. Tariff	Intermediate Tariff	General Tariff
326e	Articles of glass, not plate or sheet, designed to be cut or mounted; articles of glassware, when imported by manufacturers of silverware to be used in receptacles made of or electro-plated with precious metals or to be equipped with tops made of or electro-plated with precious metals, in their own factories	Free	10 p.c.	22½ p.c.	Free 10 p.c.	10 p.c. 30 p.c.	22½ p.c. 32½ p.c.
326k	High thermal shock resisting glass bowls when imported by manufacturers of coffee makers for use exclusively in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories	Free	Free	25 p.c.	Free	25 p.c.	32½ p.c.
386	(p) Sheets or strip, of iron or steel, hot or cold rolled, with silicon content of ·75 p.c. or more, when imported by manufacturers of electrical apparatus, for use in the manufacture of electrical apparatus in their own factories	Free	12½ p.c.	12½ p.c.	Free 7½ p.c.	12½ p.c. 20 p.c.	12½ p.c. 20 p.c.
398	Pipes and tubes, of steel, seamless, cold drawn, plain ends, valued at not less than five cents per pound, n.o.p.:—						
	(i) Of a class or kind not made in Canada	Free	5 p.c.	5 p.c.	Free	5 p.c.	5 p.c.
	(ii) N.o.p	Free	20 p.c.	20 p.c.	Free	5 p.c.	5 p.c.
398c	Welded stainless steel tubes, not more than 6 inches in diameter, when imported by manufacturers of condensers or evaporators for use exclusively in the manufacture of condensers or evaporators in their own factories	Free	10 p.c.	30 p.c.	15 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
399	Pipes, tubes and flues, of wrought iron or steel, with plain, swelled or thickened ends, when imported for use exclusively in the manufacture or repiar of pressure parts of boilers, pulp mill digesters and vessels for the refining of oil, under regulations prescribed by the Minister:—						
	(i) Of a class or kind not made in Canada	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free
	(ii) N.o.p	Free	20 p.c.	20 p.c.	Free	Free	Free

434c	Trucks of welded design with tubular frame, cast steel cross members, rubber mountings and rubber inserted wheels, of a class or kind not made in Canada, and body shells of welded sheet steel, for use in the construction of street railway cars, not to include electric motors or magnetic truck brakes; complete parts of the foregoing.....	Free	10 p.c.	35 p.c.	Free	30 p.c.	35 p.c.
438b	Bearings, clutch release; bearings, graphite; bearings, steel or bronze backed, with non-ferrous metal lining; bushings, graphited or oil impregnated; ceramic insulator spark plug cores, not further manufactured than burned and glazed, printed or decorated or not, without fittings; commutator copper segments; commutator insulating and rings; tapered discs of hot rolled steel, with or without center hole, for disc wheels; distributor rotors and cam assemblies; door bumper shoes; electric wiring terminals, sockets, fittings and connectors and parts thereof, not to include battery terminals; gaskets of any material except cork or felt, composite or not; ignition contact points; keys for shafting; lenses of glass for head, tail, dome, signal and cowl or parking lamps, and for light reflectors; lock washers; piston ring castings in the rough, with or without gates and fins removed; rails of lock seam section, corners, locks and catches, unplated ventilators and parts thereof, the foregoing being of metal other than aluminum, for the manufacture of window sashes for bus bodies; steel bolts, capped with stainless steel; switches for lamps, heaters and defrosters and parts thereof; vacuum control assemblies; vulcanized fibre in sheets, rods, strips and tubing; all of the foregoing when of a class or kind not made in Canada and for use in the manufacture or the repair of the goods enumerated in tariff items 424 and 438a, or for use in the manufacture of parts therefor.....	Free	Free	30 p.c.	Free	Free	30 p.c.

Tariff Item	—	British Preferential Tariff	Intermediate Tariff	General Tariff	Present Rates		
					B.P. Tariff	Intermediate Tariff	General Tariff
438c	Ammeters; arm rests and wheel housing lining of indurated fibre, pressed to shape; axle housings, one piece welded, machined or not; carburetors and parts thereof; chassis frames and steel shapes for the manufacture thereof; cigar and cigarette lighters, whether in combination with a cigarette holder or not, including base, and parts thereof; control ventilator gear box; cylinder lock barrels, with or without sleeves and keys thereof; dash heat indicators and parts thereof; electric gear shift switches and parts thereof; engine speed governor units and parts thereof; front axle cross channel king pin support section assembly of steel, in the rough; fuel pumps, vacuum pumps and combinations thereof and parts therefor; gasoline gauges and parts thereof; hinges and parts thereof, finished or not, for bodies; horns and parts thereof; instrument bezel assemblies and parts thereof; instrument board lamps; locks, electric ignition, steering gear, transmission, or combinations of such locks, and parts thereof; mouldings of metal, with nails set in position, lead filled or not; oil filters and parts thereof; oil gauges and parts thereof; pipe lines of tubing, rigid or flexible, covered or not, with or without fittings, and tubing therefor, for oil, fuel, air, or liquid for actuating hydraulic brakes; purifiers for air, and parts thereof; purifiers for oil or gasoline, parts thereof and brackets and fittings therefor; radiator, hood and other grills, assembled or not, but not polished nor plated, and not to include finish or decorative moulding; radiator ornaments, and hood lift lock ornaments, unplated, and parts thereof; radiator shutter assemblies, automatic; radiator water gauges; radiator shells and parts thereof, not plated nor metal finished in any degree; shackles, bearing spring, and parts thereof; speedometers and parts thereof; spring covers of metal and closing strips or shapes therefor; stampings, body, cowl, hood, fender and instrument board, of metal in the rough, trimmed or not, but not metal finished in any degree; starter switch assembly and parts thereof; steering wheels, rims and spiders therefor; sun visor blanks of gypsum weatherboard; thermos-						

	tats and parts thereof; throttle, spark and choke assemblies, including buttons therefor, and parts thereof; tire clamping rings of steel, plated or not; universal joint ball assemblies; voltage control regulators; wind-shield wipers and parts thereof; all of the foregoing when of a class or kind not made in Canada and for use in the manufacture or the repair of the goods enumerated in tariff items 424 and 438a or for use in the manufacture of parts therefor..	Free	20 p.c.	30 p.c.	Free	20 p.c.	30 p.c.
	(1) Provided, that if the above articles are imported for use as original equipment by a manufacturer of automobiles, motor vehicles, electric trackless trolley buses or chassis enumerated in tariff items 438a and 424 whose total factory output during the year in which importation is sought does not exceed ten thousand complete automobiles, motor vehicles, electric trackless trolley buses or chassis, and provided that not less than forty per centum of the factory cost of production of such automobiles, motor vehicles, electric trackless trolley buses or chassis, not to include duties and taxes, is incurred in the British Empire, the rates of duty under this item shall be.....	Free	Free	25 p.c.	Free	Free	25 p.c.
	(2) Provided, that if the above articles are imported for use as original equipment by a manufacturer of automobiles, motor vehicles, electric trackless trolley buses or chassis enumerated in tariff items 438a and 424 whose total factory output during the year in which importation is sought exceeds ten thousand automobiles, motor vehicles, electric trackless trolley buses or chassis, and provided that not less than sixty-five per centum of the factory cost of production of such automobiles, motor vehicles, electric trackless trolley buses or chassis, not to include duties and taxes, is incurred in the British Empire, the rates of duty under this item shall be.....	Free	Free	25 p.c.	Free	Free	25 p.c.
	(3) Provided that the Governor in Council may make such regulations, if any, as are deemed necessary for carrying out the provisions of this item.						
438d	Front and rear axles; brakes; clutches; internal combustion engines; steering gears; magnetos; rims for pneumatic tires larger than thirty inches by five inches; transmission assemblies, hydraulic or fluid couplings and torque convertors; drive shafts; universal joints; steel road wheels; and parts of the foregoing, when of a class or kind not made in Canada, and imported by manufacturers of the goods enumerated in tariff items 424 and 438a for use only in the manufacture of motor trucks, motor buses and electric trackless trolley buses, or for the manufacture of chassis for the same.....	Free	17½ p.c.	27½ p.c.	Free Free	17½ p.c. 25 p.c.	27½ p.c. 40 p.c.

Tariff Item	—	British Preferential Tariff	Intermediate Tariff	General Tariff	Present Rates		
					B. P. Tariff	Intermediate Tariff	General Tariff
	(1) Provided that if the above articles are imported for use as original equipment for motor trucks, motor buses and electric trackless trolley buses, or for chassis for the same, by a manufacturer of the goods enumerated in tariff items 424 and 438a, and provided also that during the year during which importation is sought, not less than forty per centum of the factory cost of production of such motor vehicles and chassis therefor, not to include duties and taxes, is incurred in the British Empire, the rates of duty under this item shall be..... (2) Provided that the Governor in Council may make such regulations, if any, as are deemed necessary for carrying out the provisions of this item.	Free	7½ p.c.	27½ p.c.	Free	7½ p.c	27½ p.c.
438i	Body bottom cross members and steel shapes for the manufacture thereof; bumpers, front and rear, and parts thereof, including spring steel bumper plates; casket tables or platforms for hearses; destination and route sign assemblies, illuminated or not, and parts thereof; direction signals, illuminated or not; door and step mechanism, hand, vacuum or air operated, and parts thereof; door locks and catches and parts thereof; electric switches, buzzers, bells, push buttons, fuse assemblies and parts thereof; forward drive control conversion assemblies and parts thereof; lamps of all kinds, illuminating and indicating, including sockets, flanges, terminals, glassware, lenses and gaskets therefor, assembled or not, but not to include lamp bulbs; metal stampings, oiled and primed or not, and assemblies thereof; rubber fenders; seat operating mechanisms; ventilators, including motor drivenf an type, and grills, and parts thereof; window operating mechanisms; all of the foregoing when imported to be used only in the manufacture of motor truck bodies, motor bus bodies, electric trackless trolley bus bodies, motor ambulances and hearses.....	Free	Free	20 p.c.	Free Various	Free Various	20 p.c. Various
445o	Acid-free capacitor tissue and paper, plain and gummed; metal cans, extruded, plated or unplated; automatic record changers; parts for pickups; bias cells and holders; frames, yokes, brackets, pole-						

	pieces, gaskets and held covers, separate or assembled for use in speakers with mounting diameter not exceeding 6⅜ inches; cones, spiders, spider suspensions, voice coils and voice coil dust covers, separate or assembled; magnetic structures and parts thereof for permanent magnet speakers; glass dial crystals and scales and metal dials or scales made by the silkscreen process; metal cabinet escutcheons without crystals, plain or finished; high frequency circuit switches and essential components thereof; high frequency iron cores with or without inserts moulded therein and metal powders for use in the manufacture thereof; motors and gears for automatic tuning; radio frequency ceramics; raw low loss mica; sheets and punchings of low loss mica; tube shields and parts thereof; vibrators; vulcanized fibre in sheets, rods, strips or tubing; high frequency coil forms and tubing having an outside diameter not exceeding one inch; for use in the manufacture or the repair of the goods enumerated in tariff items 445d, 597a, and other apparatus using radio tubes, or for use in the manufacture of parts therefor.....	Free	Free	30 p.c.	Free 10 p.c.	Free 27½ p.c.	30 p.c. 35 p.c.
445p	Ceramic parts; copper alloys for welding; getter and getter assemblies; glass parts; glass bulbs glass tubing, glass cane; mica parts; mica assemblies; wire of molybdenum and molybdenum alloy; nickel and nickel alloy tubing, wire, ribbon, screen and strip, coated or not, carbonized or not; tungsten and tungsten alloy and zinc wire; wire and strip of silver copper, chrome copper, chrome iron or plated iron; molybdenum strip; tantalum wire and strip; copper tubing, rod and strip; iron strip; leads, spuds and welds; hooks and supports; top cap assemblies; graphite anodes; heaters and filaments; metal parts, coated or not, carbonized or not; all the foregoing when imported by manufacturers of radio tubes and parts therefor, for use exclusively in the manufacture of such articles, in their own factories.....	Free	Free	30 p.c.	Free	Free	30 p.c.
446c	Golf shafts of seamless steel, coated or not.....	Free	15 p.c.	35 p.c.	Free 17½ p.c.	25 p.c. 33⅓ p.c.	35 p.c. 45 p.c.
446h	Welding rods or welding wires of all kinds, whether or not flux-coated.....	Free	15 p.c.	35 p.c.	Various	Various	Various
454	Frames not more than sixteen inches in width, clasps and fasteners (not to include slide or hookless fasteners), when imported by manufacturers of purses, chatelaine bags or reticules for use exclusively in the manufacture of purses, chatelaine bags or reticules, in their own factories, under regulations prescribed by the Minister; parts of the foregoing..	Free	12½ p.c.	20 p.c.	Free 20 p.c.	12½ p.c. 30 p.c.	20 p.c. 35 p.c.

Tariff Item	—	British Preferential Tariff	Intermediate Tariff	General Tariff	Present Rates		
					B. P. Tariff	Intermediate Tariff	General Tariff
462a	Photographic cameras and equipment, and complete parts of the foregoing, for use by professional photographers and commercial photo-finishers in their own business, as follows:— Cameras for professional purposes, for making negatives 4¼ inches by 6½ inches and larger, and the following accessories for use with such cameras: lenses, shutters, exposure meters, range finders, film and plate holders, lens hoods, lens boards, ground glass carriages, reducing backs, reversible adapter backs, lantern slide attachments, film sheaths, combination paper and plate holders, kits, carrying cases, camera stands, camera tripods, camera tripod tops, vignetters, diffusion disks, diffusion disk holders, colour filters, colour filter holders, polarizing screens, polarizing screen holders and backgrounds. Printers, enlargers, heaters, dryers, mounting presses, print washers, automatic film processors, printing frames and tanks for developing, fixing and washing	Free	Free	Free	Free 7½ p.c.	Free 25 p.c.	Free 30 p.c.
616	(iii) Latex, being crude rubber in liquid form, not compounded beyond the addition of preservatives	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free
648a	Diamonds, rough or unset, and not advanced in condition or value from their natural state by cleaving, splitting, cutting, or other process, whether in their natural form or broken	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free
648b	Diamonds, n.o.p., advanced in condition or value from the natural state by cleaving, splitting, cutting or other process	Free	10 p.c.	10 p.c.	Free	Free	Free
653	Brushes of all kinds, n.o.p.	15 p.c.	30 p.c.	40 p.c.	15 p.c.	30 p.c.	40 p.c.
669	Emery, corundum, garnet, and artificial abrasives, n.o.p., ground or unground	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free
670	Paper, cloth, and combinations of paper and cloth, coated with natural or artificial abrasives or with a combination of natural and artificial abrasives, and manufactures of all the foregoing; grinding						

	wheels, stones or blocks, manufactured by the bonding together of either natural or artificial abrasives; manufactures of emery, corundum, garnet, or artificial abrasives, n.o.p.	10 p.c.	20 p.c.	30 p.c.	10 p.c. 12½ p.c.	25 p.c. 22½ p.c.	30 p.c. 25 p.c.
703	*(a)* Travellers' baggage, under regulations prescribed by the Minister.	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free
	(b) Goods valued at not more than one hundred dollars included in the baggage accompanying residents of Canada returning from abroad after an absence from Canada of not less than forty-eight hours and acquired by them for personal or household use or as souvenirs or gifts, but not bought on commission or as an accommodation for other persons or for sale, under regulations prescribed by the Minister	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free
	Provided that a resident of Canada shall not be entitled to the exemption herein granted within a period of four months from the date of the last exemption allowed, nor shall the exemption be allowed on alcoholic beverages in excess of one quart, or on tobacco in excess of fifty cigars, two hundred cigarettes and two pounds of manufactured tobacco.						
	Provided further that goods entitled to entry under this Item shall be exempt from all imposts, notwithstanding the provisions of this Act, The Customs Tariff Amendment Act, 1939 or any other Act.						
725	Paperboard or fibreboard, single ply, not coated or impregnated, in rolls containing not less than five hundred square feet, when imported by manufacturers of impregnated socklining base, innersoling, welting, or similar materials, for use only in the manufacture of such materials in their own factories.	Free	10 p.c.	25 p.c.	15 p.c.	25 p.c.	35 p.c.

2. Resolved, that any enactment founded upon the foregoing resolutions to amend the Customs Tariff or Schedules thereto shall be deemed to have come into force on the thirteenth day of October, one thousand nine hundred and forty-five, and to have applied to all goods mentioned in the foregoing resolutions imported or taken out of warehouse for consumption on and after that date, and to have applied to goods previously imported for which no entry for consumption was made before that date.

APPENDIX TO THE BUDGET, 1945-46

A. Review of Government Accounts, 1944-1945.

B. Tables on Economic Conditions, 1944-1945.

A. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTS, 1944-45

Comparative Summary of Revenues and Expenditures

1. The figures that appear in this white paper are final, not estimated as in previous years. The following tables show, by main categories and in detail, revenues, expenditures and the increase in net debt for the fiscal year 1944-45, together with comparable figures for the four preceding fiscal years.

STATEMENT OF REVENUES FOR THE LAST FIVE FISCAL YEARS

(Thousands of Dollars)

—	1940-41	1941-42	1942-43	1943-44	1944-45
	$	$	$	$	$
TAX REVENUE—					
Direct Taxes—					
Direct Taxes on Incomes—					
Individual Income Tax, including National Defence Tax	103,535	296,139	534,138	813,435	767,755
Tax on Interest and Dividends	12,282	26,643	26,711	25,671	27,053
Taxes on Rents and Royalties	760	1,626	1,370	1,272	1,546
Corporation Income Tax	131,566	185,836	347,970	311,379	276,404
Excess Profits Tax	23,995	135,168	454,581	468,718	465,805
Total Direct Taxes on Incomes	272,138	645,412	1,364,770	1,620,475	1,538,563
Succession Duties	.....	6,957	13,273	15,020	17,251
Total Direct Taxes	272,138	652,369	1,378,043	1,635,495	1,555,814
Indirect Taxes—					
Customs Import Duties	130,757	142,392	118,963	167,882	115,091
Excise Duties—					
Spirits, malt, etc	34,140	46,776	65,594	65,922	72,133
Cigars, cigarettes and tobacco	55,417	65,050	76,372	79,906	83,142
Licences	45	40	38	37	37
Less Refunds	−994	−1,775	−3,283	−3,741	−3,390
Total Excise Duties	88,608	110,091	138,721	142,124	151,922
Excise Taxes—					
Taxes on Commodities—					
Sales Tax	184,536	246,553	250,478	339,256	404,109
War Exchange Tax	61,932	100,874	94,553	118,913	98,164
Automobiles, rubber tires and tubes	11,206	16,742	3,062	6,000	6,480
Beverages	.....	6,247	14,119	19,059	19,442
Candy and chewing gum	.....	.....	8,185	12,602	12,874
Cigars, cigarettes and tobacco	245	333	26,295	54,688	62,306
Cigarette papers and tubes	3,356	3,948	5,056	6,159	6,658
Electric and gas appliances	1,886	8,470	5,306	3,302	4,057
Furs	.....	.....	3,170	4,199	5,217
Gasoline	.....	24,752	24,898	24,930	29,671
Matches and lighters	2,173	2,766	2,855	2,874	3,117
Phonographs, radios and tubes	1,289	2,361	1,191	491	1,112
Special excise on importations	1,008	861	480	508	545
Sugar	11,894	22,009	14,950	13,048	11,744
Toilet preparations and soaps	1,542	3,539	4,542	5,327	6,347
Trunks, bags, luggage, etc	.....	.....	2,187	4,170	4,134
Wines	658	1,445	2,007	1,710	1,772
Sundry	682	877	1,938	2,579	2,977
Taxes on Amusements and Services—					
Amusements	.....	7,710	10,778	12,019	12,284
Tax on pari-mutuel bets	.....	1,082	1,287	1,683	1,904
Transportation and communication	1,848	8,131	16,083	22,379	24,205
Stamps, including payment of taxes on jewellery, chinaware, cabaret attendance, etc	4,574	4,893	12,586	16,734	18,296
Licences, interest and miscellaneous	173	202	255	331	369
Less refunds	−4,835	−10,370	−17,549	−34,342	−194,719
Total Excise Taxes	284,167	453,425	488,712	638,619	543,065
Other Taxes—					
Chartered bank note circulation	898	786	665	457	350
Insurance Companies	972	1,148	10,893	6,481	7,182
Miscellaneous	636	702	723	753	702
Total Indirect Taxes	506,038	708,544	758,677	956,316	818,312
Total Revenue from Taxes	778,176	1,360,913	2,136,720	2,591,811	2,374,126

STATEMENT OF REVENUES FOR THE LAST FIVE FISCAL YEARS—*Concluded*

(Thousands of Dollars)

—	1940-41	1941-42	1942-43	1943-44	1944-45
	$	$	$	$	$
NON-TAX REVENUE—					
Post Office	40,383	45,994	48,869	61,071	66,056
Return on Investments	17,902	25,826	41,242	48,281	60,749
Bullion and coinage	6,266	4,767	5,883	8,732	4,586
Premium, discount and exchange	6,107	11,855	395	2,154	.....
Other	10,921	14,469	19,690	13,045	14,080
Total Non-tax Revenue	81,579	102,911	116,079	133,283	145,471
Total Ordinary Revenue	859,755	1,463,824	2,252,799	2,725,094	2,519,597
SPECIAL RECEIPTS AND CREDITS—					
Consolidated Deficit Account—					
Refunds of previous years' Special Expenditure	78	102	239	221	53
Special Receipts—War Appropriation Acts	1,542	16,384	18,651	98,918	360,061
War Donations	1,410	459	275	216	177
Canadian Wheat Board—					
Reduction in Reserve Account	.....	.....	6,660	2,971	589
Surpluses in certain special accounts	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,625
Canadian National Railways—					
Net credit due to increase in Canadian National Railways Securities Trust Stock (contra)	1,695[1]	1,576[1]	31,560[1]	37,838[1]	22,400[1]
Previous years' war expenditure on investment in Crown plants transferred to Active Assets	.....	.....	.....	53,448	.....
Other	4	.....	1	26	.....
Total Consolidated Deficit Account	4,729	18,521	57,386	193,638	385,905
Capital and Non-active Accounts—					
Capital Accounts—					
Refunds of previous years' expenditure	20	38	102	93	728
Net insurance proceeds on the P.E.I. Car Ferry	.....	984	.....	.....	.....
Non-active Accounts—					
National Harbours Board, reduction of indebtedness	.....	33	15	.....	19
Canadian Government Merchant Marine Ltd.—balance in contingency reserve	1	.....	.....	.....	.....
Canadian National (West Indies) Steamships, Limited, reduction of indebtedness	.....	.....	.....	164	549
Canadian Pacific Railway—					
repayment of loan made under Unemployment Relief Act, 1932	.....	.....	.....	1,000	.....
Write-downs to Consolidated Deficit Account—					
Seed Grain and Relief Loans	46	58	42	29	36
Total Capital and Non-active Accounts	67	1,113	159	1,286	1,332
Total Special Receipts and Credits	4,796	19,634	57,545	194,924	387,237
GRAND TOTAL REVENUE	864,551	1,483,458	2,310,344	2,920,018	2,906,834
Less estimated amount of Income and Excess Profits Taxes refundable after the war	.....	.....	70,000	155,000	219,500
	864,551	1,483,458	2,240,344	2,765,018	2,687,334

(1) Revised to be comparable to the presentation used in Public Accounts of 1943-44, by netting the adjustments affecting the Canadian National Railways Securities Trust Stock.

STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURES BY MAJOR CATEGORIES AND BY DEPARTMENTS FOR THE LAST FIVE FISCAL YEARS

(Thousands of Dollars)

—	1940-41	1941-42	1942-43	1943-44	1944-45
	$	$	$	$	$
ORDINARY EXPENDITURE					
Agriculture	8,593	8,430	8,492	8,841	9,424
Auditor General's Office	453	457	441	348	361
Civil Service Commission	397	399	427	456	461
External Affairs, including office of Prime Minister	1,013	1,052	1,156	1,596	1,974
Finance—					
Interest on Public Debt	139,179	155,018	188,556	242,681	318,995
Cost of Loan Flotations and Annual Amortization of Bond Discounts and Commissions	6,304	16,350	13,838	19,285	20,679
Subsidies to Provinces	13,769	14,409	14,490	14,449	14,445
Special Grants to Provinces	5,475	.....	.....	.....	.....
Wartime Prices and Trade Board—					
Dominion Fuel Board Administration, coal subsidies and subventions	.....	(1) 4,880	(2) —	(2) —	(2) —
Miscellaneous Grants and Contributions	530	531	526	528	531
Civil Pensions and Superannuation	508	445	398	356	325
Government contribution to Superannuation Fund	2,316	2,347	2,341	2,299	2,341
Old Age Pensions, including pensions to blind persons	29,912	29,612	29,976	30,377	32,187
Premium, Discount and Exchange	—	—	—	—	16,348
Compensation to Provinces under Dominion-Provincial Taxation Agreements—					
Income and Corporation Taxes	—	21,120	85,942	83,678	82,977
Gasoline Tax	—	—	8,273	11,757	10,357
Administrative and Sundry Expenditure	3,500	3,807	4,181	4,472	4,724
Fisheries	1,618	1,679	1,699	1,696	2,159
Governor General and Lieutenant Governors	213	226	225	222	223
Insurance	176	181	182	183	185
Justice	2,711	2,657	2,667	2,673	2,696
Penitentiaries	2,717	2,786	2,772	2,799	2,936
Labour	826	762	698	1,147	1,419
Technical Education	18	41	19	23	25
Unemployment Insurance Act, 1940—					
Administration	69	2,344	4,657	5,171	5,115
Government contribution	—	7,287	11,487	12,344	12,746
Government Annuities—					
Payments to maintain reserve	111	617	498	32	257
Legislation—					
House of Commons	2,468	1,408	1,827	1,915	1,612
Library of Parliament	70	72	76	77	72
Senate	868	424	555	562	485
General	58	47	61	86	95
Chief Electoral Officer, including elections	2,469	282	1,447	88	179
Mines and Resources—					
Administration	179	178	160	167	161
Immigration	1,273	1,289	1,268	1,262	1,311
Indian Affairs	5,183	5,000	4,978	5,177	6,164
Lands, Parks and Forests	1,937	1,959	1,753	1,586	1,832
Surveys and Engineering	1,114	1,128	1,129	1,272	1,610
Mines and Geological Survey	1,173	1,156	1,140	1,125	1,217
Movement of Coal and Subsidies under Domestic Fuel Act	4,408	(3) —	(3) —	(3) —	(3) —
Munitions and Supply	9	12	12	14	19
Dominion Fuel Board Administration Coal subsidies and subventions	—	—	4,965	2,165	2,737
National Defence—					
Administration	30	43	44	36	40
Sundry Services	168	223	371	32	29
National Health and Welfare	1,111	1,246	1,244	1,617	1,725
National Revenue (including Income Tax)	12,229	13,428	15,190	17,721	20,114
National War Services	—	682	428	547	838

STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURES BY MAJOR CATEGORIES AND BY DEPARTMENTS FOR THE LAST FIVE FISCAL YEARS—*Continued*

(Thousands of Dollars)

—	1940-41	1941-42	1942-43	1943-44	1944-45
	$	$	$	$	$
ORDINARY EXPENDITURE—*Con.*					
Post Office	38,700	41,502	44,742	48,485	54,629
Privy Council	54	54	62	80	81
Public Archives	126	123	123	124	124
Public Printing and Stationery	283	195	245	235	232
Public Works	11,507	11,937	12,014	12,281	13,169
Reconstruction including National Research Council	—	—	—	—	969
Royal Canadian Mounted Police	5,554	5,985	6,242	6,678	7,183
Secretary of State	772	823	820	831	864
Trade and Commerce	4,315	(4) 6,200	4,566	4,196	3,497
Canada Grain Act	1,908	1,909	1,918	2,089	2,333
Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions	942	616	616	800	869
Transport—					
Administration	334	388	375	397	402
Air Service	3,478	3,386	3,334	3,593	3,939
Marine Service	3,795	4,010	4,257	4,504	4,897
Canadian Travel Bureau	470	(5) —	(5) —	(5) —	(5) —
Railways and Canals	3,527	3,694	3,340	4,090	4,260
Maritime Freight Rates Act	3,951	3,935	4,894	5,058	4,733
Railway Grade Crossing Fund	126	25	12	17	34
Veterans Affairs—					
Departmental Administration	133	182	162	176	195
Pensions (War 1914-18 and military)	41,515	40,569	39,684	38,998	39,372
War Service Gratuities and credits	—	—	—	—	20,228
Treatment and after-care of returned soldiers and allowances to dependents	13,402	12,667	12,689	14,050	19,845
Soldier Settlement and Veterans Land Act	582	564	567	837	1,391
Total ordinary expenditure	390,629	444,778	561,251	630,381	767,376
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE					
Railways	7	4	38	692	630
Public Works	3,351	3,426	3,238	1,930	2,534
Total Capital Expenditure	3,358	3,430	3,276	2,622	3,164
WAR EXPENDITURE					
National Defence—Army—					
Army Services	380,345	502,773	1,021,944	1,312,348	1,243,732
Internment Operations	805	1,370	1,556	1,100	1,580
Inspection Board of the U.K. and Canada	—	4,876	10,946	10,522	8,362
Sundry	2,085	2,150	3,344	4,835	8,080
	383,235	*511,169*	*1,037,790*	*1,328,805*	*1,261,754*
National Defence—Naval Services	*88,163*	*129,368*	*210,182*	*369,556*	*417,099*
National Defence—Air Services—					
Overseas War Establishment	5,362	13,333	23,666	383,888	759,070
Home War Establishment	49,415	109,820	226,550	312,761	227,942
Air Training	121,502	247,383	366,897	233,893	272,342
Sundry	—	113	122	124	103
	176,279	*370,649*	*617,235*	*930,666*	*1,259,457*
Munitions and Supply—					
Administration	2,068	4,930	9,457	9,957	8,841
Expansion of Industry	77,886	247,761	469,675	672,804	205,039
Acquisition of U. K. Assets	—	—	200,000	5,000	1,964
	79,954	*252,691*	*679,132*	*687,761*	*215,844*

(1) For previous years included in Departments of Trade and Commerce and Mines and Resources.
(2) For current year see Department of Munitions and Supply.
(3) For relative years see Departments of Finance and Munitions and Supply.
(4) Includes an amount of $2,615,000 for Census of population of Canada.
(5) Included in Department of National War Services.

STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURES BY MAJOR CATEGORIES AND BY DEPARTMENTS FOR THE LAST FIVE FISCAL YEARS—*Continued*

(Thousands of Dollars)

—	1940-41	1941-42	1942-43	1943-44	1944-45
	$	$	$	$	$
WAR EXPENDITURE—*Continued*					
Agriculture—					
Disposal of agricultural products rendered surplus by the War	4,350	2,260	2,901	1,876	1,194
Subsidy to increase export bacon price to secure adequate supplies for the U.K.	—	2,281	—	—	—
Payments on cheese exports to the U.K.	—	1,784	—	—	—
Freight assistance on western feed grains	—	3,972	10,318	17,754	15,943
Payment to increase the income of farmers in the spring wheat area of Western Canada	—	16,299	2,678	19	2
Fertilizer subventions and freight allowance	—	—	1,036	903	350
Subsidy on western wheat used exclusively as feed for live-stock	—	—	836	4,500	7,471
Subsidy on milk and milk products	—	—	—	29,505	42,330
Premium on hog carcasses suitable for export to Great Britain	—	—	—	3,855	14,091
To provide for reserve stocks of feed grains	—	—	—	1,292	715
Sundry	140	791	2,211	4,589	5,958
	4,490	*27,587*	*19,980*	*64,293*	*88,054*
Finance—					
Comptroller of the Treasury	1,602	3,866	6,493	8,404	9,216
Payment of premiums on the purchase of Dominion of Canada Registered Stock	—	8,100	126	13	14
Wartime Prices and Trade Board—					
Administration	(6) —	1,437	9,278	13,705	12,720
Subsidies due to application of Order placing a ceiling over all prices	—	3,242	67,715	81,519	107,338
Canadian Wheat Board—					
Accountable advances for payment of drawback claims to millers and other manufacturers of wheat products	—	—	(7) —	20,500	19,700
Deficits	—	—	—	—	13,058
House Conversion Program	—	—	—	841	4,053
Old Age Pensions, increased benefits	—	—	—	3,062	8,788
Sundry	90	80	1,051	417	1,632
	1,692	*16,725*	*84,663*	*128,461*	*176,519*
Labour—					
Industrial training	1,400	4,569	4,360	3,478	1,617
Training aircraft mechanics	249	1,489	2,019	1,378	333
National Selective Service	—	—	4,737	9,346	11,098
Removal of enemy aliens from protected areas	—	—	4,328	2,545	2,137
Sundry	248	496	1,383	2,891	4,479
	1,897	*6,554*	*16,827*	*19,638*	*19,664*
Mines and Resources—					
Prince Rupert—Terrace—Cedarvale Highway	—	10	2,965	5,750	2,499
Employment of Japanese	—	71	1,686	894	511
Sundry	292	678	1,626	2,761	2,804
	292	*759*	*6,277*	*9,405*	*5,814*
National War Services—					
War Charities	—	1,175	6,499	10,910	15,933
National Film Board	—	10	122	1,220	1,341
Censorship	—	22	(8) 1,070	(8) 1,727	(8) 1,856
Sundry	2,370	2,011	954	1,330	6,852
	2,370	*3,218*	*8,645*	*15,187*	*25,982*

(6) Included under Department of Labour.
(7) See Department of Trade and Commerce.
(8) Including the censorship of telegrams, cables, etc., which was included under National Defence—Army, in previous years.

STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURES BY MAJOR CATEGORIES AND BY DEPARTMENTS FOR THE LAST FIVE FISCAL YEARS—*Continued*

(Thousands of Dollars)

—	1940-41	1941-42	1942-43	1943-44	1944-45
	$	$	$	$	$
WAR EXPENDITURE—*Concluded*					
Pensions and National Health—					
Treatment—Defence Forces	2,144	2,696	4,175	6,456	—
Pensions—Defence Forces	189	886	2,760	5,637	—
Air Raid Precautions	140	619	5,027	1,724	—
Sundry	897	1,412	2,358	4,135	—
	3,370	*5,613*	*14,320*	*17,952*	—
Veterans Affairs—					
Treatment—Defence Forces	—	—	—	—	11,449
Pensions—Defence Forces	—	—	—	—	11,939
Additions, alterations and improvements to departmental hospitals, including land purchases	—	—	—	—	5,738
Sundry	—	—	—	—	3,633
					32,759
National Health and Welfare	(9) —	(9) —	(9) —	(9) —	*1,340*
Public Works	*4,917*	*4,497*	*6,880*	*6,467*	*6,500*
Royal Canadian Mounted Police	*2,385*	*3,001*	*3,870*	*4,267*	*3,709*
Reconstruction—National Research Council	*419*	*1,125*	*2,091*	*2,640*	*2,932*
Trade and Commerce—					
Gift of wheat to Greece	—	—	3,835	8,798	6,749
Canadian Wheat Board—					
Accountable advances for payment of drawback claims to millers and other manufacturers of wheat products	—	—	3,000	(10) —	(10) —
Sundry	21	80	529	745	670
	21	*80*	*7,364*	*9,543*	*7,419*
Transport	*1,464*	*5,228*	*5,762*	*9,941*	*16,077*
Acquisition of Airfields and Works from United States Government	—	—	—	*66,600*	*18,661*
Wartime Information Board	—	—	*1,474*	*759*	*1,700*
Can. Mutual Aid Board—Military Relief	—	—	—	—	*50,199*
Other Departments	*1,097*	*1,610*	*1,757*	*2,479*	*3,617*
	752,045	1,339,674	2,724,249	3,674,420	3,615,100
The War Appropriation (U.K. Financing) Act, 1942	—	—	1,000,000	—	—
The War Appropriation (United Nations Mutual Aid) Acts	—	—	—	912,603	803,346
Total War Expenditure	752,045	1,339,674	3,724,249	4,587,023	4,418,446
SPECIAL EXPENDITURE					
Unemployment Relief	27,647	8,500	5,013	3,751	3,869
Western Drought Area Relief—					
Prairie Farm Assistance Act, 1939—					
Administration	346	423	157	217	188
Advances to Prairie Farm Emergency Fund	4,376	11,848	249	2,578	1,295
Wheat acreage reduction plan—					
Administration	.....	980	1,342	848	261
Payments of awards to farmers	.....	29,654	24,527	30,102	1,707
Provision for reserve to meet deficits resulting from the operations of the Canadian Wheat Board not previously provided for	10,500	12,571	—	—	186
Total special expenditure	42,869	63,976	31,288	37,496	7,506

(9) Included in Pensions and National Health.
(10) See Department of Finance.

STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURES BY MAJOR CATEGORIES AND BY DEPARTMENTS FOR THE LAST FIVE FISCAL YEARS—*Concluded*

(Thousands of Dollars)

—	1940-41	1941-42	1942-43	1943-44	1944-45
	$	$	$	$	$
GOVERNMENT OWNED ENTERPRISES					
Losses charged to Consolidated Deficit Account—					
Canadian National Railways System, ex-eastern lines	14,451	—	—	—	—
Eastern lines	2,514	—	—	—	—
Prince Edward Island Car Ferry and Terminals	461	424	591	698	773
National Harbours Board	40	33	—	30	59
Total charged to consolidated deficit account	17,466	457	591	728	832
Loans and advances non-active—					
National Harbours Board	716	758	657	579	526
Total non-active advances	716	758	657	579	526
Total government-owned enterprises	18,182	1,215	1,248	1,307	1,358
OTHER CHARGES					
Write-down of assets chargeable to Consolidated Deficit Account—					
Reduction of soldier and general land settlement loans	1,011	271	51	553	325
Yearly established losses in seed grain and relief accounts—Department of Mines and Resources	46	58	42	29	36
Cancellation of Canadian Farm Loan Board—					
Capital Stock	12	10	7	5	1
To provide a reserve for possible losses on ultimate realization of Active Assets	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
Fulfilment of guarantees—					
Saskatchewan Seed Grain Loans, 1937	7,136	—	—	—	—
Canadian National Railways Securities Trust Stock—					
Net changes in Dominion's equity in Canadian National Railways	1,695	1,576	31,560	37,838	22,400
Total other charges	34,900	26,915	56,660	63,425	47,762
Grand total expenditures	1,241,983	1,879,988	4,377,972	5,322,254	5,245,612

SUMMARY OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES

(Thousands of Dollars)

—	1940-41	1941-42	1942-43	1943-44	1944-45
	$	$	$	$	$
Ordinary revenues	859,755	1,463,824	2,182,799	2,570,094	2,300,097
Capital refunds	20	1,022	102	93	728
Special receipts and other credits	4,776	18,612	57,443	194,831	386,509
Total revenues	864,551	1,483,458	2,240,344	2,765,018	2,687,334
Ordinary expenditures	390,629	444,778	561,251	630,381	767,376
Capital expenditures	3,358	3,430	3,276	2,622	3,164
War expenditures	752,045	1,339,674	3,724,249	4,587,023	4,418,446
Special expenditures	42,869	63,976	31,288	37,496	7,506
Government Owned Enterprises	18,182	1,215	1,248	1,307	1,358
Other charges	34,900	26,915	56,660	63,425	47,762
Total expenditures	1,241,983	1,879,988	4,377,972	5,322,254	5,245,612
Total deficit or increase of direct net debt	377,432	396,530	2,137,628	2,557,236	2,558,278

REVENUES 1944-45

2. Dominion government revenues for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1945, totalled $2,687,334,000, a decline of $77,684,000, or 2·8 per cent, from the previous year, which had been the highest in the dominion's history. The above figure represents the net revenue after deducting reserves established for the refundable portions of the personal income and excess profits taxes, and refunds and drawbacks against customs duties and excise and other taxes. The decline in total revenue was largely due to the fact that the amounts debited on these accounts were substantially higher than in the previous year. Details relating to these debits are given in later paragraphs. A table on page 16 also gives a detailed comparison of the actual revenue figures for the year with the forecast made in the budget speech of June 26, 1944.

3. A feature again prominent in the tax revenue of the year was the large proportion derived from direct taxation of income. This form of taxation is generally recognized as being most equitable. Under the individual income tax it is possible to impose taxation measured approximately by the individual ability to pay, while direct levies on corporations under the corporation and excess profits taxes assure that abnormal and unreasonable profits are not made from war production. The proportion of tax revenue derived from direct taxes in 1944-45 was 62·0 per cent compared with 32·6 per cent in 1938-39, the last pre-war year.

[Mr. Ilsley.]

4. An amount of $219,500,000 representing taxes estimated to be refundable under the provisions of the Income War Tax Act and the Excess Profits Tax Act has been deducted from the overall total revenue to present a net figure for the year. This amount does not relate solely to taxes collected in the year 1944-45 but includes some additional provision for previous years which are detailed more fully under the sections relating to income and excess profits taxes below. Taken together with the amounts previously set aside on this account the latest provision brings the net accumulated liability to the end of 1944-45 to a total of $444,271,000 of taxes refundable in the post-war period. Of this amount $259,771,000 is in respect of individual income tax and $184,499,000 is in respect of the excess profits tax.

ORDINARY REVENUES

5. Net revenue from customs duties for the fiscal year 1944-45 amounted to $115,091,000, compared with net revenue of $167,882,000 in the preceding year.

6. The explanation of this sharp decline in net revenue lies partly in a small reduction in gross customs receipts, but was due primarily to a marked increase in the amount of refunds and drawbacks debited from this source during the year. As explained in the Public Accounts for 1943-44, the taxation of war supplies and munitions produced on behalf of our allies underwent a development during the war which had a marked effect on government revenues. Prior to April 1, 1943, importations

into Canada or purchases in Canada by or on behalf of allied governments were granted exemption from customs duty and also from sales tax and any other excise taxes that would normally have applied, although purchases by the Canadian government for its own account were subject in full to all applicable taxes. With the adoption of the mutual aid programme the Canadian government became the purchaser of a substantial proportion of munitions and other war supplies procured in Canada for the use of other governments, and during the fiscal year 1943-44 only those supplies which were purchased in Canada for cash by allied governments were exigible for tax exemption, which exemption was granted in the form of a rebate, subsequent to the time of purchase, of the amount of duties and taxes included in the purchase price. In the fiscal year 1944-45 this policy was extended to provide for the refunding of duties and taxes on goods delivered under mutual aid as well as those paid for by cash in Canada.

7. The effect of this change was to bring within the scope of taxation in the first instance a substantial volume of war supplies excluded prior to April 1, 1943, which was the principal factor in accounting for the rise in gross receipts from customs duties and certain other taxes in the fiscal year 1943-44. At the same time it was known at the end of the fiscal year 1943-44 that a substantial but indeterminate amount of this increased revenue would be subject to rebate, and it was indicated in the public accounts for that year that there were arrears of refunds to allied governments then outstanding which had not at that time been determined. With the extension of the scope of the refunding procedure to include deliveries under mutual aid during the fiscal year 1944-45 it was also evident that the volume of such rebates would be increased over that of the previous fiscal year.

8. In the course of the fiscal year 1944-45 progress was made in determining and refunding the amount of duties and taxes not only in respect of 1943-44 but also in respect of 1944-45, so that by the time the books for the latter year were closed substantially all rebates on goods delivered to the end of that year had been made. In the results, however, not only the rebates of the year 1944-45 were debited against the revenue of that year but also the arrears of rebates from the previous year, which reduced customs and excise revenues to a much greater extent than if there had been no carry-over of arrears from the previous year and correspondingly left revenue for the previous year higher than if it had been possible to determine and refund the proper amount of taxes allocable to that year. The overall effect on customs refunds and drawbacks was that the total, including refunds on other accounts, increased from $20,010,000 in the fiscal year 1943-44 to $58,638,000 in the fiscal year 1944-45. It was this marked increase in refunds, attributable to the causes set forth above, which explains the decline in net customs revenue.

9. Excise duties are levied exclusively on alcoholic beverages and tobacco products. Revenue in the fiscal year 1944-45 amounted to $151,922,000, some $9,798,000 higher than the previous year, of which increase alcoholic beverages contributed $6,211,000 and tobacco products $3,237,000. The increase in the former classification was attributable largely to higher revenues from beer, while cigarettes accounted for the largest part of the latter increase. The extent of the smokers' contribution to the federal treasury is indicated by the overall revenue from tobacco products which, including the additional taxes imposed under the Special War Revenue Act on tobacco, cigars, cigarettes and cigarette papers and tubes amounted in the fiscal year 1944-45 to $152,106,000, or a sum in excess of one-third of the total tax revenue of the government in the last pre-war year, 1938-39.

10. Under "excise taxes" are included the wide variety of commodity taxes levied under the Special War Revenue Act, of which the sales tax and the war exchange tax are the largest revenue sources. Gross revenue from excise taxes in the fiscal year 1944-45 amounted to $737,784,000, some $64,823,000 higher than the previous year, but total refunds of $194,719,000, compared with $34,342,000 in the previous year, reduced net revenue in 1944-45 to $543,065,000, some $95,554,000 ower than 1943-44. The increase in refunds on excise taxes, mostly in respect of the sales tax, was attributable to the same circumstances as were outlined in the section dealing with customs revenue.

11. The two major revenue sources, sales tax and war exchange tax, showed respectively an increase in gross revenue of $64,853,000, and a decrease of $20,749,000. The increase in sales tax revenue is to be attributed mostly to the higher level of munitions production, while the decrease in war exchange tax revenue arose from the exemption of certain imports, including raw cotton and cotton yarns, agricultural implements and several other classes, from application of the tax. All other excise taxes yielded $235,511,000, exceeding the revenue of the previous year by $20,718,000. The

significant increases occurred under the following headings (the amount shown is the increase in 1944-45 over 1943-44).

1. Cigars, cigarettes and tobacco..	$ 7,618,000
2. Gasoline	4,741,000
3. Transportation and communications	1,825,000
4. Stamps, etc., including payment of taxes on jewellery, chinaware cabaret attendance, etc	1,561,000
5. Toilet preparations and soaps..	1,022,000
6. Furs	1,020,000
7. Electric and gas appliances.....	754,000
8. Phonographs, radios and tubes..	621,000

12. Certain other revenues, on the other hand, suffered some reduction due largely to rationing of domestic consumption. The most important of these was sugar revenue, which declined from $13,049,000 to $11,744,000.

13. The personal income tax, again the largest single source of revenue, yielded a total of $767,755,000, compared with collections of $813,435,000 in the previous year. The decline was due to the fact that collection of the refundable tax ceased after July 1, 1944, thus reducing receipts for the last nine months of the fiscal year.

14. In 1944-45 a deduction was made of an amount of $95,000,000 in respect of the refundable portion of the tax which brought net revenue down to $672,755,000. This was lower than the net revenue of $698,435,000 in the previous year, a reduction which was largely attributable to the fact that the amount of $95,000,000 deducted for refundable taxes in 1944-45 related only to the extent of $70,000,000 to tax revenues of that year, the balance of $25,000,000 representing an increase in the reserves previously set aside against the two earlier years in which this requirement was in effect. The estimated total accumulated liability in respect of refundable taxes paid on personal incomes for the three taxation years, 1942, 1943 and 1944, has now been provisionally established at $260,000,000. Of this total amount $60,000,000 relates to 1942, $130,000,000 to 1943, and $70,000,000 to 1944. The reserves now provisionally established for 1942 and 1943 represent increases of $5,000,000 and $20,000,000 respectively over the amounts established previously for those years, the total increase of $25,000,000 being included in the figure of $95,000,000 deducted from revenue of 1944-45 fiscal year.

15. Corporation income tax and excess profits tax, both of which are levied on business incomes, may appropriately be discussed together. Revenue from the corporation income tax amounted to $276,404,000, as compared with $311,379,000 in 1943-44, while revenue from the excess profits tax, before deducting the estimated refundable portion, was $465,805,000, only slightly less than the figure of $468,718,000 for 1943-44.

16. It will be noted that from the excess profits tax revenue for 1944-45 there has been deducted an amount of $124,500,000 in respect of the refundable portion of the tax, as compared with a deduction of $40,000,000 in 1943-44. The magnitude of the figure for 1944-45 deserves some comment. It represents a substantial revision in the amounts previously set aside in earlier years and also the establishment of a liability against 1944-45 at a much higher level than was previously anticipated. The explanation of this upward adjustment lies in the fact that the early estimates of the refundable portion of excess profits tax were based on the level of revenue from that tax as indicated by annual receipts under that heading. It has become apparent, however, as an increasing volume of corporation returns for the war years are assessed, that the distribution of tax liability between the corporation income tax and the excess profits tax is weighted more heavily towards the latter tax than the flow of revenue had indicated. This disparity is probably in large part explained by the fact that in making their monthly instalment payments many taxpayers, although paying a correct amount in total, distinguished inaccurately or do not distinguish at all between the corporation income tax and the excess profits tax portions of their payment. It will only be possible to make an exact allocation of revenue between the two sources as assessment of corporation returns progresses and the correct total distribution of tax liability is determined.

17. This reallocation of revenue will be effected through transfers from one source to the other as returns are assessed, and probably will not be completed for some time. It was felt appropriate, however, to anticipate in so far as possible the final effect of this redistribution in establishing the reserves for the refundable portion of the tax. On the basis of such final figures as are now available it has been estimated that the reserve for refundable portion of excess profits tax revenues collected in 1942-43 and 1943-44 should be increased from the amount of $60,000,000 then provided to an amount of $119,500,000, an increase of $59,500,000, and that the reserve in respect of 1944-45 should be established at $65,000,000, subject to further change as final and accurate figures become available. With these additions the accumulated liability to March 31, 1945, amounted for all years to $184,500,000.

18. Revenue under the heading of dividends, interest, etc., is derived from special taxes

imposed on certain income under Section 9b of the Income War Tax Act. In 1944-45 this revenue amounted to $27,053,000, increased by some $1,382,000, and was derived for the most part from the 15 per cent tax levied on interest and dividends paid to non-residents.

19. The dominion government has levied succession duties only since 1941, and revenue from this source is showing a gradual increase from year to year. In 1944-45 it amounted to $17,251,000 as compared with $15,020,000 in 1943-44 and $13,273,000 in 1942-43.

20. Small amounts of tax revenue are derived from the tax on the note circulation of the chartered banks, which decreases from year to year with the decline in circulation of such notes as provided by statute; from taxes on the net premium income of insurance companies; from a tax on the export of electrical energy from Canada, and from a tax on the export of furs from the northwest territories. Revenue from all these taxes amounted in 1944-45 to $8,234,000.

21. Non-tax revenues for 1944-45 amounted to $145,471,000, an increase of $12,188,000 over 1943-44. Receipts from the post office total $66,056,000, an increase of approximately, $4,985,000. The receipts from the post office exceeded the cost of operations by about $11,427,000 without taking into account any credit for service rendered other departments free of charge and without adding to the cost of operations, rentals and other costs of premises occupied by the post office. Return on investments realized $60,749,000, an increase over the previous year of about $12,468,000. The larger items making up this total are: interest on advances to Canadian National Railways, $18,282,000; Bank of Canada profits, $18,079,000; interest on loans to Foreign Exchange Control Board, $5,951,000; interest on bonds held in securities investment account, $5,545,000; interest on loans to National Harbours Board, $4,000,000; interest on loans to provinces, $2,927,000; interest on loans to Canadian Farm Loan Board, $911,000; Soldier Land Settlement loans, $797,000, and interest on advances to Canadian National Railways for purchase of railway equipment, $1,792,000.

SPECIAL RECEIPTS AND CREDITS

22. The total amount for the fiscal year 1944-45 under this heading is $387,237,000, compared with $194,924,000 for the previous year. Refunds of previous years' war expenditures totalled $298,626,000, of which the department of Munitions and Supply accounted for $220,831,000; the Department of National Defence, Army services, $52,210,000; Navy services, $2,867,000 and Air services, $20,981,000. The three principal items under the Department of Munitions and Supply were, net production refunds representing mainly return of working capital advances from prefinanced plants, $206,146,000; refunds from contracts in connection with cost audits, voluntary refunds, negotiation of contracts, etc., $9,121,000, and miscellaneous refunds from sundry companies, $4,618,000. Included in the amount of $20,981,000 under Air services, are amounts totalling $7,985,000 received from the governments of the United States, the United Kingdom and other government departments for materials and equipment supplied, and an amount of $3,097,000 received from the government of New Zealand representing certain liabilities due under the terms of the agreements governing its participation in the British Commonwealth Air Training Plan, No. 1. The remainder constitutes chiefly refunds on contracts after cost audits and proceeds from the sale of materials and supplies.

23. The amount classified as miscellaneous war revenue is $45,884,000, of which $31,445,000 represents net revenue derived from the operation of government-owned companies and crown plants—sundry companies. Some of the other items making up this total are net revenue from the sale of gasoline ration books, $1,581,000; rental of buildings and equipment and return on plant investment and working capital loans from sundry companies, $1,678,000; sundry permits and sales, Department of National Defence, Army services, $2,583,000; Navy services, $590,000; Air services, including equipment and supplies furnished other government departments, $3,461,000, and Department of Transport, made up mainly of the balance of the operating surplus as at March 31, 1945, of the Dominion Lighthouse depot at Prescott, Ontario, $2,231,000.

24. Other large items recorded under the heading of special receipts and credits are, sale of surplus war assets, $8,408,000; asset values of properties disposed of under lease purchase option agreements previously charged to war appropriation, $7,143,000, and $22,400,000, representing the net result of the changes in the dominion's equity in the Canadian National Railways for the calendar year 1944, due to surplus earnings of the Canadian National Railways of $23,027,000 less loss on capital abandonments of $627,000. This last item of $22,400,000 increased the book valuation of the Canadian National Railways' securities trust capital stock and accordingly is offset by a contra amount appearing on the expenditure side under the heading "Other Charges."

25. The table which follows gives a summary of the forecast made at the time of the last budget of the probable receipts from the various sources of revenue during the fiscal year 1944-45, and a comparison of these forecasts with receipts for the fiscal year. The increase in total receipts over the amount forecast in terms of percentage, excluding estimated refundable portion of income and excess profits taxes is 3·3 per cent.

DETAILED STATEMENT OF BUDGET FORECAST COMPARED WITH ACTUAL REVENUE FOR 1944-45

Source of Revenue	Budget Forecast of Revenue	Actual Revenue	Increase (+) or decrease (−) in revenue as compared with budget forecast
	(thousands of dollars)		
TAX REVENUES			
Customs Duties	160,000	115,091	— 44,909
Excise Duties	150,000	151,922	+ 1,922
Excise Taxes:			
Sales Tax (net)	290,000	209,391	— 80,609
War Exchange Tax	120,000	98,164	— 21,836
Other Excise Taxes	225,000	235,511	+ 10,511
Total Excise Taxes	635,000	543,066	— 91,934
Income Taxes:			
Tax on personal incomes	760,000	767,755	+ 7,755
Corporate Income Tax	300,000	276,404	— 23,596
Excess Profits Tax	425,000	465,805	+ 40,805
Interest and Dividends	27,000	28,598	+ 1,598
Total Income Taxes	1,512,000	1,538,562	+ 26,562
Succession Duties	17,000	17,251	+ 251
Miscellaneous Taxes	8,000	8,235	+ 235
Total Tax Revenues	2,482,900	2,374,127	— 107,873
Non Tax Revenues	145,000	145,471	+ 471
Total	2,627,000	2,519,598	— 107,402
Special Receipts and Credits	75,000	387,237	+ 312,237
Total Revenue	2,702,000	2,906,835	+ 204,835
Less Refundable Taxes	100,000	219,500	— 119,500
Net Total Revenue	2,602,000	2,687,335	+ 85,335

EXPENDITURES, 1944-45

26. Expenditures are dealt with under the usual classifications, viz. (1) Ordinary expenditures; (2) Capital expenditures; (3) War expenditures; (4) Special expenditures; (5) Government owned enterprises; (6) Other charges. All disbursements under these categories, with the exception of active loans and investments charged to the War Appropriation Acts, are included as expenditures in arriving at the over-all deficit or increase in net debt.

[Mr. Ilsley.]

ORDINARY EXPENDITURES

27. Ordinary expenditures totalled $767,376,000 in the fiscal year ended March 31, 1945, compared with $630,381,000 in the previous year or an increase of $136,995,000. A few of the larger contractual and uncontrollable items, such as interest and other charges on the public debt, pensions, unemployment insurance, post office, subsidies and payments to provinces under the dominion-provincial taxation agreements, war service gratuities and re-

establishment credits total $642,100,000 or 83·7 per cent of total ordinary expenditure.

28. Details of some of the larger increases in ordinary expenditure over the previous fiscal year are as follows:

Increased interest and public debt charges	$77,707,000
Increase in Post Office expenditure	6,144,000
Increase in old age pensions and pensions to blind persons	1,810,000
Increase in administrative cost of Department of National Revenue, including income tax	2,393,000
Increase in premium, discount and exchange expenditure	16,348,000
Increase in cost of treatment and after care of returned soldiers and allowances to dependents	5,795,000
War service gratuities and credits (new item)	20,228,000

29. Smaller increases, as well as decreases effected during the year are revealed in the five-year table. It should be noted, however, that many increases in expenditure which are classified as ordinary expenditures are in fact made necessary by or arising out of the war.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES

30. Capital expenditures totalled $3,164,000 in the fiscal year ended March 31, 1945, compared with $2,622,000 in the previous fiscal year. The main items classified as capital are the expenditures arising out of the dredging of the St. Lawrence ship channel, improvements in connection with civil airways and airports and the construction costs of the new Prince Edward Island car ferry.

WAR EXPENDITURES

31. Under the authority of the War Appropriation Act and the War Appropriation (United Nations Mutual Aid) Acts, $4,453,685,000 was disbursed. Of this amount $35,239,000 was for loans, advances and investments treated as active assets, and the remainder $4,418,446,000 was classed as war expenditures. The following table gives the same classification for the last six fiscal years:

Fiscal Year	Charged to Active Assets	War Expenditures	Total
	$	$	$
1939-40	9,092,742	118,291,022	127,383,764
1940-41	26,379,066	752,045,326	778,424,392
1941-42	42,816,676	1,339,674,152	1,382,490,828
1942-43	65,231,622	3,724,248,890	3,789,480,512
1943-44	91,906,305	4,587,023,094	4,678,929,399
1944-45	35,238,956	4,418,446,315	4,453,685,271
	270,665,367	14,939,728,799	15,210,394,166

32. The following table gives a summary of the disbursements from the War Appropriation Acts divided between the amounts classified as expenditure and those classified as active assets.

WAR APPROPRIATION ACTS—EXPENDITURE

Department of National Defence —Army service	$1,261,755,000
Department of National Defence —Navy service	417,099,000
Department of National Defence —Air service	1,259,456,000
Department of Munitions and Supply	215,844,000
Miscellaneous Departments—	
Agriculture	88,054,000
Auditor General's office	269,000
Canadian Mutual Aid Board	50,199,000
Civil Service Commission	527,000
External Affairs including Prime Minister's office	316,000
Finance	176,519,000
Fisheries	407,000
Justice	45,000
Labour	19,664,000
Legislation	96,000
Mines and Resources	5,814,000
National Harbours Board	356,000
National Health and Welfare	1,340,000
National War Services	25,982,000
Post Office	1,300,000
Privy Council	1,758,000
Public Works	6,500,000
Reconstruction	2,932,000
Royal Canadian Mounted Police	3,709,000
Secretary of State	244,000
Trade and Commerce	7,419,000
Transport	34,738,000
Veterans Affairs	32,759,000
	$3,615,101,000
The War Appropriation (United Nations Mutual Aid) Acts	803,346,000
Total war expenditure	$4,418,447,000

ACTIVE ASSETS

Purchase of railway equipment:	
1942 orders	7,733,000
1943 orders	13,031,000
Commodity Prices Stabilization Corporation, Limited	12,658,000
Wartime Food Corporation, Limited	4,000
Construction of dock and rail facilities for Steep Rock Iron Mines, Limited	1,755,000

Loan to village of Dawson Creek for construction of a sewage disposal system	58,000
Total active loans, advances and investments from the War Appropriation, 1944-45	35,239,000
Total disbursements from the War Appropriation, 1944-45	$4,453,686,000

33. The table in the preceding section does not include recoverable outlays made under the provisions of section 3 of the War Appropriation Act which are also classed as active assets rather than expenditure. Under this section, the government of Canada may act as the agent of an allied government for any purpose which will aid directly or indirectly in the prosecution of the war and any obligations or costs incurred temporarily or assumed may be paid out of unappropriated moneys in the consolidated revenue fund. Furthermore, any expenditure required to be made by the government under any contract for war supplies entered into for the purpose of enabling any company wholly owned by the government to fulfil its obligations in respect of orders received by such company from an allied government may also be paid out of unappropriated moneys.

34. The principal items of war expenditure for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1945, and the four preceding fiscal years are detailed on pages 1027 and 1028. An explanation of a few of the more significant changes is appropriate. The first is the large increase in the expenditure for overseas war establishment, from $383,888,000 to $759,070,000, which was due to (1) the establishment of additional squadrons, (2) provisional payment of $100,000,000 to the government of the United Kingdom on reserve stores and pipe line supplies and (3) an advance payment of $134,000 to the government of the United Kingdom for advance training of air crew personnel.

35. A new item of war expenditure that deserves explanation is the expenditure of $50,199,000 by the Canadian Mutual Aid Board for military relief. This amount was provided to cover expenditures made during the fiscal year in connection with Canada's share of the cost of relief supplies furnished by the allied military forces in Europe to civilian populations during the period of military responsibility.

36. The large decrease under the Department of Munitions and Supply for the expansion of war industry from $677,804,000 to $205,038,000 was due to the curtailment of capital expenditure and recovery of prior years' working capital part of which was used for financing operations during the current year.

WAR EXPENDITURES BY DEPARTMENTS AND SERVICES—FISCAL YEAR 1944-45

Agriculture—			
Agricultural Supplies Board—			
Administration	$ 28,000		
Programmes to encourage production of essential war supplies	286,000		
Assistance in disposal of agricultural products rendered surplus by the war	1,195,000		
Feeds administrator	24,185,000		
Flax fibre administrator	23,000		
Fertilizers and pesticides administrator	589,000		
Seed administrator	148,000		
		$ 26,454,000	
Meat Board		14,247,000	
Dairy Products Board		24,000	
Special Products Board		1,922,000	
Agricultural Food Board		45,405,000	
Special farm income payments		2,000	
			$ 88,054,000
Auditor General—			
Auditing and checking war appropriation accounts			$ 269,000
Canadian Mutual Aid Board—			
Military relief			50,199,000
Civil Service Commission—			
Supply of personnel for war services	$ 515,000		
Payment of minimum rate railway fare re stenographers and typists	12,000		
			527,000

External Affairs—			
Departmental Administration and Passport Offices	147,000		
Representatives abroad	82,000		
Legation building and residence, Chunking, China	3,000		
Sundries	84,000		
			316,000
Finance—			
Payment of premium on purchase of Dominion of Canada registered stock		$ 14,000	
Comptroller of Treasury's Office		9,215,000	
Wartime Prices and Trade Board—			
Administration	$ 12,720,000		
Canadian Wool Board Ltd.	341,000		
Commodity Prices Stabilization Corporation—			
Administration and Subsidies	107,338,000		
		120,399,000	
Payments to millers and manufacturers of wheat products		19,700,000	
Advances to the Canadian Wheat Board to cover deficits in Board operations		13,057,000	
Old Age Pensions including pensions to blind persons		8,788,000	
Payment to the Unemployment Insurance Fund in settlement of contributions due the Fund		940,000	
Dominion-Provincial Conference		79,000	
Conversion of large dwellings into multiple housing units		4,053,000	
Administration of Employees Instalment Purchase Plan, Victory Loans		184,000	
Royal Commission on Cooperatives		42,000	
Royal Commission on Annuities and Family Corporations		23,000	
Sundries		25,000	
			176,519,000
Fisheries—			
Subsidies for the construction of packer-seiner vessels		116,000	
Subsidies for the construction of dragger vessels		33,000	
Construction, etc., of experimental long line vessel		36,000	
Purchase of fish for Greek Government		172,000	
Expenses re supply of frozen fish for British Ministry of Food		12,000	
Bonus to crews of fisheries vessels in war zones		17,000	
Salt Fish Regulations—Administration		18,000	
Sundries		3,000	
		$	407,000
Justice—			
Defence of Canada regulations		$ 6,000	
War Measures Act		4,000	
Penitentiaries Branch—			
Purchase of materials re manufactures for war departments		35,000	
			45,000
Labour—			
Industrial training for war work		$ 1,617,000	
Training of young men for aircraft manufacturing, etc.		333,000	
War emergency training—administration		35,000	
Vocational training for discharged members of the Canadian armed forces		602,000	
National War Labour Board		432,000	
Wartime Labour Relations Board—			
Administration		89,000	
Western War Labour Board—			
Administration		19,000	
Wartime Bureau of technical personnel		162,000	
Personnel management training		5,000	
National Selective Service—			
Labour Supply Administration	$ 676,000		
Mobilization Division	3,019,000		
Manpower statistics units	190,000		
Expenses of work done by Unemployment Insurance Commission	6,878,000		
National Registration—			
Administration	335,000		
		11,098,000	
Coordination of shiploading and unloading operations at Halifax		134,000	
Stabilization of longshore labour, Halifax		670,000	
Universities—Accelerating courses and loans to students		74,000	

Labour—*Con.*			
General labour transference in war industries and agriculture		491,000	
Harvest assistance to provinces		482,000	
British Columbia Security Commission		2,137,000	
Organization and operation of day nurseries, etc.		151,000	
Army Labour Account—Revolving Fund		385,000	
Compulsory transfer of ex-coal mine workers back to coal industry		70,000	
Transportation expenses of members of the armed forces for harvest leave		227,000	
Assistance to provinces in transporting labourers to farms		334,000	
Industrial Production Cooperation Board—			
Administration		72,000	
Sundries		45,000	
			19,664,000
Legislation—			
Accountable advance to Empire Parliamentary Association		$ 2,400	
Indemnity and Transportation Expenses—			
Members of the House of Commons and Senate		93,600	
			96,000
Mines and Resources—			
Mines and Geology—			
Development of tar sands		$ 866,000	
Oil explorations		112,500	
Strategic minerals—exploration and development work		8,000	
Vertical air surveys		51,000	
New Metallurgical Laboratory		25,000	
Explosives Division—Administration of regulations re explosives		31,000	
Assistance to provinces re transportation facilities to wartime mining projects		12,000	
Metallic Minerals Division—Services to war departments		277,000	
Sundries		6,500	
		$ 1,389,000	
Lands, Parks and Forests—			
National Parks Bureau—Alternative service work camps		168,000	
Dominion Forest Service—			
Alternative service work camps		107,000	
Alternative service work camps, B.C.		9,000	
Internment and prisoner of war operations		29,000	
Forest Products Laboratories		53,000	
Bureau of Northwest Territories and Yukon Affairs—			
Expense of liaison officers Alcan and Canol projects		5,000	
Sundries		2,000	
		$ 373,000	
Surveys and Engineering—			
Engineering and Construction Service—			
Prince Rupert—Cedarvale Highway		$ 2,500,000	
Employment of persons of the Japanese race and Japanese nationals		511,000	
Post-war Construction—Planning		104,000	
Geodetic Service—			
Post-war Construction—Planning		101,000	
Legal Surveys and Map Service—			
Post-war Planning		4,000	
Hydrographic Service—			
Post-war Planning	14,000		
Dominion Water and Power Bureau—			
Tidal power investigations	25,000		
Sundries	66,000		
		$ 3,325,000	
Immigration—			
Canadian interests abroad	493,000		
Grants to National Advisory Committee for children from overseas	55,000		
Repatriation of wives and dependents of the Canadian forces overseas	133,000		
Sundries	46,000		
		727,000	
			5,814,000

Munitions and Supply—		
Administration	$ 8,842,000	
Expansion of war industry	205,038,000	
Acquisition of United Kingdom interest in war plants	1,964,000	
		215,844,000
National Defence—Army Services—		
Departmental Administration	$ 1,550,000	
Dependents' Allowance Board	686,000	
Dependents' Supplementary Grants Fund	4,041,000	
Army	1,243,733,000	
Internment Operations	1,580,000	
Inspection Board—United Kingdom and Canada	8,362,000	
Imperial War Graves Commission	30,000	
Chemical Warfare Experimental Station	1,773,000	
		1,261,755,000
National Defence—Naval Services—		
Navy	$ 416,639,000	
Royal Canadian Sea Cadets	460,000	
		417,099,000
National Defence—Air Services—		
Home War Establishment	$ 227,941,000	
Overseas Establishment	759,070,000	
Departmental Administration	103,000	
British Commonwealth Air Training Plan	272,342,000	
		1,259,456,000
National Harbours Board—		
Halifax—Operation of Fire Boat *Rouille*	$ 64,000	
Installation of additional car dumpers at grain elevator	10,000	
Special fire protection	103,000	
Reconstruction of transit shed 21	175,000	
Saint John—Acquisition, etc., of heavy lift crane equipment	4,000	
		356,000
National Health and Welfare—		
Inspection of industrial plants	$ 23,000	
Laboratory of hygiene	22,000	
Public health engineering	27,000	
Foods and drugs	10,000	
Quarantine service	62,000	
Processing of blood for dried serum	632,000	
Maintenance of non-resident seamen	33,000	
Addition—John street Laboratories, Ottawa	7,000	
Grant to Canadian Nurses Association	250,000	
Chlorination of Water Systems—		
Pacific Coast	189,000	
Dawson Creek, B.C., Water Supply	25,000	
Treatment Canadian fishermen and seamen	11,000	
Hire of Boat—Halifax Harbour	18,000	
Maintenance of Health Unit, Prince Rupert, B.C.	4,000	
Contribution toward Health Services, Halifax	6,000	
Prince Rupert, B.C.—Purchase and installation of water pump	2,000	
Ottawa Laboratory of Hygiene—		
Construction	14,000	
Sundries	5,000	
		1,340,000
National War Services—		
Departmental administration	$ 74,000	
War Charities—General	89,000	
War Charities—Auxiliary services	15,933,000	
Salvage Division	180,000	
Women's voluntary services	19,000	
Canadian firefighters for United Kingdom	761,000	
Canadian Prisoners of War Next-of-Kin Division	15,000	
Committee in cooperation in Canadian citizenship	14,000	
Censorship Division	1,856,000	
Government Office Economies Control	9,000	
Canadian Broadcasting Corporation Short Wave Station—Construction and maintenance	691,000	
Red Cross food parcels	5,000,000	
National Film Board—		
Special War Library $ 36,000		
Purchase of Supplies—Revolving Fund 96,000		
Wartime Information Film Programme 1,087,000		
Stills production and distribution 115,000		
Sundry 7,000		
	1,341,000	
		25,982,000

Post Office—			
Canadian Postal Corps		$ 588,000	
Mail service for troops overseas		212,000	
Purchase of tobacco labels for service purchases		500,000	
			1,300,000
Privy Council—			
Statutory Orders and Regulations Division		$ 29,000	
Wartime Information Board		1,700,000	
Expenses of Special Commission for defence projects in the Northwest		16,000	
Sundries		13,000	
			1,758,000
Public Works—			
Chief Architect's Branch—			
Armoury Accommodation for Canadian Officers' Training Corps Units	$ 50,000		
Repairs, alterations, operation and maintenance of buildings	2,363,000		
Rental of premises occupied for war purposes	1,846,000		
Furniture, etc., for war employees	672,000		
Ottawa—			
Temporary Building No. 8 (Carling ave.)	307,000		
Hostels for junior employees in the public service—construction and furnishings	1,000		
Army Base Post Office—			
Extension	20,000		
Temporary Annex to Records Building	13,000		
Payment of claim re construction of Temporary Building No. 1	14,000		
Edmonton—			
Expropriation of Oliver property	27,000		
Building for Weights and Measures Office	6,000		
Halifax—			
Extension to Old Salt Fish Building	18,000		
Norman Wells, N.W.T.—			
Office and living accommodation for government departments	8,000		
Quebec—			
Conversion of Drill Hall to provide office accommodation	9,000		
Sundries	3,000		
		$ 5,357,000	
Chief Engineer's Branch—			
Saint John Harbour (Courtenay Bay), N.B.—			
Dredging	$ 215,000		
North Sydney, N.S.—Reconstruction of wharf and terminal facilities	328,000		
Post-war Construction Programme—			
Preparation of plans	142,000		
Waterways, Alta.—			
Improvements	8,000		
Dredging	33,000		
Sundry	1,000		
		727,000	
Telegraph Branch—			
To provide for a 24-hour telegraph service on the Pacific Coast	$ 82,000		
Telephone service and unforeseen	308,000		
		390,000	
Contingencies		26,000	
			6,500,000
Reconstruction—			
National Research Council—			
Special war activities			2,932,000
Royal Canadian Mounted Police—			
Increased activities of the Force due to the war		$ 3,578,000	
Securities control		131,000	
			3,709,000
Secretary of State—			
Expenses in connection with the Quebec Conference		$ 225,000	
Sundries		19,000	
			244,000

Trade and Commerce—			
Canadian Shipping Board		$ 70,000	
Export Permits Board		154,000	
Shipping Priorities Branch		48,000	
Revolving Chartering Fund		5,000	
Gift of wheat to Greece		6,749,000	
Steamship Stabilization Fund		331,000	
Canadian Export Board		40,000	
Government Trade Commissioner's Office—Washington		7,000	
Investigation of pre-fabricated houses		15,000	
			7,419,000
Transport—			
Departmental administration		$ 33,000	
Transport Controller's Office		323,000	
Director of Merchant Seamen, including administration, manning pools, nautical schools and welfare facilities		1,593,000	
Air Service—Special radio interception and monitoring services, etc.—			
Radio service	$ 2,172,000		
Meteorological service	1,590,000		
Municipal terminal airports	696,000		
Moncton-Newfoundland airline	173,000		
Montreal (Dorval) Airport—additional facilities	930,000		
Civil Aviation—Extra airport control	464,000		
Canadian Government Transatlantic Air Service	362,000		
Acquisition of airfields and works from United States Government	18,661,000		
Northwest Staging Route—Construction	5,206,000		
Goose Bay Airport—additional facilities	67,000		
Transportation facilities at Malton and Dorval for employees	29,000		
Improvements to Tor Bay—St. John's, Newfoundland	65,000		
Meteorological requirements at the Mackenzie River Route	16,000		
Engineering representatives at Canol Project and maintenance of landing strips	313,000		
Sundries	13,000		
		30,757,000	
Marine Service—			
Aids to navigation, including lightships	$ 58,000		
Marine Service Steamers	190,000		
Reconditioning *Chesterfield*	75,000		
Nautical Services	51,000		
Degaussing equipment for Canadian vessels	269,000		
Compensation to crews of Canadian vessels for personal effects	12,000		
Purchase, etc., of machinery and equipment for l'Ecole des Arts et Metiers de Rimouski	20,000		
Marine Service Steamers—			
Repairs to *N. R. McLean*	59,000		
Reconditioning C.G.S. *Lady Grey*	271,000		
General war risk bonus	103,000		
Dominion Lighthouse Depot, Munitions, Prescott	523,000		
		1,631,000	
Railway Service—			
Additional labour and terminal facilities at Halifax	$ 29,000		
Acquiring properties in Canada for United States Government	20,000		
Accommodation for freight handlers at Saint John, N.B.	12,000		
Contribution re freight rates on ore from Steep Rock Iron Mines	12,000		
Overhaul, etc., C.N. (W.I.) S.S. *Connector*	200,000		
Government Employees Compensation Act	68,000		
		401,000	
			34,738,000
Veterans Affairs—			
Treatment—			
Defence Forces		$ 11,449,000	
Royal Canadian Mounted Police		95,000	
Pensions—Defence Forces		11,939,000	
Air Raid Precautions		484,000	
Investigations—Dependents' Allowance Board		62,000	
Committee on demobilization		3,000	

Veteran's Affairs—*Con.*			
Rehabilitation benefits			2,468,000
Detention Allowances—Canadian Seamen			143,000
Reserve Stores—Revolving Account			50,000
Hospital Unit adjacent to Ottawa Civic Hospital			13,000
Acquisition of Land—Westminster Hospital, London, Ontario			14,000
Additions, Alterations and Improvements to Departmental Hospitals—			
St. Anne de Bellevue, Que.—St. Anne's Hospital	$	936,000	
Montreal, Que.—Currie Memorial Hospital		29,000	
Charlottetown, P.E.I., Provincial Sanatorium		75,000	
Halifax, N.S., Camp Hill Hospital		62,000	
Gloucester Township, Ont.—Health and Occupational Centre		365,000	
Peterborough, Ont.—Hostel		57,000	
Kingston, Ont.—Women's Hostel		52,000	
Toronto, Ont.—Christie Street Hospital and Memorial Hospital		1,505,000	
London, Ont.—Westminster Hospital		328,000	
Winnipeg, Man.—Deer Lodge Hospital		467,000	
Regina, Sask.—General Hospital		196,000	
Calgary, Alta.—Col. Belcher Hospital		89,000	
Edmonton, Alta.—University Hospital		483,000	
Vancouver, B.C., Shaughnessy Hospital		267,000	
Saint John, N.B.—Lancaster Hospital		82,000	
			4,993,000
Land Purchases for Hospitals—			
Victoria—Land for 200-bed Hospital	$	12,000	
Montreal, Que.—Currie Memorial Hospital		113,000	
Halifax, N.S., purchase of J. C. Tory Property		33,000	
Saint John, N.B.—Health and Occupational Centre		35,000	
Ottawa, Ont.—purchase of Land from Beechwood Cemetery		45,000	
Gloucester Township, Ont.—			
Purchase of Smythe Estate		18,000	
Purchase of James Dempsey Property		9,000	
Toronto, Ont.—			
Purchase of Nathanson Property Health and Occupational Centre		45,000	
Acquisition of Flanagan Property		275,000	
Winnipeg, Man.—purchase of Children's Home to provide accommodation for veterans care cases		148,000	
Calgary—J. Leslie Bell property		12,000	
			745,000
Soldier Settlement—purchase of right-of-way, etc., re Canada Alaska Highway			26,000
Advertising and radio publicity re measures for rehabilitation of members of the armed forces			204,000
Sundries			71,000
			32,759,000
Total Direct War Expenditures, 1944-45 under War Appropriation Act			$ 3,615,101,000

37. Under the War Appropriation (United Nations Mutual Aid) Acts, $803,346,000 was expended in the fiscal year ended March 31, 1945. The following table gives the distribution by countries and the type of aid provided.

DISTRIBUTION OF MUTUAL AID BY COUNTRIES

United Kingdom	$ 598,751,973
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	87,436,954
Australia	47,672,519
China	14,676,879
France	17,551,779
New Zealand	7,796,734
India	14,431,201
British West Indies	3,881,858
United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration	11,092,754
	$ 803,292,651

DISTRIBUTION OF MUTUAL AID BY TYPE OF AID

Munitions and Military Supplies, including ships—	
Aircraft and parts	$117,850,961
Automotive equipment and mechanical transport	131,677,341
Tanks and other fighting equipment	38,261,251
Chemicals and explosives	12,542,417
Guns and small arms	34,560,677
Shells and ammunition	103,683,947
Merchant vessels—	
Construction	43,074,718
Repairs and servicing	5,065,077
Naval vessels and equipment	17,947,438

Munitions and Military Supplies—*Con.*		
Clothes, clothing and fabrics	6,975,606	
Radio, electrical and telephone equipment	30,827,481	
Lumber and heavy materials	5,938,376	
Machine tools and heavy equipment	10,281,443	
Small tools, stores and miscellaneous	2,963,184	
Aluminium	9,316,915	
Other base metals	11,844,951	
Locomotives and railway rolling stock	5,466,328	
Freight	16,154,930	
Cancellation charges	3,156	
		$604,436,197
Foodstuffs and Farm Products—		
Bacon	$ 49,765,350	
Canned pork	1,354,835	
Offals	361,102	
Casings	429,232	
Beef	6,725,137	
Other meats	85,695	
Lard	2,653,310	
Cheese	4,214,736	
Milk	95,000	
Eggs	8,235,653	
Dehydrated vegetables	2,749,010	
Fresh apples	59,945	
Dried apple rings	581,298	
Dried beans and canned corn	205,400	
Garden seeds	20,306	
Forage crop seeds	284,400	
Seed potatoes	325,621	
Canned salmon	193,837	
Canned herring	1,653,213	
Frozen fish	1,329,446	
Other fish products	2,192,281	
Wheat	47,554,590	
Flour	37,968,191	
Linseed oil	1,271,731	
Rolled oats	923,231	
Oatmeal	300,105	
		171,632,655
General Supplies—		
Asbestos	$ 954,480	
Paper	71,499	
Farm machinery	2,337,967	
Boots, clothing and fabrics	529,265	
Fertilizers and chemicals	494,666	
Soap	572,202	
Miscellaneous	459,384	
		5,419,463
Air Training Services under B.C.A.T.P.		14,159,836
United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration—Contribution to Central Committee		7,664,500
		$803,292,651
Administration		53,051
		$803,345,702

SPECIAL EXPENDITURES

38. Special expenditures for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1945, totalled $7,506,000 compared with $37,496,000 in the previous fiscal year. This decrease is occasioned mainly by the decrease in the payments of awards to farmers under the Wheat Acreage Reduction Plan.

GOVERNMENT OWNED ENTERPRISES

39. The classification of expenditures entitled Government Owned Enterprises comprises the losses of and non-Active Advances to Government Owned Enterprises which had been established before the war and are operated as separate corporations. As the Canadian National Railways has shown substantial annual surpluses since 1940, expenditure under this heading since the fiscal year 1940-41 has been of minor importance, the total for 1944-45 being $1,358,000.

Canadian National Railways

40. The operating revenues of the Canadian National Railways for the calendar year 1944 totalled $441,148,000, the highest in the Company's history.

41. Operating expenses of the railway amounted to $362,547,000, an increase of $38,072,000 over the previous year. This increase was occasioned by the higher wage rates prevailing in 1944, higher prices for materials and additional maintenance expenditures.

42. The net operating revenue of the railway was $78,600,000 and after deducting $10,876,000 for taxes, equipment and joint facility rents, there remained a net railway operating income of $67,725,000. Other income, less deductions, amounted to $3,372,000, and accordingly the net income available for payment of interest was $71,097,000. After payment of interest charges of $28,136,000 on debt held by the public and interest charges of $19,934,000 due to the government in respect of temporary loans for capital and refunding purposes, there was a net cash surplus of $23,027,000. This cash surplus was paid to the government in redemption of loans and advances.

43. The operating deficit of the Prince Edward Island Car Ferry and Terminals during 1944 was $773,000 compared with $698,000 in the previous year.

Canadian National Steamships

44. The Canadian National (West Indies) Steamships, Limited, in the calendar year 1944 produced an operating profit of $1,974,000. After payment of $521,700 in bond interest and exchange and $181,000 in current interest due to the government, there was available $1,271,000 which was paid to the government in reduction of interest arrears and capital advances.

National Harbours Board

45. The operating income of the National Harbours Board for the calendar year 1944, after payment of interest to the public but before depreciation, reserve for replacements and interest on Government advances totalled $5,580,515 compared with $4,596,917 in 1943. Interest paid to the government in the fiscal year amounted to $4,000,000.

46. Financial assistance provided by the government to the National Harbours Board and charged to expenditure under the category of Government Owned Enterprises totalled $584,674, divided as follows: $59,000 for the operating deficit of Churchill Harbour: $275,000 for non-active advances to meet the deficit of the Jacques Cartier Bridge at Montreal: $47,500 for the retirement of maturing debentures of the Saint John Harbour Commission and $28,000 for capital expenditures, Saint John Harbour; $16,500 for capital expenditures, Halifax Harbour and $158,400 for the retirement of maturing debentures of the Three Rivers Harbour Commission. Details of expenditures charged to the War Appropriation are given under "War Expenditures".

47. The elevators at Port Colborne and Prescott operated at a profit during the year and $291,000 was paid to the government.

OTHER CHARGES

48. The total of Other Charges, the final category of expenditures was $47,762,000.

49. The largest item in this category is the amount of $25,000,000, which has been added to the reserve to meet possible losses on the ultimate realization of active assets. This is the same amount as has been provided in the four previous fiscal years and the total reserve therefore now amounts to $125,000,000. The annual write-off from active assets of Soldier and General Land Settlement Loans amounted to $325,000 and the concellation of Canadian Farm Loan Board Capital Stock amounted to $1,000. The provision of the reserve and the two write-offs resulted in a proportionate increase in the dominion's net debt.

50. There was written-off from non-active assets an amount of $36,000 representing the yearly established losses on Seed Grain and Relief account administered by the Department of Mines and Resources. As this account is classified as a non-active asset and therefore included in the net debt of Canada it is offset by a similar amount on the Revenue side under "Other Receipts and Credits".

51. The remaining items in Other Charges totalling $22,400,000, relate to the Canadian National Railways Securities Trust stock. The value of this stock which represents the dominion's equity in the Canadian National Railways increased during the year by $23,027,000, due to the surplus earnings of the System for 1944, less $627,000 due to capital abandonment during the year. The Canadian National Railways Securities Trust Stock is carried in the dominion's books as a non-active asset, and thus the net debt of Canada is not affected by these transactions.

SUMMARY OF EXPENDITURES

52. The grand total of expenditure for the fiscal year 1944-45 under the various categories enumerated, namely Ordinary Expenditures, Capital Expenditures, War Expenditures, Special Expenditures, Losses of and non-active advances to government-owned enterprises, and Other Charges, was $5,245,612,000.

53. The following table shows the percentage distribution of estimated revenues and expenditures for a number of important items. Receipts from various taxes and other revenue sources, after deducting the $219,500,000 of income and excess profits taxes estimated as refundable after the war, are shown as percentages both of total revenues and of total expenditures. Similarly, several of the main items of expenditure or groups of such items are shown as percentages both of total expenditures and of total revenues. The purpose of this table is to enable broad conclusions to be drawn as to the relative burdens imposed on the public treasury by the war and the main services or obligations of government.

54. It should be noted that many expenditures attributable to the war are not charged to the War Appropriation. The interest on the increased public debt and practically all the expenses of war-expanded departments like the Post Office and National Revenue—are charged to Ordinary Expenditures. Accordingly, the so-called non-war expenditures have increased greatly during the war despite the fact that the controllable portion has only increased from $112,200,000 in 1938-39 to $119,800,000 in 1944-45. The following table gives an analysis of non-war expenditure for the fiscal year 1944-45 and the five previous fiscal years:

ANALYSIS OF NON-WAR EXPENDITURE (1)

(Millions of Dollars)

	Fiscal Years Ended March 31:					
	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945
1. Grand Total Expenditure	680·8	1,249·6	1,885·1	4,387·1	5,322·3	5,245·6
2. *Less* War Expenditure (2)	118·3	752·0	1,339·7	3,724·2	4,587·0	4,418·4
3. Total Non-War Expenditure (1)	562·5	497·6	545·4	662·9	735·2	827·2
Deduct Uncontrollable Items: (3)						
4. Unemployment Insurance (4)	.....	0·1	9·6	16·1	17·5	17·9
5. Public Debt Charges	134·6	145·7	171·6	202·5	262·1	339·8
6. Pensions, Superannuation, etc.	75·7	74·9	73·7	73·2	72·9	75·2
7. National Revenue Department	12·1	12·2	13·4	15·2	17·7	20·1
8. Post Office Department	36·7	38·7	41·5	44·7	48·5	54·6
9. Subsidies, and Payments to Provinces under Taxation Agreements.	19·2	19·2	35·5	108·7	109·9	107·8
10. National Defence Department	13·2	0·2	0·3	0·4	0·1	0·1
11. War Service Gratuities and Re-establishment Credits	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	20·2
12. Premium Discount and Exchange	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	16·3
13. Special Expenditure	89·1	42·9	64·0	31·3	37·5	7·5
14. C.N.R. Operating Deficits	40·1	17·0	.....	.....	.....	.....
15. Adjustment of C.N.R. Securities Trust Stock for Net Income Surpluses and Capital Gains	.....	5·5	4·1	36·1	37·8	22·4
16. Write-down of Assets	23·3	29·9	27·9	29·7	25·6	25·4
17. Total to be Deducted (4 to 16)	444·0	386·3	441·6	558·1	629·6	707·4
18. All Other Non-War Expenditure, (5) (3 minus 17)	118·5	111·3	103·8	104·8	105·6	119·8

(1) All expenditure not charged to war appropriations.
(2) Expenditure charged to war appropriations.
(3) Including services initiated or expanded during the war as a matter of policy, such as Unemployment Insurance; certain expenditure showing increases largely attributable to the war, such as those of the Departments of National Revenue and Post Office; contractual items; expenditures classed as "Special" (mostly for relief and farm assistance purposes); and certain bookkeeping adjustments.
(4) The Government's contribution and the cost of administration.
(5) Controllable expenditures not specially affected by the war. Note, however, that the war has increased the costs of many of the services concerned, for example by necessitating cost-of-living bonuses

OVER-ALL DEFICIT

55. As total revenues for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1945, were $2,687,334,000 and expenditures aggregated $5,245,612,000, the over-all deficit or increase in net debt for the year was $2,558,278,000.

[Mr. Ilsley.]

LOANS, ADVANCES AND INVESTMENTS

56. In addition to the expenditures aleady detailed, the government makes disbursements for the acquisition of investments which are treated as "active" and are deducted from total gross liabilities in arriving at the figure

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE, 1944-45

—	Amount in thousands of dollars	Percentage of Total Revenue	Percentage to Total Expenditure
	$	%	%
Ordinary Revenue—			
Customs Import Duties	115,091	4·28	2·19
Excise Duties	151,922	5·65	2·90
Excise Taxes—sales tax and other excise taxes	444,901	16·56	8·48
War Exchange Tax	98,164	3·65	1·87
Income tax on persons, corporations, etc. (net)	977,758	36·39	18·64
Excess Profits Tax (net)	341,305	12·70	6·51
Succession Duties	17,251	0·64	0·33
Other Tax Revenues	8,234	0·31	0·16
Total Revenue from Taxes	2,154,626	80·18	41·08
Non-tax Revenue	145,471	5·41	2·77
Total Ordinary Revenue	2,300,097	85·59	43·85
Special Receipts and Credits	387,237	14·41	7·38
Grand Total Revenue	2,687,334	100·00	51·23

—	Amount in thousands of dollars	Percentage of Total Expenditure	Percentage to Total Revenue
	$	%	%
Ordinary Expenditure—			
Interest on Public Debt	318,995	6·08	11·87
Other Public Debt Charges	20,851	0·40	0·78
Subsidies and payments to provinces under taxation agreements	107,779	2·06	4·01
Old Age Pensions and pensions for blind persons	32,187	0·61	1·20
Unemployment Insurance Act, administration and Government's contribution	17,861	0·34	0·66
Agriculture	9,424	0·18	0·35
Mines and Resources	12,296	0·23	0·46
National Revenue	20,114	0·38	0·75
Post Office	54,629	1·04	2·03
Public Works	13,169	0·25	0·49
Transport	18,265	0·35	0·68
Veterans Affairs	81,031	1·55	3·01
All other	60,775	1·16	2·26
Total Ordinary Expenditure	767,376	14·63	28·55
Capital Expenditure	3,164	0·06	0·12
War Expenditure—			
National Defence—Army	1,261,755	24·05	46·95
Navy	417,099	7·95	15·52
Air	1,259,456	24·01	46·87
Munitions and Supply	215,844	4·12	8·03
Other Departments	460,946	8·79	17·15
War Appropriation (United Nations Mutual Aid) Acts	803,346	15·31	29·89
Total War Expenditure	4,418,446	84·23	164·41
Special Expenditure	7,506	0·14	0·28
Government Owned Enterprises	1,358	0·03	0·05
Other Charges	47,762	0·91	1·78
Grand Total Expenditure	5,245,612	100·00	195·19

of net debt. The net increase in loans, advances and investments for 1944-45 was $457,458,000 compared with $635,341,000 in 1943-44. Details of these increases together with those for the four previous fiscal years will be found in the table on page 39.

Railway and Steamship Companies—

57. The net increase in this category in the fiscal year ended March 31, 1945, was $83,608,000, and relates entirely to transactions with the Canadian National Railways.

58. In the fiscal year the government made net payments to the Canadian National Railways in the amount of $83,607,995, classified as follows:

Advances—	
Under Canadian National Railways Refunding Act, 1938—for retirement of maturing issues	$ 35,000,000
Under Canadian National Railways Refunding Act, 1944—for retirement of maturing issues	56,684,000
Under Canadian National Railways Financing and Guarantee Act, 1940—Purchase of Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada 4% Perpetual Consolidated Debenture Stock	425,434
Under Canadian National Railways Financing and Guarantee Acts, 1941 and 1942—Purchase of securities from Canadian holders	58,199
Under the War Appropriation (United Kingdom Financing) Act, 1942—Purchase of securities from government of the United Kingdom	1,019,149
Total advances by way of loan	$ 93,186,782
Equipment purchased by government and leased to Railway under Hire-Purchase Agreements:	
1943 Agreement	$ 6,058,498
1944 Agreement	14,705,925
Total Equipment Purchased	$ 20,764,423
Total Loans and Equipment Purchased	$113,951,205
Repayments—	
Application of 1944 Net Income Surplus to advances under Refunding Act, 1938	$ 23,026,924
Surplus available from Depreciation Reserves and Debt Discount Amortization after providing for capital expenditures during 1944—Applied to advances under the Refunding Act, 1938	2,776,532
Financing and Guarantee Act, 1941—Purchase of securities	86,312
	$ 25,889,768
Repayments of Instalments under Hire-Purchase Agreements:	
1936 Agreement	$ 517,173
1940 Agreement	991,968
1941 Agreement	1,382,634
1943 Agreement	1,561,667
Total Equipment Repayments	$ 4,453,442
Total Repayments of Loans and Equipment Repayments	$ 30,343,210
Net Total Payments on account of Loans and for Equipment Purchased	$ 83,607,995

Foreign Exchange Control Board—

59. During the fiscal year $265,000,000 was advanced to the Foreign Exchange Control Board to enable the Board to finance the purchase of gold and foreign exchange.

Sundry Government Agencies—

60. The net change in the fiscal year in advances to the National Harbours Board was only $8,000. Advances of $19,000 were made for capital purposes at the port of Montreal, while a capital refund of $11,000 was received from Vancouver.

61. The net increase in the fiscal year in advances for Soldier and General Land Settlement aggregated $3,948,000. This increase was occasioned by advances of $7,958,000 under the Veterans' Land Act, less net repayments by settlers and $325,000 written off and charged to Consolidated Deficit Account.

62. Net advances to Sundry Crown Companies were reduced during the year by $17,374,000, due principally to the liquidation of inventories, repayment of working capital and transfer of surplus assets to War Assets Corporation. An advance of $500,000 was made to the Export Credits Insurance Corporation which commenced operations in the fiscal year.

63. Net advances to Sundry Crown Plants—Privately Managed were reduced by $10,309,000 due principally to the return of working capital provided in prior years.

Provincial and Municipal Governments—

64. Advances under this category increased in the fiscal year by $15,599,000 due to the government implementing its guarantee to the chartered banks under the Saskatchewan Seed Grain Loans Guarantee Act, 1938. The net advances for this purpose outstanding at the close of the fiscal year, less repayments recovered from amounts payable to the Province totalled $15,887,000. Small repayments on Relief Loans were received during the year from Alberta, British Columbia and Saskatche-

wan. Repayments of $168,000 were received from municipalities on loans made under the authority of the Municipal Improvements Assistance Act, 1938.

United Kingdom and Other Governments—

65. Net advances under this heading decreased by $38,272,000 during the year. Food advance accounts for the purchase of food by the United Kingdom increased by $10,613,000. The Canadian dollar obligation of the government of the United Kingdom under the authority of the War Appropriation (United Kingdom Financing) Act, 1942, was reduced by $55,098,000, leaving a balance outstanding of $602,510,000.

66. Recoverable advances on account of air training increased during the year by $81,586,000, due to increased advances to the government of the United Kingdom.

67. Advances to War Supplies Limited were completely liquidated by repayment totalling $71,158,000.

68. The remaining items in this category covering many departments and governments decreased by $4,215,000 during the year.

Miscellaneous—

69. In the period from April 1, 1944 to March 31, 1945, 1065 loans were approved under the National Housing Act, 1938, and 862 under the National Housing Act, 1944, in the amount of $3,772,740 and $3,575,785 respectively. During the year repayments of loans exceeded loan disbursements by $1,240,000, leaving the balance outstanding at March 31, 1945, at $14,721,232.

70. Loans by the Department of Munitions and Supply to private companies under the authority of the War Appropriation Act increased by $7,975,000 in the fiscal year ended Mach 31, 1945.

Investments—

71. The government's investment in the Canadian Farm Loan Board decreased during the year by $5,001,000, due to the purchase by the Board out of its surplus funds of $5,000,000 of its 3½% bonds due January 2, 1960. In addition $1,000 of the Board's capital stock was written off to Consolidated Deficit Account. At the end of the fiscal year the government's investment in the Canadian Farm Loan Board totalled $24,024,000.

72. Miscellaneous investments increased during the year by $153,552,000. The main item in this category is the Securities Investment Account consisting chiefly of the cost of acquisition of dominion government direct and guaranteed securities including Victory Bonds held under instalment purchase plans for civil servants and members of the Armed Forces.

73. The following table gives the details of the annual changes in loans, advances and investments in the fiscal year ended March 31. 1945, and the four previous fiscal years.

ANNUAL CHANGES IN ACTIVE LOANS AND ADVANCES AND INVESTMENTS, 1940-41 TO 1944-45

(In thousands of dollars)

	Fiscal Years Ended March 31				
	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945
Loans and Advances—					
RAILWAY AND STEAMSHIP COMPANIES					
1. Canadian National Railways	113,747	251,240	142,539	Cr. 3,907	83,608
2. Canadian National Steamships — Canadian Government Merchant Marine Ltd	800	Cr. 800	.....	.....	.....
3. Canadian Pacific Railway Co	6,396	Cr. 2,085	Cr. 12,814	.....	.....
4. Net Total, Railway and Steamship Companies	120,943	248,355	129,725	Cr. 3,907	83,608
5. Foreign Exchange Control Board	325,000	400,000	Cr.325,000	185,000	265,000
SUNDRY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES					
6. Canadian Broadcasting Corporation	Cr. 364	Cr. 283	Cr. 503	.....	.....
7. National Harbours Board	Cr. 333	Cr. 980	Cr. 267	Cr. 127	8
8. Soldier Settlement of Canada	Cr. 2,150	Cr. 1,791	Cr. 1,692	Cr. 2,090	3,948
9. Sundry Crown Companies (war activities)	9,866	15,397	45,140	63,317	Cr. 17,374
10. Sundry Crown Plants, privately managed (war activities)	.....	.....	.....	57,007	Cr. 10,309
11. Other	1	8	4	Cr. 11	38
12. Net Total, Sundry Government Agencies	7,020	12,351	42,682	118,096	Cr. 23,689
13. Provincial and Municipal Governments	1,656	Cr. 629	Cr. 899	Cr. 437	15,599
UNITED KINGDOM AND OTHER GOVERNMENTS					
14. United Kingdom, food advance accounts	.....	.....	6,755	13,244	10,613
15. United Kingdom, loan under The War Appropriation (U.K. Financing) Act, 1942	.....	.....	700,000	Cr. 42,392	Cr. 55,098
16. United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand —air training accounts	33,956	72,199	56,360	205,403	81,586
17. Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, loan for the purchase of wheat	.....	.....	917	9,083	.....
18. War Supplies Ltd., for munitions to be sold to the United States of America	.....	.....	83,042	Cr. 11,884	Cr. 71,158
19. Sundry Governments, miscellaneous recoverable accounts	6,444	7,405	661	16,766	Cr. 4,215
20. Net Total, U.K. and other Governments	40,400	79,604	847,735	190,220	Cr. 38,272
MISCELLANEOUS					
21. Dominion and National Housing Acts	3,805	2,644	239	Cr. 532	Cr. 1,240
22. Sundry munitions contractors, etc. (Department of Munitions and Supply)	25	9,260	3,640	Cr. 3,964	7,975
23. Sundry loans and advances	Cr. 124	Cr. 651	Cr. 329	Cr. 61	Cr. 126
24. Net Total, Miscellaneous	3,706	11,253	3,550	Cr. 4,557	6,661
25. Net Total, All Loans and Advances	498,725	750,934	697,793	484,415	308,907
INVESTMENTS					
26. Canadian Farm Loan Board	850	Cr. 985	Cr. 2,507	Cr. 5,005	Cr. 5,001
27. Other investments	Cr. 38,524	6,530	Cr. 7,645	155,931	153,552
28. Net total, Investments	Cr. 37,674	5,545	Cr. 10,152	150,926	148,551
29. Net Total of changes in Loans and Advances and Investments	461,051	756,479	687,641	635,341	457,458

[Mr. Ilsley.]

74. In the fiscal year ended March 31, 1945, the Dominion issued securities in the domestic market in an amount of $4,069,222,680. This amount includes the net increase of $20,000,000 in Treasury Bills and $210,000,000 in Deposit Certificates outstanding, but does not include the amount of the recurring issues of Treasury Bills and Deposit Certificates issued to refund similar securities maturing during the year. In the fiscal year $1,241,580,589 of Dominion obligations matured or were called for redemption, leaving the sum of $2,827,642,091, less cost of flotations, available for direct and indirect war expenditures.

The following table gives the details of issues sold during the year, divided as to original issue by sales to the Bank of Canada, the chartered banks and the general public (it does not include the $33,293,471, 4% School Lands Debentures held by the Prairie Provinces which were again renewed for one year):

—	Issue Date	Maturity Date	Interest Rate	Price to Government	Yield at Price to Government	Total Amount Issued	Renewals or Conversions included in Amount Issued	Amount Issued for cash
			%	$	%	$	$	$
Treasury Bills (net increase)						20,000,000		20,000,000
Sold to Bank of Canada								
One Year Notes	April 15, 1944.	April 15, 1945...	1	100 00	1·00	250,000,000	250,000,000	
Two Year Notes	April 15, 1944.	April 15, 1946...	1½	99 85	1·45	100,000,000	100,000,000	
Six Months Notes	Sept. 1, 1944..	March 1, 1945...	¾	100 00	0·75	104,000,000	104,000,000	
Six Months Notes	Oct. 16, 1944..	April 16, 1945...	¾	100 00	0·75	102,000,000	102,000,000	
Six Months Notes	March 1, 1945.	Sept. 1, 1945....	¾	100 00	0·75	154,000,000	154,000,000	
Sold to Chartered Banks						710,000,000	710,000,000	
Deposit Certificates (net increase)			¾	100 00	0·75	210,000,000		210,000,000
Sold to General Public								
Sixth Victory Loan	May 1, 1944...	March 1, 1948...	1¾	99 59	1·86	239,713,000		239,713,000
Sixth Victory Loan	May 1, 1944...	June 1, 1960.....	3	99 37	3·05	1,165,300,350		1,165,300,350
Seventh Victory Loan	Nov. 1, 1944..	Nov. 1, 1948....	1¾	99 61	1·85	344,267,000	147,544,000	1,512,362,200
Seventh Victory Loan	Nov. 1, 1944..	Feb. 1, 1962.....	3	99 39	3·05	1,315,639,200		
War Savings Certificates and Stamps (net)			3(1)	100 00	(1)3·00	28,801,982		28,801,982
Non-Interest Bearing Certificates (net)		June 15, 1947....		100 00		2,207,677		2,207,677
						3,095,929,209	147,544,000	2,948,385,209
Grand Total						4,035,929,209	857,544,000	3,178,385,209

(1) Yield to investor if held to maturity, seven and one-half years after issue date, amount issued includes interest accrued during the year on outttanding certificates.

75. In the fiscal year 1944-45, the Sixth and Seventh Victory Loans were sold, both being larger than any previous Canadian loan sold for cash. The Sixth Victory Loan was sold entirely for cash in the amount of $1,405,013,350, the number of subscriptions being 3,077,123. The Seventh Victory Loan was sold in the amount of $1,512,362,200 for cash and $147,544,000 in conversion of bonds maturing or called for redemption on October 15, 1944. The number of cash subscriptions was 3,306,990 and the number of conversion subscriptions was 20,325.

76. The following table sets out the bond redemptions in the fiscal year ended March 31, 1945:

DOMINION OF CANADA BOND REDEMPTIONS 1944-45

Maturity or Call Date	Interest Rate	Where Payable	Amount
	%		$
April 15, 1944	1	Canada	250,000,000
April 15, 1944	1½	Canada	100,000,000
June 1, 1944	2	Canada	90,625,000
July 1, 1944	4	Canada	33,293,471
September 1, 1944	1½	Canada	150,000,000
October 15, 1944	4½	Canada	50,000,000
October 15, 1944 (1)	3½	Canada	138,322,000
October 16, 1944	1½	Canada	200,000,000
November 15, 1944	2½	Canada	20,000,000
March 1, 1945	¾	Canada	104,000,000
March 1, 1945	2	Canada	105,000,000
October 1, 1947 (2)	2½	London	68,945
May 1, 1955 (3)	3¼	London	134,077
September 1, 1958 (3)	4	London	90,481
July 1, 1963 (3)	3¼	London	46,615
Total			1,241,580,589
Less amounts renewed or converted (4)			890,837,471
Provided from cash resources			350,743,118

(1) Maturity date October 15, 1949, called for redemption on October 15, 1944.

(2) This issue was vested by the Treasury of the United Kingdom in January, 1942. The amount (at par of exchange) purchased in the fiscal year 1944-45 was cancelled.

(3) These issues were vested by the Treasury of the United Kingdom in August, 1941. The amounts (at par of exchange) purchased in the fiscal year 1944-45 were cancelled.

(4) Total from previous table $857,544,000 and School Lands Debenture Stock, viz. $33,293,471.

77. The fortnightly issue of three months' Treasury Bills was continued during the year and the amount was increased by $20,000,000 to $380,000,000. The last issue in the fiscal year was sold at a discount of ·365 per cent.

The average rate of interest on the dominion's direct funded debt (including Treasury Bills and Deposit Certificates) outstanding at March 31, 1945, was 2·51 per cent. This compares with 2·54 per cent on the debt outstanding at the close of the preceding year.

CASH DEFICIENCY

78. The following table shows the total cash deficiency of the Government for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1945, at $2,955,000,000. The comparable figure for the previous fiscal year was $3,065,600,000.

79. The significant thing is that while the budgetary deficit for 1944-45 was $2,558,277,000, the cash deficiency (that is the excess of cash requirements over receipts other than borrowing) was $396,700,000 greater. It is the sum of $2,955,000,000 which had to be met by borrowing from the Canadian people.

REQUIREMENTS FOR AND SOURCES OF CASH, FISCAL YEAR 1944-45 (1)

(Millions of Dollars)

REQUIREMENTS FOR CASH			
Non-War Requirements (2)—			
Expenditure—			
Interest on the public debt	$ 319·0		
Payments to provinces under the tax agreements	93·3		
Other Ordinary Expenditure (3)	325·9		
		$ 738·2	
Capital Expenditure		3·2	
Special Expenditure		7·5	
Government Owned Enterprises		1·4	
Total Non-War Cash Expenditure (3) (4)		750·3	
Outlay that Increased Assets or Decreased Liabilities—			
Active loans, advances, investments, etc.—			
Bond Holding Account (including repatriated securities and bonds held under instalment purchase plans)	151·3		
Canadian National Railways (5)	71·0		
Other (net)	24·2		
Sub-total	246·5		
Cost of loan flotations, portion to be amortized	17·9		
Reduction of New York indebtedness (6)	0·9		
Purchase price of increase in holdings of gold and U.S. dollars (7)	119·4		
		384·7	
			$ 1,135·0
War Requirements (2)—			
Expenditure—			
Department of National Defence—			
Army	$ 1,238·6		
Navy	417·1		
Air Force	1,259·5		
Department of Munitions and Supply	184·8		
Other Departments	461·0		
Total War Appropriation Act	$ 3,561·0		
The War Appropriation (United Nations Mutual Aid) Acts	803·3		
		4,364·3	
Outlay that Increased Assets or Decreased Liabilities—			
Active loans, advances, investments, etc.—			
Department of National Defence recoverable advances	80·4		
Foreign Exchange Control Board	265·0		
Canadian National Railways (5)	18·3		
Other (net)	−139·0		
Sub-total	224·7		
Revaluation of war plants	− 7·1		
Reduction of London indebtedness (6)	0·3		
Less purchase price of decrease in holdings of sterling balances	−11·9		
		206·0	
			4,570·3
Total Requirements for Cash			5,705·3

FOOTNOTES

(1) "Cash" and "non-cash" transactions are sometimes difficult to define; for example, interest payments to certain trust and other accounts are left on deposit with the Receiver General. Those here treated as non-cash are limited to adjustments to the valuation of assets and liabilities, and the amortization of loan flotation charges.

(2) War requirements means outlays under the war appropriation acts and such other accounts as obviously relate to the war; non-war means all other requirements.

(3) Excluding the amortization of bond discounts and commissions, $12·8 million.

[Mr. Ilsley.]

REQUIREMENTS FOR AND SOURCES OF CASH, FISCAL YEAR 1944-45

(Millions of Dollars)

SOURCES OF CASH			
Revenue—			
Ordinary Revenue—			
Customs duties, excise duties, and excise taxes	$ 810·1		
Personal income tax	767·8		
Corporate income tax	276·4		
Excess profits tax	465·8		
Other tax revenue	54·0		
Total tax revenue	$ 2,374·1		
Post Office revenue	66·1		
Return on investments	60·7		
Other Ordinary Revenue [8]	20·0		
Gross Ordinary Revenue [8]	$ 2,520·9		
Less estimated refundable portion of personal income tax and excess profits tax	−219·5		
		$ 2,301·4	
Capital Refunds		0·7	
Special Receipts and Credits [9]		356·4	
			$ 2,658·5
Other Receipts—			
Miscellaneous receipts and credits on war account		32·2	
Miscellaneous receipts and credits on non-war account		59·5	
			91·7
Borrowing in Canada—			
New Issues of Funded Debt—			
Treasury Bills, net increase	$ 20·0		
Chartered banks, net	112·0		
General public [10]	2,948·4		
		3,080·4	
Less Maturities paid off in cash		−252·4	
Estimated refundable portion of personal income tax and excess profits tax		219·3	
Net increase in funded debt		3,047·3	
Net increase in floating debt		59·5	
Net increase in funded and floating debt		3,106·8	
Increase in Cash Balances held in domestic currency		−151·8	
Total of borrowing less increase in cash balances (equals "cash deficiency")			2,955·0
Total sources of Cash			$ 5,705·3

FOOTNOTES—*Concluded*

(4) Excluding the write-down of assets, $25·4 million, and adjustments of the valuation of C.N.R. Securities Trust Stock due to the net income surplus and capital gain, $22·4 million.

(5) For details see page 36. The advances treated as relating to the war are those for the repatriation of sterling securities, and the purchase of equipment leased to the railway under the terms of the 1940 and subsequent agreements.

(6) Including both matured and unmatured funded debt, and the premium or discount on foreign funds.

(7) Computed by adding the 10% exchange premium to the change during the year. The figures exclude changes in funds held for special purposes.

(8) Adjusted by the addition of $1·3 million (net) with respect to Premium, Discount and Exchange arising out of the fact that foreign exchange is valued at par on the balance sheet, but is valued at current levels for the purpose of this table.

(9) Excluding the adjustment of the reserve against losses of the Canadian Wheat Board, and the entry recording the increase in value of the C.N.R. Securities Trust Stock.

(10) Includes the increase in value of War Savings Certificates during the year due to interest accruals, $5·8 million.

NATIONAL DEBT

80. The gross unmatured funded debt (including Deposit Certificates, Treasury Bills and the estimated refundable portion of personal income tax and excess profits tax) of the Dominion outstanding at the close of the fiscal year 1944-45, was $13,983,764,000. Other liabilities consisting chiefly of Deposit and Trust Accounts, Insurance, Pension and Guaranty Accounts totalled $1,728,418,000 on the same date. The gross liabilities of the Dominion on March 31, 1945, were $15,712,182,000. On the other side of the balance sheet there are active assets totalling $4,413,820,000, consisting of cash, loans and advances and investments, less a reserve of $125,000,000 for possible losses on their ultimate realization. If the amount of net active assets is deducted from the amount of gross liabilities, there results a figure of $11,298,362,000, representing the net debt of the Dominion as at March 31, 1945. The increase in the net debt in the year was $2,558,278,000, or the amount of the over-all deficit for the fiscal year 1944-45.

81. The following is a condensed balance sheet of the Dominion, together with details of non-active assets:

BALANCE SHEET—MARCH 31, 1945

(Thousands of Dollars)

Liabilities—			
Floating Debt—			
Matured Funded Debt Outstanding		$ 18,701	
Stock and other obligations payable on demand		419	
Interest due and outstanding		28,835	
Outstanding cheques and warrants		112,547	
Post Office Account		4,565	
			$ 165,067
Deposit and Trust Accounts—			
Post Office Savings Bank Deposits		33,469	
Bank Circulation Redemption Fund		2,259	
Indian Trust Funds		16,638	
Miscellaneous		941,235	
			993,601
Insurance, Pension and Guaranty Accounts—			
Government Annuities		243,538	
Insurance Fund—Civil Service		18,020	
Insurance Fund—Returned Soldiers		22,762	
Unemployment Insurance Fund (Cash portion only)		6,103	
Other Insurance Funds		21,951	
Civil Service Superannuation Account		79,147	
Civil Service Retirement Fund		13,923	
Other Pension Funds		1,028	
			406,472
Deferred Credits			26,379
Sundry Suspense Accounts			81,334
Province Debt Accounts			11,920
Reserve or Certain Contingent Liabilities			43,645
Funded Debt Unmatured—			
Payable in Canada—			
Bonds, Deposit Certificates and Treasury Bills		13,194,427	
Refundable Portion of Personal Income Tax and Excess Profits Tax (estimated)		444,271	
Payable in London		12,066	
Payable in New York		333,000	13,983,764
			$ 15,712,182
Assets—			
Cash—			
In Current Deposits		$ 154,974	
In Special Deposits		2,793	
			$ 157,767
Departmental Working Capital Advances			7,374
Loans and Advances—			
To Railway and Steamship Companies—			
Canadian National Railways	$ 655,915		
Canadian National (West Indies) Steamships Ltd.	450		
		656,365	
To Foreign Exchange Control Board		850,000	
To Sundry Government Agencies—			
Soldier Settlement of Canada	34,055		
National Harbours Board	85,031		
Crown Companies	116,346		
Crown Plants Privately Managed	46,698		
Other	40		
		282,170	
To Provincial and Municipal Governments—			
Unemployment Relief Loans	156,291		
Province of Alberta—Subsidy overpayment	350		
Province of Saskatchewan—Seed Grain Loans Guarantee 1938	15,887		
Municipal Improvements Assistance Act	5,543		
Other	183		
		178,254	

BALANCE SHEET—MARCH 31, 1945—*Concluded*

Assets—Con.			
Loans and Advances—*Con.*			
To United Kingdom and Other Governments—			
United Kingdom—War Appropriation (United Kingdom Financing) Act	602,510		
Government of Greece	6,525		
Government of Roumania	24,329		
Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	10,000		
Other	508,488		
		1,151,852	
Miscellaneous—			
Dominion and National Housing Acts	14,721		
Other	20,345		
		35,066	
			3,153,707
Investments—			
Bank of Canada—Capital stock		5,920	
Canadian Farm Loan Board—			
Advances and Capital Stock		24,024	
Miscellaneous		343,963	
			373,907
Province Debt Accounts			2,296
Deferred Charges—Unamortized Discounts and Commissions on Loans			86,739
Sundry Suspense Accounts			757,030
			4,538,820
Less—Reserve for possible losses on ultimate realization of active assets			125,000
			4,413,820
Net Debt, March 31, 1945			$ 11,298,362

NET DEBT—MARCH 31, 1945

(Thousands of Dollars)

Net Debt represented by—			
(A) Expenditures for Capital Purposes and Non-Active Assets—			
Public Works—			
Canals			$ 240,237
Railways			427,014
Miscellaneous			315,005
Military Property and Stores			12,617
Territorial Accounts			9,896
Canadian Pacific Railway (old)			62,791
Canadian National Railways Securities Trust Stock			359,081
Canadian National Railways Stock			18,000
Loans Non-Active—			
Canadian National Steamships			13,158
National Harbours Board—			
Chicoutimi		$ 3,838	
Churchill		10	
Halifax		12,502	
Montreal (Jacques Cartier Bridge)		5,840	
Quebec		27,766	
Saint John		17,056	
Three Rivers		3,980	
			70,992
Soldier and General Land Settlement			16,526
Seed Grain and Relief Advances			239
Saskatchewan Seed Grain Loans Guarantee Act, 1936			2,637
Seed Grain Loans Guarantee Act, 1937			7,136
Miscellaneous Non-Active Accounts			2,458
			1,557,787
(B) Consolidated Deficit Account—			
Balance, Consolidated Deficit Account brought forward from March 31, 1944		7,207,056	
Excess of expenditure over revenue, less amounts charged under A above, fiscal year ended March 31, 1945		2,533,519	
			9,740,575
			$ 11,298,362

82. The following table gives the details of the various obligations included in the unmatured funded debt of the Dominion outstanding as at March 31, 1945, and the annual interest charges thereon:

UNMATURED FUNDED DEBT AND TREASURY BILLS AS AT MARCH 31, 1945, AND ANNUAL INTEREST THEREON

Date of Maturity	Rate Per Cent	Where Payable	Amount of Loan	Annual Interest Charges
			$ c.	$ c.
1945, April 15	1	Canada	250,000,000 00	2,500,000 00
April 16	·75	Canada	102,000 000 00	765,000,00
July 1	4	Canada	33,293,470 85	1,331,738 83
July 2	1½	Canada	450,000,000 00	6,750,000 00
Sept. 1	·75	Canada	154,000,000 00	1,155,000 00
1946, Feb. 1	4½	Canada	45,000,000 00	2,025,000 00
April 15	1⅜	Canada	100,000,000 00	1,375,000 00
May 1	1¼	Canada	144,253,000 00	2,524,427 50
Nov. 1	1¾	Canada	197,455,000 00	3,455,462 50
Dec. 15	2	Canada	193,286,000 00	3,865,720 00
1947, May 1	1¾	Canada	373,259,000 00	6,532,032 50
Oct. 1	2½	London	103,084 94	2,577 12
1948, Jan. 15	2½	New York	30,000,000 00	750,000 00
Feb. 1	3¼	Canada	50,000,000 00	1,625,000 00
Mar. 1	2¼	Canada	269,879,000 00	6,072,277 50
Mar. 1	1¾	Canada	239,713,000 00	4,194,977 50
Nov. 1	1¾	Canada	344,267,000 00	6,024,672 50
1949, Feb. 1	3¼	Canada	50,000,000 00	1,625,000 00
June 1	3¼	Canada	33,500,000 00	1,088,750 00
1950, Feb. 1	3¼	Canada	50,000,000 00	1,625,000 00
1951, Feb. 1	3¼	Canada	(1) 50,250,000 00	1,625,000 00
June 15	3	Canada	(2) 649,969,592 50	19,306,027 50
Nov. 15	3½	Canada	60,000,000 00	1,950,000 00
1952, Feb. 1	3¼	Canada	(3) 50,500,000 00	1,625,000 00
Oct. 1	3	Canada	324,945,700 00	9,748,371 00
Oct. 15	4	Canada	56,191,000 00	2,247,640 00
1953, Jan. 15	3	New York	30,000,000 00	900,000 00
1954, Mar. 1	3	Canada	(4) 676,355,489 00	20,089,767 00
1955, May 1	3¼	London	4,958,401 84	161,148 06
June 1	3	Canada	40,000,000 00	1,200,000 00
June 1	3	Canada	55,000,000 00	1,650,000 00
1956, Nov. 1	4½	Canada	43,125,700 00	1,940,656 50
Nov. 1	3	Canada	(5) 855,607,410 50	25,414,081 50
1957, May 1	3	Canada	1,111,261,650 00	33,337,849 50
Nov. 1	4½	Canada	37,523,200 00	1,688,544 00
1958, Jan. 15	3	New York	30,000,000 00	900,000 00
June 1	3	Canada	88,200,000 00	2,646,000 00
Sept. 1	4	London	3,345,182 58	133,807 30
Nov. 1	4½	Canada	276,687,600 00	12,450,942 00
1959, Jan. 1	3	Canada	1,197,324,750 00	35,919,742 50
Nov. 1	4½	Canada	289,693,300 00	13,036,198 50
1960, June 1	3	Canada	1,165,300,350 00	34,959,010 50
Oct. 1	4	New York	100,000,000 00	4,000,000 00
1961, Jan. 15	3½	New York	48,000,000 00	1,560,000 00
1962, Feb. 1	3	Canada	1,315,639,200 00	39,469,176 00
1963, July 1	3¼	London	3,658,863 50	118,913 06
1966, June 1	3¼	Canada	54,703,000 00	1,777,847 50
1967, Jan. 15	3	New York	55,000,000 00	1,650,000 00
1968, Nov. 15	3	New York	40,000,000 00	1,200,000 00
Perpetual	3	Canada	55,000,000 00	1,650,000 00
1945, April 13 Treasury Bills	·371	Canada	65,000,000 00	241,150 00
April 27 Treasury Bills	·371	Canada	65,000,000 00	241,150 00
May 11 Treasury Bills	·371	Canada	55,000,000 00	204,050 00
June 1 Treasury Bills	·368	Canada	65,000,000 00	239,200 00
June 15 Treasury Bills	·365	Canada	65,000,000 00	237,250 00
June 29 Treasury Bills	·365	Canada	65,000,000 00	237,250 00
April 3 Deposit Certificates	·75	Canada	130,000,000 00	975,000 00
April 10 Deposit Certificates	·75	Canada	50,000,000 00	375,000 00
April 17 Deposit Certificates	·75	Canada	140,000,000 00	1,050,000 00
April 24 Deposit Certificates	·75	Canada	145,000,000 00	1,087,500 00
Aug. 28 Deposit Certificates	·75	Canada	57,100,000 00	428,250 00
Sept. 4 Deposit Certificates	·75	Canada	88,920,000 00	666,900 00
Sept. 11 Deposit Certificates	·75	Canada	128,980,000 00	967,350 00
Sept. 18 Deposit Certificates	·75	Canada	110,000,000 00	825,000 00
Sept. 25 Deposit Certificates	·75	Canada	150,000,000 00	1,125,000 00

UNMATURED FUNDED DEBT AND TREASURY BILLS AS AT MARCH 31, 1945, AND ANNUAL INTEREST THEREON—*Concluded*

Date of Maturity	Rate Per Cent	Where Payable	Amount of Loan	Annual Interest Charges
			$ c.	$ c.
1945, June 15 Non-interest Bearing Certificates	.....	Canada	6,443,644 39	.....
1947, June 15 Non-interest Bearing Certificates	.....	Canada	5,808,558 38	.....
War Savings Certificates	3	Canada	261,696,507 09	7,850,895 21
War Savings Stamps	.....	Canada	7,294,936 75	.....
			13,539,492,592 32	346,394,303 58
Refundable portion of personal income tax and excess profits tax (estimated)	2	.....	444,270,982 59	(6)5,195,447 69
			13,983,763,574 91	351,589,751 27
Payable in Canada	.....	.....	$ 13,638,698,042 05	97·53%
Payable in New York	.....	.....	333,000,000 00	2·38%
Payable in London	.....	.....	12,065,532 86	0·09%
			13,983,763,574 91	100·00%

(1) Redeemable at 100½ per cent. Amount outstanding includes $ 250,000.00 redemption bonus.
(2) Redeemable at 101 per cent. Amount outstanding includes $6,435,342.50 redemption bonus.
(3) Redeemable at 101 per cent. Amount outstanding includes $ 500,000.00 redemption bonus.
(4) Redeemable at 101 per cent. Amount outstanding includes $6,696,589.00 redemption bonus.
(5) Redeemable at 101 per cent. Amount outstanding includes $8,471,360.50 redemption bonus.
(6) Interest on refundable portion of personal income tax only.

INDIRECT LIABILITIES

83. Bonds and debenture stocks bearing the guarantee of the Dominion and outstanding in the hands of the public totalled $606,665,000 at March 31, 1945 or a decrease of $92,778,000 from the amount outstanding at the close of the previous year. This decrease is occasioned mainly by the redemption of two Canadian National Railway Company bond issues on May 1, 1944 and July 1, 1944 (due July 1, 1969 but called for prior payment) outstanding in the amounts of $35,000,000 and $56,684,000 respectively. The funds required to meet these maturities were loaned to the Company by the Government.

84. There were also outstanding at the close of the fiscal year other contingent liabilities authorized by various statutes.

85. Guaranteed bank advances to the Canadian Wheat Board totalled $71,166,000 at March 31, 1945, and related to wheat in the amount of $65,564,000; to flax in the amount of $5,211,000 and to rapeseed and sunflower seed in the amount of $391,000.

86. Pursuant to the terms of an Order in Council dated August 11, 1943, the Commodity Prices Stabilization Corporation, a Government-owned Corporation, guaranteed certain advances, obtained by any person engaged in the production of logs or lumber, from a chartered bank. The liability of the Corporation is limited to twenty-five per cent of the aggregate advances made by each bank. The contingent liability of the Corporation at March 31, 1945, was $27,400.

87. Under the terms of an Order in Council dated April 6, 1944, the Commodity Prices Stabilization Corporation was authorized to guarantee certain advances and interest thereon obtained by any person from a chartered bank in order to purchase coal, coke or briquettes in the summer of 1944. The liability of the Corporation is limited to ten per cent of the aggregate amount of advances made by each bank, but the maximum amount of guarantee is $500,000. The contingent liability of the Corporation at March 31, 1945, was $39,277.

88. Under the terms of an Order in Council dated May 4, 1943, the Government guaranteed bank overdrafts obtained by certain Crown companies and management-fee companies doing business under the Department of Munitions and Supply. Prior to the establishment of this system of financing, funds

advanced by the Government to the contractors remained idle for considerable periods. The amounts of the various overdrafts are repaid monthly, so no liability is outstanding at the close of the fiscal year in connection with this guarantee. The maximum amount of guarantees authorized at March 31, 1945, was $110,581,000.

89. Before operations under the Home Improvement Loans Guarantee Act were discontinued (October 30, 1940), 125,720 loans had been made by banks and other approved loaning institutions to home owners under the terms of this Act and the total amount of such loans was $49,959,055. The Dominion's contingent liability arising out of these loans is limited to 15 per cent of the aggregate of such loans made by approved lending institutions, but as the balance of these loans on March 31, 1945 was $246,120, the contingent liability of the Government is limited to this amount. Up to March 31, 1945, 1,249 loss claims for an aggregate amount of $454,018 had been paid. In terms of total losses to total volume of loans, this loss ratio is only ·909 of one per cent.

90. Under the provisions of the Appropriation Act No. 5, 1942, the Home Extension Plan was started. It provided for loans not exceeding in the aggregate $2,000,000 by banks under regulations similar to those of the Home Improvement Loans Guarantee Act for the purpose of financing the creation of additional self-contained housing units by alterations or additions to a building used solely or partially as a dwelling at the time application is made for the loan. To March 31, 1945, 59 loans for a total amount of $109,238 had been made. The Dominion's contingent liability arising out of these loans amounted to 15 per cent of the aggregate of such loans made by the banks or $16,309. There have been no claims for loss made by the banks.

91. Under the Dominion Housing Act, 1935, the National Housing Act, 1938, and the National Housing Act, 1944, the Dominion has accepted and is accepting certain obligations arising out of its contracts with approved lending institutions which, while not expressed in the form of a guarantee, may nevertheless be regarded as contingent or indirect liabilities.

92. The manner in which losses in respect of any loan are to be shared by the Dominion and the lending institution is fixed by the contract. The general principle under the Dominion Housing Act and the National Housing Act, 1938, is that the Dominion bears two-thirds of the loss, if at the time the loss is sustained the principal amount of the loan repaid, less any other amounts due, is equal to or less than the amount advanced by the Dominion and one-third of the loss if at the time the loss is sustained the principal amount repaid, less any other amounts due, is more than the amount advanced by the Dominion. In the case of small loans (that is, loans not in excess of $4,000 in the case of a single family dwelling or not in excess of $700 per habitable room in the case of a multiple family dwelling), the share of the loss to be borne by the Dominion is not more than 80 per cent and not less than 50 per cent of the loss. Under the National Housing Act, 1938, a new provision was added to encourage the making of small loans in such small or remote communities and in such districts of other communities as may be designated by the Minister of Finance in any contract. In respect of such loans, the Dominion has agreed in contracts with certain lending institutions to pay losses sustained by any such lending institution up to certain amounts determined by the contract which are not less than 7 per cent and do not exceed 25 per cent of the total amount of such loans made in such areas by each such lending institution. Under the National Housing Act, 1944, the Dominion bears the first one-quarter of the loss and agrees to pay losses sustained by any lending institution up to fifteen per cent of the total amount of loans made in any area by each such lending institution.

93. An amount of $2,000,000 was appropriated for the fiscal year 1944-45 to provide for advances under the National Housing Act, 1938, not exceeding with the advance made jointly by the approved lending institution, $4,000 in respect of any one house, for the construction of houses where the Minister was satisfied that permanent houses could be constructed to relieve a serious housing shortage without threatening to create a post-war surplus. Loans to the number of 21,896 have been approved at March 31, 1945, under the Dominion Housing Act, 1935, and the National Housing Act, 1938, in the amount of $87,767,957. Under the National Housing Act, 1944, to the same date 862 loans in the amount of $3,575,785 have been approved. Losses recorded and paid to March 31, 1945, amounted to $2,644.78, covering the

Dominion's proportion of the loss on seven loans. This amount represents total losses to that date under both the Dominion Housing Act, 1935, and Part I of the National Housing Act, 1938. These losses are offset in part by a profit of $497.74 realized by the sale of eleven properties. The net loss to March 31, 1945, is therefore only $2,147.04. There have been no losses under the National Housing Act, 1944.

94. As announced in the Budget Speech of 1943 and provided in the Appropriation Act, the Minister of Finance entered into agreements with certain provinces guaranteeing the liquor revenues of the provinces on the basis of such revenues received during the twelve months ended June 30, 1942. No payments have been made to March 31, 1945, under these Agreements.

95. Under the terms of Orders in Council passed under the Export Credits Insurance Act, the Dominion Government guaranteed the payment to certain contractors for goods supplied and services rendered to the agent of a foreign country. The maximum amount authorized at March 31, 1945, under ths authority was $3,230,000.

96. The guarantee of bank advances to municipalities in Saskatchewan under the authority of The Seed Grain Loans Guarantee Act, 1938, was required to be implemented during the fiscal year. On December 11, 1944, the Government paid $16,469,000 to the chartered banks, the amount so advanced was charged in the Dominion's books as a loan to the Province of Saskatchewan which in the first instance guaranteed the advances. At the close of the fiscal year the amount so advanced had been reduced to $15,887,000.

97. The following is a statement of bonds and debenture stocks and other indebtedness guaranteed by the Dominion outstanding on March 31, 1945.

BONDS AND DEBENTURE STOCKS GUARANTEED BY THE DOMINION GOVERNMENT AS AT MARCH 31, 1945

Date of Maturity	Issue	Interest Rate	Amount Outstanding
		%	$
Jan. 15, 1946....	Canadian National	2¼	15,000,000
July 1, 1946....	Canadian Northern	6½	23,752,000
April 1, 1948....	New Westminster Harbour Commissioners	4¾	700,000
Dec. 15, 1950....	Canadian National	3	50,500,000
Sept. 1, 1951....	Canadian National	4½	48,022,000
Feb. 1, 1952....	Canadian National	3	20,000,000
Aug. 1, 1952....	Saint John Harbour Commissioners	5	667,953
Feb. 15, 1953....	Canadian National	3	25,000,000
July 10, 1953....	Canadian Northern	3	1,169,460
Feb. 1, 1954....	Canadian National	5	50,000,000
Mar. 1, 1955....	Canadian National (West Indies) Steamships Limited	5	9,400,000
June 15, 1955....	Canadian National	4¾	48,496,000
Feb. 1, 1956....	Canadian National	4½	67,368,000
July 1, 1957....	Canadian National	4½	64,136,000
July 20, 1958....	Canadian Northern	3½	5,641,326
Jan. 15, 1959....	Canadian National	3	35,000,000
May 4, 1960....	Canadian Northern Alberta	3½	551,505
May 19, 1961....	Canadian Northern Ontario	3½	3,643,985
Jan. 1, 1962....	Grand Trunk Pacific	3	26,465,130
Jan. 1, 1962....	Grand Trunk Pacific	4	7,999,074
Oct. 1, 1969....	Canadian National	5	57,728,500
Nov. 1, 1969....	Harbour Commissioners of Montreal	5	19,000,000
Feb. 1, 1970....	Canadian National	5	17,338,000
Various dates 1946-54.....	City of Saint John Debentures assumed by Saint John Harbour Commissioners	Various	590,229
Perpetual.....	Grand Trunk Debenture Stock	5	1,502,720
"	Great Western Debenture Stock	5	864,855
"	Grand Trunk Debenture Stock	4	6,100,887
"	Northern Railway of Canada Debenture Stock	4	27,458
			606,665,082

OTHER GUARANTEES OR CONTINGENT LIABILITIES

	Principal Amount Outstanding March 31, 1945
Bank Advances, re Province of Manitoba Savings Office	$ 5,299,078
Province of Manitoba Treasury Bill	4,305,723
Province of British Columbia Treasury Bill	626,534
Bank Advances, re Canadian Wheat Board:	
Wheat	65,563,970
Flax	5,210,947
Rapeseed and sunflower seed	390,772
Loans made by approved lending institutions under Dominion and National Housing Acts	Indeterminate
Loans made by approved lending institutions under The Home Improvement Loans Guarantee Act, 1935	246,120
Loans made by approved lending institutions under the Home Extension Plan	16,309
Deposits maintained by the chartered banks in the Bank of Canada	422,029,434
Bank Advances, re Government War Contracts—Department of Munitions and Supply	3,003,750
Bank Overdrafts—Government War Contracts—Department of Munitions and Supply (closed out monthly)	———
Bank Advances, re production of logs or lumber—Commodity Prices Stabilization Corporation	27,400
Bank Advances, re coal, coke or briquette purchases—Commodity Prices Stabilization Corporation	39,277
Guarantee under Dominion-Provincial Taxation Agreements of Provincial receipts from gasoline taxes at amounts received in fiscal years ending nearest December 31, 1940	Indeterminate
Guarantee under Dominion-Provincial Agreements of Provincial liquor revenues at amounts received during the twelve months ended June 30, 1942	Indeterminate
Guarantees under Export Credits Insurance Act	Indeterminate

(B.) CANADIAN ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

ANNUAL FIGURES

	Calendar Years						
	1926	1928	1932	1937	1939	1943	1944
Group I.—Comprehensive Indexes (1935-39=100)							
Physical volume of business	87	103	69	107	107	236	237
Volume of manufacturing	89	100	66	109	105	294	292
Mining	55	65	59	104	118	242	235
Forestry	84	87	57	117	103	123	121
Carloadings	131	148	88	106	102	139	146
Electric power output	46	61	61	106	108	154	154
Employment (a)	100	112	88	114	114	184	183
National income	110	129	69	107	112	214	225
Retail sales	(e)	(e)	92	105	105	161	173
Group II.—Price Levels and Financial Factors (1926=100)							
Wholesale prices	100	96	67	85	75	100	103
Farm product prices	100	101	48	87	64	96	103
Cost of living (b)	122	121	99	101	102	118	119
Common stock prices (b)	92	147	51	117	92	84	84
Bank deposits	100	115	100	120	132	199	234
Active currency circulation	100	105	81	103	111	353	482
Group III.—Gross Value of Production in Major Industries ($ millions)							
Agriculture	1,148	1,265	496	800	900	1,524	(c)1,874
Forestry	556	586	267	494	466	809	(c) 936
Fisheries	73	71	34	51	53	119	(c) 133
Mining (including Smelting)	281	316	238	663	663	974	(c) 893
Construction	452	578	271	352	373	572	(c) 407
Manufacturing	3,101	3,582	1,980	3,625	3,475	8,733	(c)8,713
Group IV.—Foreign Trade and International Transactions ($ millions)							
Exports (gold excluded)	1,277	1,364	498	1,012	936	3,001	3,440
Net non-monetary gold exports (d)	30	40	70	145	184	142	110
Total exports, including non-monetary gold	1,307	1,404	568	1,157	1,120	3,143	3,550
Imports (gold excluded)	1,008	1,222	453	809	751	1,735	1,759
Total trade	2,315	2,626	1,021	1,966	1,871	4,878	5,309
Export balance	+299	+182	+115	+348	+369	+1,408	+1,791
Net tourist receipts	53	79	65	79	68	52	(e)
Net interest and dividends going abroad	201	221	262	226	249	202	(e)

(a) 1926=100.

(b) 1935-39=100.

(c) Estimated.

(d) Adjusted for changes in stocks of earmarked gold. These figures were computed by the Bank of Canada on the basis of official trade returns.

(e) Not available.

CANADIAN ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

MONTHLY FIGURES

—		Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	April	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.
Group I.—Comprehensive Indexes (a) (1935-39=100)													
Physical volume of business	1943	226	227	232	237	232	232	236	241	237	240	243	249
	1944	247	242	248	240	242	239	232	233	231	228	228	233
	1945	229	217	225	232	219	220	214					
Volume of manufacturing	1943	279	291	294	297	287	286	285	291	299	304	307	308
	1944	304	305	301	291	297	292	288	292	285	286	285	284
	1945	274	270	271	271	256	253	249					
Mining	1943	224	218	245	248	255	245	253	254	243	240	232	245
	1944	250	256	263	248	239	226	225	215	206	209	192	189
	1945	174	148	174	183	189	175	161					
Forestry	1943	106	121	124	116	119	132	127	127	127	114	126	132
	1944	114	125	125	115	119	121	113	122	116	129	125	126
	1945	117	127	138	119	124	125	125					
Carloadings	1943	131	140	144	144	143	147	148	139	123	122	139	153
	1944	155	158	157	145	157	153	147	143	126	125	141	143
	1945	152	148	149	149	154	156	151					
Electric power output	1943	143	142	147	153	161	162	167	164	161	151	149	154
	1944	156	154	155	153	165	160	155	153	152	152	149	145
	1945	152	150	154	166	165	164	162					
Employment (b)	1943	191	188	189	191	185	181	180	181	179	179	181	186
	1944	193	190	189	191	185	181	180	179	178	174	176	181
	1945	187	186	186	187	182	175						
Retail sales (c)	1943	129	131	151	168	163	159	148	143	158	174	173	221
	1944	140	139	163	175	178	178	155	161	179	183	191	237
	1945	143	147	194	175	182	196						
Group II.—Price Levels and Financial Factors— (1926=100)													
Wholesale prices	1943	97	98	99	99	99	100	100	100	101	102	102	103
	1944	103	103	103	103	103	103	103	102	102	102	102	103
	1945	103	103	103	103	103	103	104					
product prices	1943	88	89	91	92	93	94	96	98	98	104	104	105
	1944	104	104	105	104	102	102	102	101	101	103	103	103
	1945	104	105	105	105	105	106	108					

Cost of living (d)	1943	117	117	117	118	118	119	119	119	119	119	119	119
	1944	119	119	119	119	119	119	119	119	119	119	119	119
	1945	119	119	119	119	119	120	120					
Common stock prices (d)	1943	76	79	79	83	84	86	91	89	89	86	80	81
	1944	82	82	82	79	80	84	88	87	85	86	86	87
	1945	89	93	93	94	97	103	101					
Bank deposits (e)	1943	178	176	184	193	203	203	202	199	205	204	221	218
	1944	215	211	213	222	237	238	239	235	233	243	259	260
	1945	257	253	251	255	273	281						
Active currency circulation (e)	1943	312	320	331	341	341	344	352	362	372	382	382	394
	1944	391	399	411	419	413	415	427	437	445	458	457	467
	1945	461	467	477	482	477	479						
Group III.—Other Significant Factors													
Exports (f) ($ millions)	1943	177	168	205	228	251	249	304	293	245	260	290	303
	1944	242	227	283	283	368	343	279	257	265	314	313	267
	1945	230	236	301	312	315	323	283					
Imports (f) ($ millions)	1943	127	114	146	151	154	147	151	149	137	163	160	135
	1944	126	138	151	137	159	152	148	157	160	160	142	127
	1945	130	112	132	133	144	146	139					
Net non-monetary gold exports (g) ($ millions)	1943	14	13	13	14	13	12	10	10	12	11	9	12
	1944	9	8	13	9	9	17	7	10	9	8	10	6
	1945	9	8	10	7	10	5	8					
Construction contracts awarded ($ millions)	1943	12	19	11	16	23	20	16	24	19	19	14	12
	1944	9	16	31	28	32	37	32	24	25	26	19	13
	1945	12	13	20	34	38	59	51					
War contracts awarded (h) ($ millions)	1943	112	92	307	109	73	115	255	94	89	116	75	64
	1944	97	51	128	44	100	62	54	44	50	47	28	45
	1945	45	77	68	35	27	22	16	13				
Canadian war expenditure ($ millions) (j)	1943	184	196	(i) 703	137	276	262	452	451	312	377	423	641
	1944	290	319	(i) 647	199	90	302	422	439	348	385	88	662
	1945	242	239	(i) 797	129	400	327	298	304				

(a) Indexes seasonally adjusted unless otherwise indicated.
(b) As at first of month. 1926=100.
(c) Unadjusted.
(d) 1935-39=100.
(e) Based on daily average figures; index unadjusted.
(f) All gold excluded; includes exports of foreign produce.
(g) Adjusted for changes in stocks of earmarked gold. These figures were computed by the Bank of Canada on the basis of official trade returns.
(h) Contracts awarded by Department of Munitions and Supply on Canadian Account, including Capital Assistance; subject to revision.
(i) Includes year-end expenditure.
(j) Includes expenditure under United Nations Mutual Aid Acts of 1943 and 1944 from July, 1943; figures from September, 1944, subject to revision.

Mr. J. M. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Mr. Speaker, in rising to move the adjournment of the debate I should like first to make a few brief observations. It would be unnatural not to compliment the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) upon the speech which has just been read. I am sure that throughout Canada he will now have many people ready to do him honour.

I might say to him that I think he has removed from the minds of the people of Canada a fear which many of them had. Word had gone out that the Minister of Finance was so far removed from the foibles that oppress most of us that if he did not actually like paying taxes, at any rate the paying of them did not cause him the pain that it caused the rest of us. I think there went abroad a feeling almost of fear that the minister would not be able to reduce taxes, because he himself liked paying them so well, and that he might not be able to bring himself to the point where he would reduce them for anyone else. It is a very nice budget for all those people who are affected by the reduction in taxation and, as I have said, I am sure they will be duly grateful to the Minister of Finance.

But that really is not the thing which concerns us at the present time. For a few moments I should like to suggest some general considerations which, it seems to me, people should have in mind when reading this budget speech. It is not a question of whether this or that person may take pleasure from the impact the speech may have upon himself. The question is whether these proposals do or do not give us a picture which will enable us to reorganize the economic life of our country, now that we have come to the era of peace.

There is something we can all agree on, namely, that this first peace-time budget is fraught with tremendous importance to all of us. During the war we accepted the astronomical figures of the budget. The preparing of the budget was a rather straight ahead business. Everyone was ready to pay. When a man feels that his back is to the wall he will not haggle about dollars. When the flood broke over us in the spring of 1940, every man felt that his back was to the wall. It was not a question of holding back on expenditures; indeed the opposite was the case. It was a question, not of how little we should spend but of how much we could spend and how fast we could spend it. So, as I say, the task of the minister was in a way easy. All he had to do was to put the utmost burden on the taxpayer, taking care

that the taxpayer, however badly he might be bent, was not actually broken; then, in addition to that, to borrow the rest from the public.

That was the situation. It is no disrespect to the job that was done to say that in a way it was terribly obvious and even terribly easy. The government came and asked for what it wanted; it got it, and no questions asked.

For five and a half years that mentality has existed, on the part of both the tax collector and the taxpayer. But the attitude of the taxpayer has now changed and changed rapidly. He feels that for those five and a half years the cart has been before the horse. We have spent what we felt it was desirable to spend and then we have looked around to see how we could raise the money. I am not complaining about that and I do not think the taxpayer complains about it. But he is now anxious; he wants to be terribly sure that we are trying to get back and will get back as quickly as we can to what he would like to think are the normal tried and tested methods of financing. When I say that I do not mean that the taxpayer believes he can get back to the 1930's. He knows that the government has assumed new obligations; he knows that there are social services which must be taken care of. Nevertheless, he feels that as long as we are borrowing these fabulous sums which are outlined in a budget of this kind, we are in great danger. According to this budget we shall have to borrow $2,000 million, and there may be another additional $800 million for credits.

He is frightened; he is really alarmed. He does not believe that we can go on borrowing for ever, as some blithe spirits think. He believes that if a debt of $14,000 million or $15,000 million develops into a debt of $20,000 million, and that debt of $20,000 million grows to a debt of $30,000 million, we may arrive at the point when finally we shall not be able to borrow. The lender will say, I am not sure that this money can be paid back. Therefore the taxpayer has now come to the point where, to use the slang phrase, he is from Missouri as to whether expenditures are being reduced to the lowest point they can be.

He considers that this budget is something like a family budget where the family revenue is $200 a month and where the wife brings in a budget showing they can get along nicely on $300 a month, without any indication as to how the income is to go up or how expenditures are to come down.

I suggest that, notwithstanding the interesting figures we have heard to-night, notwithstanding the respect that we have for those

who have framed this budget, there are serious questions still left in the mind of the taxpayer. He realizes how extraordinarily difficult it is for a government which has been spending billions to get down to the point where a few paltry millions can really seem to matter very much. As I say, there are certain questions in the mind of the taxpayer, and I have noted some of those which have occurred to me and which I now propose to bring to the attention of the house.

Of necessity I must bring these to the attention of the house somewhat tentatively, because I am not one of those people who can hear a speech read as it was read to-night, analyse the whole thing and be prepared to make dogmatic assertions. But I am asking the questions which seem to me to be unanswered, questions which seem to me to be important to the taxpayer in figuring out his business. After all, it is his business he wants to know about. But I think he will feel that the astronomical figures he has heard to-night are not related to anything. They do not mean much to him. If he is told we are going to spend $4,000 million, receiving $2,000 million by taxation and raising $2,000 million by borrowing, those figures really do not mean much to a fellow who is getting a couple of hundred dollars a month. What he wants to know is how that relates to the whole nation's business.

I said I was going to be brief and I intend to be brief. What I want to do now is to read these questions that I have noted down. As I said, they will be somewhat tentative, because it may be that on a further study of this document I may have to come back and say that some of these questions have been answered. However, it seems to me that the questions I am about to read have not been answered and they should be answered.

First, however, I should like to bring to the attention of the house an interesting point from abroad—from Great Britain. They have a practical way of going at things in Britain, and I should like to quote from the writings of an Italian by the name of De Marco who just after the last war made an interesting contrast between the way Great Britain approached its budgeting task in and about the year 1920 and the way they did it in Italy. I wish to say in advance that I do not suggest that at the present time we can do what they did in Great Britain at that time. I think it was too heroic; I think it was too drastic; I think it was too sudden. Nevertheless, I believe every fair-minded and sensible man in this house will agree that this was a sensible and realistic and common-sense way of going at the problem. We are now in the position where, as I said a few minutes ago, we have spent these astronomical amounts and we must begin to look around to see where the money is coming from.

According to Mr. De Marco, here is what they did in England in 1920, as compared with what they did in Italy. I quote:

> A typical example of this difference in point of view has been provided recently by the difference in the method followed in England and that followed in Italy for the reduction of bureaucratic expenditures, which increased extraordinarily during the war.
>
> In the post-war period there arose everywhere the problem of reducing these bureaucratic expenditures in order to get them into equilibrium with revenue, which the war had drastically reduced, in comparison with the pre-war period.
>
> In England the chancellor of the exchequer, in presenting the budget for 1921-1922, said: "The revenues must not be above £910,000,000; therefore we must bring the expenditures of civil and military services within these limits."

And later he goes on to say:

> And a commission was named with the precise instructions to propose the reduction of expenditures by a total amount of £175,000,000.

Let me say again that I think that was too sudden; I think in a financial sense it was too heroic, and I think it is quite arguable that by the sudden action taken in that way evil results flowed therefrom. Nevertheless, it points to a good way of stopping increase of debt, viz., not to spend beyond your income. Mr. De Marco goes on:

> In Italy, the commission named for the purpose was charged with studying the possibility of making economies. Since, however, no government knew how to overcome the resistance of interested parties, the expenditures remained, and taxes were raised, thereby subordinating income to expenditure.

I give that illustration because I think it indicates a realistic approach to this question. I come now to my questions.

My first question is: Does the budget give us a clear picture of the amount of national income from which the government must get its taxes and borrowings, and how is this national income arrived at? Is it built up on inflated war prices or on reasonable costs at which we can sell goods abroad?

My next question is: Are the expenditures so set out that we have a clear picture of what are ordinary and recurring expenditures, and of what are special capital expenditures non-recurring?

Next, does the budget furnish us with a definite plan whereby we shall begin to work ourselves back into the position where we pay our way without borrowing? This must be done at all costs to protect our credit, though at the moment, and for several years to come, our capacity to maintain expenditures at the rate necessary to provide our commitments, including social services, reestablishment of

veterans, et cetera, will depend on our capacity to borrow, as well as on our capacity to raise taxes.

My next question is: Is there any indication that the government has taken into account the relative tax position of business in the United States and Canada after post-war tax adjustments? The relative position of business in the two countries will affect their respective capacities to compete in the foreign market.

Next: Is there any indication of the necessary drastic measures to reduce the controls still piled one on another so that we may get away from our present position, which may be described in an old rhyme:

> For larger fleas have smaller fleas
> Upon their backs to bite 'em;
> And these again have other fleas,
> And so, ad infinitum.

My next question: Has the government shown any intention of adjusting taxes on mines and petroleum products, having regard to the great increase in production and employment which could be brought about thereby?

Next: Has the government taken into special account the tax position of farmers, particularly stock breeders?

My next question is this: Does the budget give any indication that the government is really grappling with the task of reducing expenditures? For example, has the government tackled the job of the reduction of army expenditures? Considering that V-E day came only five weeks after the beginning of the financial year, why are the army estimates only fourteen per cent down, as against twenty-eight per cent in the navy and fifty-two per cent in the air force?

In a word, has the government really developed a peace-time mentality on the question of public finance? Does it realize that if we do not get on top of expenditures, expenditures will get on top of us?

I have put these questions in the sincere hope that they may help people in reading the budget to take account of these considerations,—deep, grave considerations affecting our economic welfare, which are involved. If I am right in thinking that these questions have not been adequately dealt with, perhaps they can still be dealt with. Finally, I submit these considerations to the judgment of the house and, what is even more important, to the judgment of that great body, namely, public opinion, which can reach into this house and make its will felt when it wishes. Mr. Speaker, I now move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie the house adjourned at 9.35 p.m.

[Mr. Macdonnell.]

Monday, October 15, 1945.

The house met at three o'clock.

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

STATEMENT OF ACTING SECRETARY OF STATE FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

On the order for motions:

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs): I should like at this time to make a brief statement which was asked for by the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church) on October 4, as reported at page 756 of *Hansard*. The hon. member asked:

> Will the acting leader of the house be in a position to make a statement within a few days regarding the St. Lawrence waterway, in view of the message of President Truman to Congress yesterday recommending an early start?

In reply the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie) stated that the question would be referred to the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs. I have had the statement prepared and I think it should be communicated to the house.

The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin agreement was signed at Ottawa, March 19, 1941. It makes provision for the development of navigation and power resources within the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence basin for the joint account of the peoples of Canada and the United States. Generally, it covers the same fields as the Niagara convention of 1929 and the St. Lawrence waterway treaty of 1932.

2. Immediately after the signing of the agreement, a white paper, including correspondence and documents relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence basin development, was tabled in the House of Commons on March 21, 1941.

For the convenience of the members of the house I am tabling additional copies, both in English and in French, of the white paper: Correspondence and documents relating to The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin development, 1938-1941.

I am also tabling copies, both in English and in French, of an additional white paper: Correspondence and documents relating to The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin development, supplement No. 1; (i) legal opinions; (ii) summary of outstanding features.

3. The agreement provided for ratification and it was made subject to approval by the parliament of Canada and the congress of the United States of America. In this respect, it differed from the 1932 treaty which required the observance of "constitutional methods"

before ratification. The 1932 treaty could only be ratified by the President of the United States if approved by a two-thirds majority of the senate. The present agreement could only be ratified by him if it were approved by joint resolution of both the senate and the house of representatives.

4. Accordingly, the agreement was submitted to the house of representatives in 1941 and referred to the committee on rivers and harbours. It failed, however, to obtain the necessary congressional approval and no action was taken by way of ratification either in 1941 or in succeeding years.

5. An attempt was made in the senate of the United States in 1944 to obtain the necessary approval by the adoption of what would have been a joint resolution, but it was unsuccessful.

6. Upon the initiative of the President of the United States of America, a joint resolution was introduced in the senate and in the house of representatives on October 2 of this year. The procedure followed is somewhat different from that which was adopted in earlier years and the joint resolution is fundamentally different. The earlier resolutions had been designed to provide for approval of the entire agreement with a view to ratification of the agreement and proceeding with the project. The joint resolution as presented both in the senate and in the house of representatives is different from the earlier resolutions in the following respects:

(a) The resolution approves the agreement with the exception of articles VII and IX and authorizes the President to fulfil the undertakings, other than those which are contained in these articles, upon approval of the agreement, with the exeception of the articles in question, by reciprocal or concurrent legislation in Canada.

(b) The resolution indicates that it is the view of congress that the President should negotiate with Canada a treaty or treaties covering the subject matter of articles VII and IX, including the provision with respect to perpetual navigation rights on the great lakes, on the connecting channels and canals, and in the wholly Canadian sections of the St. Lawrence river, and provisions for the amendment of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 with respect to the diversion of waters at the Niagara river, and should submit the treaty for the advice and consent of the senate.

(c) The president is directed to provide for the investigation of the feasibility of making the project self-liquidating by the imposition of reasonable charges or tolls on the foreign commerce of the two countries utilizing the facilities.

(d) Provision is made with respect to the appropriation of funds and there is a declaration to the effect that no exchange of notes under article I, section 4 of the agreement is to impose additional financial or other obligations on the United States. (This refers to a power enabling the governments, by exchange of notes, to prescribe rules and regulations for the conduct of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin commission, to expand or abridge its powers and duties, to reduce, or after reduction, to increase the number of members, and to wind up the commission. The declaration does not, however, change the obligations of the governments in any respect, as the limitations would be implied in the absence of an express provision of this sort.)

(e) The President is authorized, by arrangement with the government of the state of New York, to transfer the power facilities to the appropriate agency of the state in accordance with certain principles and there is a proviso that the arrangement must be consistent with the laws of the United States and protect the interests of the United States and of other states and also that the arrangement is to be subject to approval by congress and the legislature of the state of New York.

7. For the information of the members of the house, I am tabling three copies, in English, of the joint resolution which has been introduced both in the senate and in the house of representatives of the United States of America and, if this course meets with the approval of the members of the house, the text of this joint resolution could be printed in *Votes and Proceedings*. May I take it that I have the unanimous consent of the house?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Consent.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: To continue:

8. If the joint resolution is approved by congress, it may be necessary for the dominion government to confer with the governments of the province of Ontario and Quebec. The existing arrangements, so far as Ontario is concerned, are embodied in the agreement at page 11 of the first white paper and in the correspondence at pages 43-45. The arrangements with the province of Quebec are embodied in the correspondence at pages 66-72. Consideration of the question as to whether the modifications involved in the procedure now before the congress of the United States of America present any difficulty from the Canadian point of view must, necessarily, be deferred until a later stage.

9. It is difficult, if not impossible, to forecast the time which will be taken (a) in dealing with the matter by the congress of the United States of America; (b) in negotiating the additional treaty, and (c) in consultations with the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, but there would seem to be a good deal of doubt as to whether the matter is likely to reach a stage at which it can be presented to parliament during the present session. In the meantime, the proceedings in congress do not in any way of course commit the parliament or government of Canada in any respect.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): As I followed the minister's statement, he indicated that the agreements which had been before the two countries, with the exception of articles VII and IX, were now being submitted to congress, through presidential action. The minister, however, did not make one point clear. Did the President of the United States or anyone acting on behalf of the government of that country submit the agreement, with the exception of articles VII and IX, to the Canadian government or any of its members, before it was presented to congress in the changed form in which it appears to have come before that body? In other words, it seems to me the President of the United States is now submitting to the congress something different from that which had originally been agreed upon between the two nations. I am wondering whether he, or someone representing the United States, had consulted with the Canadian government in respect of those changes, before the submission was made to congress.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I would not be in a position to give a positive answer to my hon. friend at the moment. My understanding, however, is that there is no intention of modifying the substance of the agreement, but rather that this proceeding has been adopted because it was felt there that with respect to all the subject matter of the agreement, not including articles VII and IX, it could be dealt with by joint resolution of the two houses of congress. It was felt, however, that with respect to articles VII and IX there should be a formal treaty. This of course would require for purposes of ratification a two-thirds vote of the senate of the United States. There were conversations, or exchanges of views, with respect to the procedure to be adopted, and Canada voiced no objection to the attempt being made to have the matter submitted in the form that is now contemplated in the United States. We, of course, will await further developments there before determining what the subject matter of our further negotiations with Ontario and Quebec should be.

Mr. GRAYDON: As this has now been put upon *Hansard*, perhaps the minister will supplement his statement by indicating generally what articles VII and IX, which are not before the members of the house, deal with in connection with the agreement.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I would not like to undertake that from memory. This is an international agreement, and I would not want to go beyond what is contained in the statement. Articles VII and IX include provisions with respect to perpetual navigation rights on the great lakes and the connecting channels and canals, and on the wholly Canadian sections of the St. Lawrence. There are also provisions to amend the Boundary Waters Treaty Act, 1909, with respect to the diversion of water at Niagara. These matters were covered by treaty, and my understanding is that it was felt they should not be varied in any way by an agreement that did not take the form of a treaty; that even though they were incidental to the agreement they should nevertheless be dealt with separately on the basis of a treaty and submitted in the usual way to the senate of the United States for its consideration.

Mr. GRAYDON: Canada is not voicing any objection to this taking the form of a treaty rather than being included in the joint agreement?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Oh, no; so far as Canada is concerned our procedure with respect to the international agreement will be the same, whether it be in the form of a treaty or in any other form. In either case it is to be brought to the houses of parliament for consideraiton.

Mr. GRAYDON: I suppose the procedure taken in the congress of the United States does not affect us so far as parliament is concerned?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Does not substantially affect us. It presents to us the same substantive matter in a slightly different form. So far as we are concerned, whether it be in the one form or in the other, our method of dealing with it will have to be the same.

EXTRADITION

ARRANGEMENT BETWEEN CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, there is another matter with respect to which considerable public interest has been manifested and which I think should be made

public just as early as can be. It has to do with the extradition arrangements between Canada and the United States.

Extradition arrangements between Canada and the United States have in the past been based upon treaties between the latter and the United Kingdom government and extending over a long period of years. A new extradition treaty was negotiated between the United States and the United Kingdom some years ago. It did not extend to Canada, and provision was made to preserve extradition arrangements under the old treaties in so far as Canada was concerned.

A new treaty with Canada was signed on April 29, 1942 and was approved by the United States senate in May of that year. On June 6, the president of the United States provided for ratification. The matter was about to be brought to the attention of parliament for approval when protests were made from financial organizations from coast to coast in respect of possible offences relating to dealings in securities, and further action was deferred.

An endeavour has since been made to formulate a protocol to overcome the substantial objections which were raised. It was recognized that it would be impossible to induce the United States to change their security laws so as to permit free marketing of securities within the United States without compliance with laws made for the protection of United States investors. On the other hand, it was recognized that protection must be given to Canadian business men engaged in legitimate business within this country and to Canadian publishers of advertising or other matter. Negotiations have been carried on with the United States representatives, and a protocol has been signed designed to carry out these objectives.

For the information of the members of the house I am tabling copies in English and in French of treaty series 1942 No. 10, treaty for the extradition of criminals concluded between Canada and the United States of America, Washington, April 29, 1942, and copies in English and in French of protocol annexed to the treaty for the extradition of criminals between the United States of America and Canada which was signed at Ottawa, October 3, 1945.

A resolution will be introduced in due course in both houses of parliament which will provide an opportunity for full discussion of this matter.

Mr. HOMUTH: Is it law now?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: No, it is subject to approval by parliament.

QUESTIONS

Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CEILING PRICE ON WHEAT

Mr. BENTLEY:

Is flour that is milled in Canada from western Canada wheat and sold on the export market subject to the export ceiling of $1.55 per bushel?

Mr. MacKINNON: Wheat for grinding into export flour is now sold to the mills by the Canadian wheat board on the same price basis as export wheat, that is, at the export price of $1.55 per bushel basis in store Fort William/Port Arthur or Vancouver. The great bulk of the export flour is sold to the United Kingdom, the U.S.S.R. and UNRRA and on these amounts the margins are fixed between the buyer and the mills. On the other smaller amounts going forward to other countries, the sales price is kept in relation to the $1.55 price by competition between the mills and the competition of U.S. flour, that is subsidized by the U.S. government to approximate parity with the Canadian export price of wheat.

EMERGENCY SHELTER COORDINATION

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

1. On what date was emergency shelter coordination established in Canada?
2. How many officials are employed?
3. What has been the total cost to date?
4. What cities have been placed under its control?
5. Under its administration how many persons have been, (a) kept out of each of said cities; (b) given permits to enter each of these cities?
6. How many such persons are returned soldiers?
7. Are returned soldiers given any preference over civilians when applying for a permit to enter any of said cities?

Mr. MAYHEW:

1. December 19, 1944.

2. 17.

3. Wartime Prices and Trade Board, $342,600; Dept. of Public Works, $20,500; Total, $363,100.

4. Ottawa and district, Vancouver and district, Victoria and district, Toronto and district, Hull and district, Hamilton and district, Winnipeg and district.

5. The permit system under the emergency shelter regulations was in effect until September 1, 1945, when it was discontinued. The number of families allowed to enter the areas is accurately shown by the number of permits granted, but the number of persons kept out of the area is not completely disclosed by the number of permits refused because in

many cases no formal application was made. No record is available of the number of families who were told during personal interviews or by letter that a permit could not be granted. However, the record of formal applications granted and refused is as follows:

City	Granted	Refused
Ottawa	2,919	679
Vancouver	1,379	1,958
Victoria	1,864	1,172
Toronto	1,369	871
Hull	658	258
Hamilton	730	568
Winnipeg	459	107

6. Of permits granted and refused the following numbers were based upon applications from active and discharged service personnel:

City	Granted	Refused
Ottawa	1,428	72
Vancouver	831	665
Victoria	1,158	590
Toronto	no record	no record
Hull	63	62
Hamilton	526	..
Winnipeg	309	..

Where blanks are shown above, no record was kept.

7. The permit system is no longer in effect in any area in Canada and accordingly the question of preference to returned soldiers does not arise. When the permit system was in effect, permits were given without question to any service personnel who have served outside Canada for one year or longer.

MILITARY DISCHARGE DEPOT, P.E.I.

Mr. McLURE:

What action has been taken to establish a military discharge depot in Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island?

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. The matter of setting up a discharge depot in Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island has been carefully studied and it was decided not to establish such a depot for the following reasons: (a) Benefits to Prince Edward Island personnel arising from the well equipped and experienced organization at No. 6 district depot in Halifax outweigh the disadvantage of longer travel. (b) The number to be discharged in Prince Edward Island does not warrant the overhead entailed in the establishment of a separate depot. (c) Shortage of personnel specialised in demobilization procedure.

[Mr. Mayhew.]

RENT CONTROL REGULATIONS

Mr. FLEMING:

What action is the government taking with respect to the revision of the present rent control regulations, (a) in regard to accommodation for ex-service personnel; (b) in any other particular?

Mr. MAYHEW:

1. (a) Under the wartime leasehold regulations, being order in council P.C. 9029 of November 21, 1941, the wartime prices and trade board are responsible for the maintenance of rentals at the 1941 level. As an aid to this end the wartime prices and trade board have restricted landlords' provincial law rights respecting termination of leases. These restrictions, by order No. 511 of that board, effective May 31, 1945, have been modified in the case of service personnel who owned houses at the date of their enlistment by permitting a three months' notice to vacate to be given to the tenant. No further modification is contemplated at the moment.

(b) From time to time the rentals regulations have been amended and as conditions change these regulations will be altered to meet new situations.

RESEARCH ENTERPRISES LIMITED

Mr. McMASTER:

1. Are the buildings of Research Enterprises Limited at Leaside or Toronto for sale? If so, by whom?

2. Will the government, or War Assets Limited, offer the buildings separately for sale by public tender?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. Yes. By War Assets Corporation.

2. This is a matter which has not yet been determined. See also minister's statement on Research Enterprises, page 929, *Hansard*, October 11, 1945.

WIVES AND CHILDREN OF EX-SERVICEMEN IN GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. FRASER:

1. Are steps being taken by the government to bring the wives and children of servicemen and ex-servicemen from Great Britain as speedily as possible?

2. Does the government pay the transportation costs for the wives and children of ex-servicemen?

3. Does the government pay an allowance to the wives and children of ex-servicemen while they are awaiting transportation to Canada?

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. Yes, although priority is being given to the return of servicemen. Every effort has

been and is being made to obtain the maximum shipping space for repatriation of dependents.

2. Yes, P.C. 6422 of 12th August, 1944, provides free transportation from home in the United Kingdom to new home in Canada, berths and meals with 500 pounds of baggage for "the wife or widow of a member of the force and who is not resident in Canada and who was married to such member of the force while serving outside of Canada or the territorial waters thereof on active service during the present war"; also "the child or children (including adopted and step-children) of such member of the force."

P.C. 64/505 of 24th January, 1945, provides also for hospitalization and medical attention if required by dependents while enroute to destination.

3. Yes, P.C. 132/6173 of 21st September, 1945, provides for payment of dependents' allowance to the dependents of discharged soldiers while held in the United Kingdom by the non-availability of shipping. The dependents' allowance is the same amount as that paid to the dependent prior to the soldier-husband's discharge.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—SENIORITY TO SERVICE PERSONNEL

Mr. McLURE:

Will war veterans, employees of the Canadian National Railways at time of enlistment, be given credit on seniority for time spent in the armed forces?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. TUSTIN:

1. Into what divisions has the Department of Veterans Affairs been divided?
2. Who are the chiefs of each division?
3. What salary is paid to each such chief?
4. What, in detail, are the duties and responsibilities of each division?

Mr. TUCKER:

1, 2 and 3. Administration, A. J. Dixon, $5,400 per annum; Rehabilitation, Major-General E. L. M. Burns, seconded from Department of National Defence; Treatment, Dr. W. P. Warner, $8,500 per annum; Prosthetic, C. A. Bell, $4,620 per annum; Veterans' Bureau, E. V. Wilson (acting), $4,740 per annum; Veterans' Insurance, W. G. Reburn, $5,100 per annum; Soldier Settlement and Veterans' Land Act, G. Murchison, $8,000 per annum; Civil Defence, A. Ross, no salary.

(N.B.—In addition, the department provides in its main estimates for the administration expenses of the Canadian Pension commission and the war veterans' allowance board, of which J. L. Melville and F. J. G. Garneau are the respective chairman.)

4. Administration.—Under direction of the deputy minister, the organization, operation and coordination of departmental activities and the provision of administrative services to other divisions, excepting the Soldier Settlement and Veterans' Land Act.

Rehabilitation.—The provision of rehabilitation services, specifically the administration of the post-discharge re-establishment order and part II of The War Service Grants Act, 1944, and generally to provide advice and guidance in all matters pertaining to rehabilitation other than treatment and settlement under the Veterans' Land Act, 1942.

Treatment.—The provision of medical, surgical and dental care to all veterans and other persons entitled.

Prosthetic.—The manufacture, supply, maintenance and development of prostheses.

Veterans' Bureau.—To advise and assist applicants for pension as required under the provisions of the Pension Act.

Veterans' Insurance.—Under the direction of the deputy minister, to administer the provisions of the Veterans' Insurance Act.

Soldier Settlement and Veterans' Land Act, —To administer the provisions of the Soldier Settlement Act and the Veterans' Land Act, 1942, and in addition to provide a field service for various departments of the government.

Civil Defence.—To wind up the affairs of the civil defence organization insofar as the dominion government is concerned.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—DIVISIONS AND CHIEFS

Mr. HENDERSON:

1. Into what divisions has the Department of External Affairs been divided?
2. Who are the chiefs of each division?
3. What salary is paid to each such chief?
4. What, in detail, are the duties and responsibilities of each division?

Mr. ST. LAURENT:

1, 2 and 3. First political division, C. S. A. Ritchie, $4,580; Second political division, G. P. Glazebrook, $5,000; Third political division, R. M. Macdonnell, $4,580; Legal division, J. E. Read, $8,000; Diplomatic division, L. Beaudry, $7,200; Economic division, S. D. Pierce, $6,000; Information division, T. W. L. MacDermot, $6,000; Administrative division, W. D. Matthews, $5,000.

4. The first political division is concerned with all matters of international organization and peace settlements; the second deals with

political affairs relating to the British commonwealth, Europe, the Middle East and Africa; the third, with political affairs relating to the U.S.A., Latin America and the Far East. The three political divisions perform their functions under the direct supervision of the Associate Under Secretary of State for External Affairs. The names of the other divisions are self-explanatory.

FEDERAL DISTRICT COMMISSION

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough):

1. What are the names of the members of the federal district commission?

2. On what date was each such person appointed?

Mr. MACKENZIE:

1. F. E. Bronson, B.Sc., M.E.I.C.; R. Chevrier, M.D.; J. W. Ste. Marie, K.C.; C. J. Booth; J. B. Spencer, B.S.A.; A. Johnston, C.M.G.; LL.D.; J. A. Ewart, B.A.Sc., R.A.I.C.; M.E.I.C.; D. K. MacTavish, B.A., K.C.; His Worship Mayor Stanley Lewis.

2. May 4, 1927; chairman, November 18, 1936; November 28, 1924; May 4, 1927; February 25, 1932; October 18, 1934; May 2, 1938; May 2, 1938; May 2, 1938; January 2, 1945.

PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE—STAFF

Mr. FRASER:

1. How many persons have been appointed to the privy council office since January 1, 1943?

2. What are their names, indicating those who are temporary and those who are permanent?

3. What is the title of the position held by each and what, in detail, are the duties of such positions?

4. By whom was each such person appointed?

5. What salary is paid to each such person?

6. What was the total number of officials of the privy council office as of, (a) September 1, 1939; (b) October 1, 1945?

7. What additional responsibilities have been undertaken by the privy council office since September 1, 1939?

Mr. MACKENZIE:

1. 22 (including office of Special Commissioner for Defence Projects in Northwest Canada, Edmonton—5)—All temporary appointments. In addition to the above there are presently on loan to the Privy Council Office 6 officials (and 4 subordinate staff) of other Departments of the Government.

2, 3, 4 and 5:

Name—Title of position—Duties of position—By whom appointed—Salary

Privy Council Office

Baldwin, J. R., senior assistant secretary and secretary to the cabinet committee on reconstruction, cabinet secretariat, civil service commission, $5,400.

[Mr. St. Laurent.]

Bayne, W., messenger, messenger service, civil service commission, $1,080.

Bethune, A., clerk, grade 2, clerical work, civil service commission, $1,140.

Bigue, L. R., clerk, grade 4, clerical work, civil service commission, $1,740.

Cross, J. L., clerk, grade 3, clerical work, civil service commission, $1,380.

Hornsby, H. G., steno. grade 3, stenographic work, civil service commission, $1,620.

Lawson, G. M., typist, part time, typing, civil service commission, $50 a month.

Marleau, M. T. L., typist, grade 2, typing, civil service commission, $1,140.

McClung, M., first assistant secretary, cabinet secretariat, civil service commission, $3,600.

Nalevykin, S., stenographer, grade 2, stenographic work, civil service commission, $1,080.

Palmer, D. A., typist, grade 1, typing, civil service commission, $840.

Saunders, T., stenographer, grade 2, stenographic work, civil service commission, $1,080.

Matte, G. J., private secretary to the president of the privy council, secretarial, governor in council, $5,000.

Statutory Orders and Regulations Division

Gauthier, H. E., principal translator, translation, civil service commission, $2,520.

Gillespie, S., typist, part time, typing, civil service commission, $50 a month.

Graham, M. M., stenographer, grade 3, stenographic work, civil service commission, $1,440.

McMillan, E. M., clerk, grade 4, clerical work, civil service commission, $1,920.

Office of Special Commissioner for Defence Projects in Northwest Canada, Edmonton

Hogg, T., administrative officer, office manager, governor in council, $2,700.

Negovich, A., typist, grade 1, typing, civil service commission, $780.

Pepin, G. M., stenographer, grade 2, stenographic work, civil service commission, $1,080.

Phinney, L. H., acting special commissioner for Defence Projects in Northwest Canada, defined by order in council P.C. 3758, 6-5-43, tabled by prime minister on 10-5-43, governor in council, $6,360.

White, S. C., stenographer, grade 2, stenographic work, civil service commission, $1,380.

Permanent Appointments, Nil.

6. (a) September 1, 1939, permanent employees, 19; temporary employees 1; total, 20. (b) October 1, 1945, permanent employees, 19; temporary employees, 26 (including office of special commissioner for defence projects northwest Canada); total, 45.

7. (a) Provision of a secretariat to the cabinet, cabinet committees and certain interdepartmental committees reporting to the government.

(b) Executive duties in connection with the wartime information board (to September 28, 1945 and subsequently the Canadian information service), the special commissioner for defence projects in northwest Canada, and the federal district commission.

(c) A statutory orders and regulations division was established in the Privy Council office on September 4, 1942 to provide for the publication of Canadian war orders and regulations.

NATIONAL REVENUE—P.C. 80/3440—DRAWBACKS ON IMPORTED COAL

Mr. HODGSON:

1. Has the Minister of National Revenue given consideration to the assertion of the Auditor General at page 10 of the Auditor General's Report for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1944, that order in council P.C. 80/3440 trenches on the legislative power?

2. What action does the minister propose?

Mr. McCANN:

1. Yes.

2. The order in council is deemed to be intra vires.

*PRISON REFORM

Mr. CHURCH:

What action is the Minister of Justice taking with regard to the remarks made by the Court of Appeal of Ontario on prison reform, and the lack of any proper steps to remedy juveniles and those who should come under the Borstal system?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Mr. Speaker, I think I will have to answer this question orally. To the question as drafted I must answer, none. Of course the matter of prison reform is under active consideration and is one of the subjects I hope to have an opportunity of discussing with the representatives of provincial governments during the present dominion-provincial conference.

*PENITENTIARIES

Mr. CHURCH:

1. What clauses of the prison reform commission report have been adopted by the government since the report was tabled?

2. Who is in charge of federal prisons, is it the Minister of Justice or the Solicitor General, and what is the division of authority between them, if any, herein?

3. Who appoints those in charge of these institutions and the staff, and what qualifications have they in this work before appointment?

4. What inspection is there of these institutions, and how many visits have been made by the minister in charge?

5. What practical experience have the chief officers of the department in this work before appointment?

6. Do grand juries visit these institutions and make a report? If so, to whom?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I should like to deal with this question orally. I have no doubt that the first question refers to the report of the royal commission on penitentiaries. No clauses of that report have been adopted. Full detailed particulars of the recommendations of the royal commission which have been acted upon by the department were furnished in answer to a question asked by the hon. member for Broadview on April 4, 1945. There have been few, if any, additional recommendations acted upon since that time.

In reply to part 2 of the question, I would say that the Minister of Justice is in charge of federal prisons; he is the minister responsible for the administration of the penitentiaries, under section three of the Penitentiary Act.

In reply to part 3, first I would say that the minister is appointed by the governor in council. The appointment of officers is made pursuant to sections 20 and 20A of the Penitentiary Act, as amended by chapter 27 of the statutes of Canada, 1933. Wardens usually have years of experience in penitentiary administration before appointment, and the staff do not necessarily have previous experience in penitentiary work before appointment.

As to qualifications, wardens are usually promoted to that position, but occasionally one is appointed without previous experience. Qualifications for appointment to the staff do not require previous penitentiary experience, but a guard is required to have certain physical qualifications and be a graduate of a public school. Chaplains, physicians and trade instructors are required to have the appropriate qualifications in their own profession or trade.

As to inspection of penitentiaries, they are inspected from time to time by the acting superintendent and by the inspectors. No visits have been made by the Minister of Justice.

In reply to part 5 I would state that acting superintendent G. L. Sauvant, had six years' experience as a penitentiary officer before being appointed inspector. He had four years' experience as inspector, of which he spent a year as acting warden, prior to assuming the duties of acting superintendent. Inspector J. A. McLaughlin was on the staff of the penitentiary branch for about eleven years, during which time he visited the various peni-

tentiaries particularly with respect to industries, farms and supplies. During the last four of those eleven years he acted as inspector before being appointed as such.

In reply to the last question I would say that grand juries do not visit the penitentiaries.

Mr. COLDWELL: May I ask a supplementary question? If a member of parliament or a member of a legislature wishes to visit these institutions, can permission be obtained?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Permission may be obtained from the Department of Justice, but there is no standing rule as to those who shall be allowed to visit them. I would not be sure that there is no such rule with respect to members of parliament, but I do not think there is with regard to members of the legislature.

Mr. COLDWELL: I happened to write to a member of the British Columbia legislature with regard to the penitentiary in that province, and I was told that he could not get permission to go there. I was wondering to whom he should apply. He probably applied to the wrong person.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: The application should come to the Department of Justice.

DISALLOWANCE OF PROVINCIAL LEGISLATION—QUEBEC RADIO ACT

Mr. COLDWELL:

Has the Minister of Justice referred the Radio Act of the legislature of the province of Quebec to his law officers for any opinion regarding the advisability of exercising his power of disallowance?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: The Quebec statutes for the last session of the legislature, including the act to authorize the creation of a provincial broadcasting service, were received by the Secretary of State of Canada on June 30, 1945, and referred by letter dated July 9 to the deputy minister of justice in accordance with the usual practice. They are now before the legal officers of the Department of Justice for the purpose of preparing memoranda to assist the Minister of Justice in determining what recommendations he should make to council on the question whether these statutes should be allowed to operate according to their terms.

THUNDERCHILD INDIANS

Mr. CAMPBELL:

1. What moneys are due the Thunderchild Indian band from sale of reserve No. 115, (a) principal; (b) interest?

2. What moneys are being held in trust for the following reserves: Red Pheasant, No. 108; Mosquito, No. 109; Sweet Grass, No. 113; Poundmaker, No. 114; Little Pine, No. 116; No. 159, No. 112, No. 115B?

[Mr. St. Laurent.]

Mr. GLEN:

1. (a) Principal, $14,827.21; (b) interest, $807.89.

2. Red Pheasant, No. 108.....	$ 437 17
*Stoney, No. 109 (Mosquito) 110 and 111.....	53,573 57
*Sweetgrass, No. 113, 113A, and 113B	5,473 73
Poundmaker, No. 114.....	1,171 18
Little Pine and Luckyman, No. 116	1,027 08
Saulteaux, No. 159.....	4,323 14
*Moosomin, No. 112, 112B, 112E, and 112F	118,621 44
*Thunderchild, No. 115, 115A, 115B, 115C and 115D.....	102,519 76

*One account includes several reserves as indicated and cannot be broken down by reserves.

WAR ASSETS—PRESTONE ANTI-FREEZE

Mr. FLEMING:

1. Is any prestone anti-freeze being kept by, or on behalf of, any department of the government in the Ford plant on Danforth avenue, Toronto? If so, how much?

2. How long has it been located there?

3. What steps have been taken, or are being taken, to make it available for sale to the public this fall?

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. There is no Prestone Anti-freeze kept at the R.C.A.S.C. garage at the Ford plant, Danforth avenue, Toronto. There are, however, 3,776 gallons of ethylene glycol base anti-freeze in storage there, also, 4,192 gallons of ethylene glycol anti-freeze reclaimed from drainings from vehicle radiators last winter which contains 50 per cent water.

2. Of the 3,776 gallons of new ethylene glycol anti-freeze, 360 gallons were carried over from last winter, 2,000 gallons were received in April, 1945, and 1,416 gallons in August, 1945. The 4,192 gallons of reclaimed ethylene glycol were received for reclaiming purposes during the spring and summer of 1945.

3. None, as it is expected it will all be required by the armed services. 1,350 gallons of reclaimed anti-freeze will be returned to Petawawa, 700 gallons to Camp Borden and 1,159 to the R.C.A.F. The remainder will be used in military district No. 2.

EXCHEQUER COURT—CASES IN WHICH JUDGMENT NOT YET DELIVERED

Mr. AYLESWORTH:

In how many cases heard by the exchequer court longer than one year ago has judgment not been delivered?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Thirty-four.

PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. BARRETT:

1. What was the total net debt of the Dominion of Canada at the end of each fiscal year, 1938 to 1945 inclusive?

2. Of this amount, what amount was payable, (a) in the United Kingdom; (b) in the United States, at the end of each fiscal year?

Mr. MAYHEW:

1. March 31, 1938	.....	$ 3,101,667,570 25
1939	.....	3,152,559,314 48
1940	.....	3,271,259,647 34
1941	.....	3,648,691,448 56
1942	.....	4,045,221,160 80
1943	.....	6,182,849,101 10
1944	.....	8,740,084,892 97
1945	.....	11,298,362,017 77

2. The net debt of Canada is the total liabilities of the dominion less active assets, accordingly it is not possible to state what amount is payable in Canada, the United Kingdom or the United States. However, the distribution of unmatured funded debt (included in total liabilities) by currency of payment is as follows:

Payable in Canadian Dollars

March 31, 1938	.....	$ 2,455,690,435 07
1939	.....	2,510,490,007 67
1940	.....	2,904,773,870 85
1941	.....	3,727,769,072 93
1942	.....	5,390,813,428 00
1943	.....	7,441,752,802 05
1944	.....	10,591,425,890 69*
1945	.....	13,638,698,042 05*

* Includes estimated amounts of refundable portion of personal income tax and excess profits tax.

Payable in London in Sterling

March 31, 1938	.....	$409,867,596 79
1939	.....	406,207,026 63
1940	.....	321,911,321 06
1941	.....	175,221,518 97
1942	.....	15,450,865 42
1943	.....	12,725,620 91
1944	.....	12,405,650 32
1945	.....	12,065,532 86

Payable in New York in United States dollars

March 31, 1938	.....	$449,000,000
1939	.....	469,000,000
1940	.....	469,000,000
1941	.....	469,000,000
1942	.....	459,000,000
1943	.....	439,000,000
1944	.....	333,000,000
1945	.....	333,000,000

INDIRECT OR CONTINGENT DOMINION LIABILITIES

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough):

1. What was the total of the indirect or contingent liabilities of the Dominion of Canada, as of March 31, 1945?

2. What is the classified breakdown of these indirect or contingent liabilities, together with the amount of the obligation under each heading?

Mr. MAYHEW:

1 and 2. Details of the contingent liabilities of the Dominion of Canada are shown on pages 49-52 of the appendix to the budget tabled in the House of Commons on October 12, 1945.

DISCHARGED MEDICAL OFFICERS—POST-GRADUATE STUDY

Mr. NICHOLSON:

1. What is the maximum grant available for medical officers on being discharged from the armed services, for the purpose of post-graduate study?

2. What deductions, if any, are being made for room and board, which the hospitals supply to interns, by the Department of Veterans Affairs?

3. How much money will be available for a married doctor who is living in a hospital taking post-graduate study on D.V.A. grants?

Mr. TUCKER:

1. The maintenance grant for a medical officer pursuing post-graduate studies under the provisions of the post-discharge reestablishment order is $60 monthly, plus additional allowances for dependents. In addition the department pays regularly university fees not exceeding $500 per academic year.

2. Full board and lodging provided to an intern by a hospital in which he is training is regarded as salary for services rendered and is valued at $30 a month. Where an intern's income, apart from maintenance grants, does not exceed $40 a month inclusive of board and lodging, no deduction is made from maintenance grants.

3. A doctor, married and without dependent children, living in a hospital and supporting a dependent wife in a separate establishment, would receive a monthly maintenance grant of $80, plus an additional allowance of $5 a week, or approximately $101.75 per month.

PAYMENTS FOR U.S. BASES IN CANADA

Mr. NICHOLSON:

How much has the Canadian government agreed to pay to the U.S.A. for American bases at, (a) The Pas; (b) Churchill, Manitoba; (c) Southampton island?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: The Canadian government has paid the United States government

the following amounts in United States dollars for construction carried out by the United States government (a) 415,000; (b) 6,206,800; (c) 5,318,870.

HOUSING—BROCKVILLE TRAINING CENTRE

Mr. WEBB:

1. Has consideration been given by the government to any plan which would result in the use of certain of the buildings at the Brockville training centre for housing accommodation?

2. If not, what use will be made of these buildings?

3. Has any action been taken in other sections of the country to utilize similar establishment buildings to relieve the housing shortage?

4. If so, at what centres has such action been taken?

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. Yes. Part of this accommodation will still be required for military purposes and the remainder will be handed over to Department of Labour for rehabilitation training.

2. See No. 1.

3. Yes.

4. Action has already been taken at Vancouver, Victoria, Port Alberni, Edmonton, Lethbridge, Saskatoon, Brandon, Toronto, Kitchener, Ottawa, Hull, Quebec and Halifax to release vacant army accommodation for emergency housing or to other departments for rehabilitation purposes, etc.

VETERANS' LAND ACT—TORONTO OFFICE

Mr. FLEMING:

1. How large a territory is served by the Toronto office under the administration of the Veterans' Land Act?

2. How many veterans have made application through the said office to be settled under the said act?

3. How many veterans have actually been settled through the said office?

Mr. TUCKER:

1. Toronto district office:—All that part of Ontario lying east of the east boundary of military district number 10. Toronto regional office:—The counties of Peel, York, Ontario, Simcoe, Muskoka and Parry Sound.

2. 2,010 applications for qualification were received by the Toronto regional office up to September 30, 1945.

3. 211 applications for financial assistance originating in the Toronto regional office had been approved as of September 30, 1945.

[Mr. St. Laurent.]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

CIVIL AVIATION—CANADIAN PACIFIC AIRLINES

Mr. KNOWLES:

1. What private companies are licensed to operate air routes in Canada?

2. What air routes are being operated by each of the above companies?

3. How many applications for licences to operate air routes in Canada have been received since March 17, 1944, (a) from Canadian Pacific Airlines; (b) from all other companies; how many licences have been granted to, (a) and (b) since said date and what routes are covered by licences so granted?

4. Has the Canadian Pacific Railway divested itself of the ownership of Canadian Pacific Airlines? If not, has the government taken any steps designed to achieve this end?

5. Has any United States air line sought to purchase Canadian Pacific Airlines from the Canadian Pacific Railway?

6. Have any steps been taken by the government to form a crown airlines corporation for the operation of feeder air lines in central and western Canada? If so, is the acquisition of the ownership of Canadian Pacific Airlines by said corporation under consideration?

DEPARTMENT OF RECONSTRUCTION—DIVISIONS AND CHIEFS

Mr. FRASER:

1. Into what divisions has the Department of Reconstruction been divided?

2. Who are the chiefs of each division?

3. What salary is paid to each such chief?

4. What, in detail, are the duties and responsibilities of each division?

5. What is the total number of employees of the department?

6. Of these, how many have had experience in trade union organizations?

7. What are their names and what positions do they hold?

REESTABLISHMENT OF EX-SERVICEMEN—RETAIL BUSINESSES

Mr. CHURCH:

What has been done to help ex-servicemen who wish to reopen their retail shops?

SOLDIERS IN PENAL INSTITUTIONS—DESERTERS

Mr. CHURCH:

1. How many soldiers of the forces overseas have been sentenced to terms of imprisonment, and from what theatres of war?

2. How many have been returned to Canada and where are they incarcerated at present?

3. How many are in the penal institutions of Canada at present?

4. How many were deserters, and where are they confined after their return from overseas?

5. How many were moved from Fort Henry at Kingston to the federal prison in that city, or to a prison adjacent to that city, at Collins bay?

6. How many deserters in Canada have been taken since the war closed; where are they confined, and how many are still at large?

WAR ASSETS—SALE OF AEROPLANES

Mr. HAZEN:

1. How many aeroplanes have been sold by the government during the last five years?
2. To whom was each of them sold, and how much was paid for each of them by the purchaser?

FARM LOANS—PRAIRIE PROVINCES

Mr. THATCHER:

1. How many applications have been received by the Canadian farm loan board from June 15, 1944, to October 1, 1945, for loans, in each of the prairie provinces?
2. By provinces, how many of these loans have been approved?
3. By provinces, how many of these loans have been actually paid out by the board during the same period?
4. How many loans were made in Saskatchewan during the fiscal years, 1942 and 1943?

WAR TAXES, 1914-18, STILL IN FORCE

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough):

What taxes, first levied during the war of 1914 to 1918, have never been removed?

TRANSPORTATION OF MILITARY PERSONNEL—PAYMENTS TO RAILWAYS

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North):

1. What amounts have been paid by the federal government to, (a) Canadian Pacific Railway; (b) the Canadian National Railway, for the transportation of military personnel of the three armed forces for each of the years 1939, 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943 and 1944, and for the first eight months of 1945?
2. What amounts were paid for the carrying of mail to the Canadian Pacific Railway and Canadian National Railway for the same years?

DOMINION BORROWINGS

Mr. BARRETT:

1. What was the total amount borrowed by the Dominion of Canada during each of the fiscal years ended March 31, 1940 to 1945, inclusive?
2. What is the classified breakdown of the above, showing the amounts borrowed through victory loan, from the chartered banks or any other means during each of the fiscal years aforementioned?

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

Mr. DORION:

1. Since September 1, 1939, how many persons, in each province, asked to be exempted from military service as conscientious objectors?
2. How many of such applications, in each province, were, (a) granted; (b) refused?
3. How many of such applications, in each province, were made, (a) before the applicant was medically examined; (b) after the applicant was medically examined?
4. What is the racial origin, by category, of those who so applied for exemption from military service as conscientious objectors?

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

SEMI-PERMANENT WARTIME HOUSES

Mr. FRASER:

For a copy of all letters, reports, contracts or agreements in possession of any department of the government in regard to the building of semi-permanent wartime houses.

Mr. HOWE: Mr. Speaker, this motion calls for a voluminous series of documents, practically the entire files of Wartime Housing Limited. It is understood that my hon. friend is asking actually only for three documents, which are being prepared. I would ask that he confirm that before the motion is passed.

Mr. FRASER: As agreed between the minister and myself, yes—St. Catharines, Ottawa and Peterborough.

Motion agreed to.

NATIONAL REVENUE—ORDERS IN COUNCIL REMITTING TAXES

Mr. ROBINSON (Bruce):

For a copy of orders in council P.C. 149/6991, 134/7263, 151/7263, 154/8855 and 76/9400 referred to in paragraph 45 of the Auditor General's Report for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1944, together with all correspondence between the Auditor General and the Department of National Revenue with relation thereto.

MINISTERS OF THE CROWN—TRAVELLING EXPENSES

Mr. DESMOND:

For statement showing the total amount of travelling expenses paid to each minister of the crown, his private secretary, assistant private secretary, or any official attached to the personal staff of such minister during the fiscal years ended March 31, 1943-44-45.

DISALLOWANCE OF PROVINCIAL LEGISLATION—SASKATCHEWAN

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

For a copy of all petitions praying that the governor in council disallow any acts of the legislature of Saskatchewan since 1920.

PORT OF CHURCHILL

ENCOURAGEMENT OF USE OF HARBOUR AND PORT FACILITIES

Mr. RONALD MOORE (Churchill) moved:

That in the opinion of this house the government should take into immediate consideration the advisability of encouraging the fullest possible use of the harbour and port facilities at Churchill, Manitoba, or the transferring of the management and control of the said port to a joint board appointed by the governments of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this resolution was placed on the order paper because it is of growing importance to northern Canada and to the future economy of our country. I do not know how much latitude we are permitted in dealing with resolutions of this kind, but it is important for us to realize that our economy is gradually spreading to the northern sections of this country.

It is a significant fact that in 1812 the first settlers in western Canada came by way of Hudson bay to the spot where Winnipeg now stands. Those original settlers did not forget the route by which they landed at the gateway to the west, and for many years after the colony became firmly established there was a growing demand that they be given an outlet to Hudson bay and a connection with their mother country.

Prior to this first settlement the inland sea known as Hudson bay had its waters furrowed by the keels of many ships belonging to the Hudson's Bay company. That the route was a safe one may be judged from the fact that the Hudson's Bay company took back to England a fabulous amount of wealth.

I think it is important that we should review briefly the history of Canada at this period. In those early days, after the fall of France in Canada, the history of this country was the history of the fur trade and the history of the fur trade was the history of two great companies, one English, the other Canadian. The Hudson's Bay company, with headquarters in London, England, sent its ships out from Europe to Hudson bay to carry with them the wares they brought from England in exchange for the furs they received from the natives along the shores and in the southern part of the northern territories. The Northwest company had their headquarters in Montreal. They, too, carried on a thriving trade with the natives in this country. However, it was found that the long route from Montreal to the head of the lakes had to be made by canoe over treacherous waterways and it was difficult terrain to traverse; it was very expensive.

History records the fact that is cost the Northwest company four times as much to place their wares in England as it cost the Hudson's Bay company. Difficulties between the two companies became rife; competition was keen. In fact toward the end open conflit resulted. But the Hudson's Bay company bided its time. It was the sheer practicability of the Hudson bay route into the heart of America, that made competition impracticable if not well-nigh impossible. The two companies finally composed their differences, with the result that the flag of the Hudson's Bay company was left on every trading post throughout the northwest.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that as time went on our governments of the past repeated in railway construction the same mistakes that led to the defeat of the Northwest company in the early fur trade in Canadian history. I wish to make it plain at this time, that we are not blaming anybody for these mistakes. It was only natural that they should occur, because our development first began from the shores of the St. Lawrence river. Canadian settlement first began at these points. Montreal and Toronto were thriving cities before the west was ever heard of; therefore it was only natural that the big interests in those places should want the trade from the northwest to flow to the financial coffers of Montreal and Toronto. We are not objecting. That was the attitude they took. But we want to point out that in accepting the building in Canada of a national transcontinental railway system to carry our goods east and west we completely ignored the most feasible and the most logical route, that to the northern sea.

We feel strongly that some time in the near future Hudson bay is going to be the principal sea lane between the old world and the new. I know there are many people who say that you cannot navigate Hudson bay and Hudson strait for more than three months of the year. I am going to allow that statement to pass for the time being, but I doubt it very much. I doubt it for this reason. It will be remembered that from 1914 to 1918, when there was great danger of German U-boats shutting off the north Atlantic, plans were ready to make full use of Hudson bay; and in the war just finished, when there was danger of long-range German U-boats cutting off the North Atlantic, it was also possible that we could have used Hudson bay.

In order to demonstrate the possibilities of this route, since the railroad is now completed to Churchill, I want to quote from some of the shipping authorities who have had boats going to the seaport of Port Churchill. I want to quote from the imperial committee on shipping. This is what they say:

> As far as physical risks are concerned we are convinced that the Hudson bay route is not more dangerous, and in some respects less dangerous, than the St. Lawrence route.

In making that statement I presume that the imperial committee is referring to the season in which shipping is carried on in Hudson bay.

May I now refer to the Dalgleish report on Hudson bay shipping. R. L. Dalgleish is the president of the Dalgleish Shipping Company of England. His boats were the first to sail into the Hudson bay to take wheat from that port after the railroad was completed in 1931. Here is what he has to say concerning the possibility of the Hudson bay route:

> I loaded the first ship at Churchill eight years ago with wheat, and anyone who says that Port Churchill will not in course of time become one of the world's great ports does not know what he is talking about.

That was in 1931, and again I presume that Mr. Dalgleish is referring to the navigational season in Hudson bay, which is from approximately the middle of June until the first week in October. But I wish to indicate to the administration the possibilities of extending that season to five or six months and perhaps at some time in the future to a year-round port. As proof of that, I wish to quote from an eminent Canadian geologist and explorer, Doctor Robert Bell, Fellow of the Royal Society, explorer of the northwest and a very high authority on northern navigation. He was sent to Hudson bay and Hudson strait by the federal government in, I believe, 1881, to investigate the possibilities of navigating Hudson bay and strait, and this is the report which he gave on returning from that area in 1881:

> It is impossible that there should be at any time in the twelve months difficulty in navigating Hudson straits for they are upon tide water. In regard to the bay itself, there is no date for the opening or closing of navigation because the bay is open all the year round, like the ocean in corresponding latitudes. It is strictly correct to say that the bay is open during the winter. There is a margin of ice along the shallow water, but it never extends so far but a man on the beach can see the open water on a clear morning. Bay ice, being light and rotten after it breaks away from the shore, offers little obstruction to the steamship.

That is the opinion of Doctor Bell in connection with the possibilities of making Hudson bay a year-round port. I am not going to ask that the present administration do that immediately; I fully realize that it will take time to bring that about; but I want to point out that there are eminent explorers who believe Hudson bay can be made a year-round port, and I venture to say that we shouid approach the matter from that angle.

From 1880 until 1914 Canada expanded in a westward direction with the settlement of the plains in the western part of the country. From now on, I think we are going to expand more. We are going to see greater development in northern Canada than we have ever seen before. At the present moment the Hudson Bay railway runs 510 miles from the Pas, Manitoba, to Churchill, and over that 510 miles of steel, it is correct to say, there is not much traffic. But that railway runs through one of the richest mineral areas to be found anywhere on this continent. At places it does not pass directly through the area but it passes close by mineral fields which could be connected up by short lines of railway, and I have no doubt that within the next few years we shall see these developments take place.

Already at a place close to the Hudson Bay railway, at Wekusko in northern Manitoba, development is being made in gold mining. I understand that a site for the town has already been laid out and some time in the future it will furnish homes for eight thousand people; and there is sufficient ore to last some fifty years.

Some hon. members may ask, what is the use of our using this route when we have already three transcontinental railways in Canada capable of shipping all Canadian grain to the eastern seaboard? The answer is this. It is much cheaper to ship by sea than by rail. The sea route from Churchill, Manitoba, to European ports is approximately 100 sea miles farther than from the eastern seaboard, but the rail haul is much less, and it is the rail haul that is really expensive. From Saskatoon to Churchill is approximately 800 miles, and from Saskatoon to the head of the lakes is only slightly greater; but it is another 1,200 miles to salt water, and that extra 1,200 miles must be made either by rail or by cargo boats across the great lakes. If you make it by cargo boat you have to shift your cargo several times before you finally get it on the ocean freighter at Montreal, and that costs money.

According to the grain commissioners, the use of this northern route will mean a saving to western Canada of seven cents a bushel, basis Port Churchill. Now seven cents a bushel is a very large saving on the grain of the western farmer. I want to suggest something that the government could do in order to increase that saving, should they find it convenient to make further use of the

Churchill route. At the present time the chief hold-up in connection with the use of the Hudson bay route is the excessively high insurance premiums charged on ships going into Hudson bay, and I should like to deal with the unfair insurance charges in connection with the bay route.

It is most important that something be done to bring to a reasonable figure the insurance rates on ships plying Hudson bay. At the moment the marine insurance rates are based on "whole-world" basis renewable yearly. These policies are subject to "institute warranties" which in actuality are agreements that the ships will not be taken into certain trade routes or into certain ports considered to involve extra risk. The British North American "warranty clause" provides that no ship may enter British North American ports, that is Canadian ports, with the exception of Vancouver, Prince Rupert, Halifax and Saint John, New Brunswick. Should a ship be routed to prohibited waters an additional fee must be paid, as laid down by the joint Hull committee. Then for vessels which wish to use the Hudson bay route a further and exorbitant penalty is exacted by the marine insurance people. At one time this rate was as high as ten times the figure charged for St. Lawrence bound vessels. This is bad enough, but even worse than this is the fact that no insured ships may enter the bay after the season, and the length of season is arbitrarily set without regard to the actual safety of the route. Thus you may understand that by the manipulation of insurance rates those people who think they have more to gain by having grain shipped from eastern ports can prevent the use of this new route.

I am not blaming them for that. Possibly they have interests tied up, money invested. Nevertheless we feel that it ought to be the policy of the government to make a little more use of the seaport which lies just north of the prairie provinces.

Now I wish to deal for a few minutes with navigation in Hudson bay. First I think we must realize that Hudson bay itself does not freeze over and it would be possible to keep the port of Churchill open with an ice-breaker. However, it is correct that ice drifts down from Baffin bay and from Davis strait to block the entrance to the strait at times. In the fall, navigation is made dangerous because of the fact that fog hangs over the straits. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this danger can be completely eliminated by the use of radar on ships going to those northern latitudes. Then in connection with navigation it has been said that the magnetic compass has too much deviation in those northern areas to be much good as far as navigation is concerned. I submit that this government can overcome that difficulty quite readily in this way. I understand that we have about a hundred corvettes that have been decommissioned and are to be destroyed. Practically all these corvettes are equipped with gyro compasses, and there is no reason at all why the government should not have those gyro compasses salvaged and placed on ocean-going ships going into Hudson bay.

In addition, I think we should investigate the possibility of constructing ships suitable for trade in Hudson Bay, just as the Russians have constructed ships suitable for trade in their northern latitudes. In this regard there is something else which I think should be mentioned in connection with Russia's development of navigation over the top of the world, over the top of Siberia. Annually the Russians send millions of tons of shipping from European Russia through the Arctic ocean almost to 70 degrees latitude, where it turns south and comes down to Vladivostok, on the Asiatic side of the Pacific ocean. That is done during two months of the summer. Hudson bay is much further south than the Arctic ocean north of Siberia, and I venture to say we could make Churchill, Manitoba, at least an eight month port.

I have just one further word to add in connection with this matter, and that is in regard to the future of northern Canada. I have mentioned already that we must do something in the near future to develop our north country. The Russians are developing their northland, and I should like to see Canada at least keep abreast of them. There is no reason at all why we cannot do in our northern country what they have been doing in theirs. I understand the government have a policy with respect to this route, and I am anxious to hear that policy, because I am sure there are in the present administration men who fully realize the great importance of northern Canada to the future of this country.

Mr. J. R. MacNICOL (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the motion of the hon. member for Churchill (Mr. Moore), and I am proud to follow such a gallant sailor as the hon. gentleman has demonstrated himself to be through his service with our own Canadian navy during the war now ended. We are fortunate to have in the House of Commons men who are conversant with sailing and who have a knowledge of shipping, such as the

hon. member. I have a warm feeling for the port of Churchill, and anything I can say or do to bring about a greater use of that port I am going to say and do. Many times I have addressed clubs of one kind and another across Ontario in an endeavour to create an interest on the part of this province in western problems. I believe the greater interest Ontario takes in the west and the problems of the west the better it will be for western Canada, because down here is the place where most of the support has to come from. On the other hand I am delighted to see western members discussing their own problems, and one of them is the port of Churchill.

I rather like to call Churchill the back door of Canada, which indeed it is. We have fine ports on the Atlantic seaboard, on the great river St. Lawrence and on the western coast, and there is no reason why we should not have a port on our northern seaboard as well. Last year I made a trip right down to the Arctic ocean to inquire into the possibilities of shipping from Aklavik on the north shore of our country, and a few years ago I made a thorough survey of the Hudson Bay railway right down to the port of Churchill, so when I speak about Churchill I am speaking about something I have myself examined into and seen.

The southern terminus of the Hudson Bay railway is the Pas. This does not mean "pass" in the ordinary sense; it is called after the Pasquia river, which flows into the Saskatchewan river near this fine thriving town. It means in Cree "the joining of the waters." From that point to Churchill is a distance of about 506 miles; and this is a mighty fine railway. Whoever had to do with the construction of that line built a spendid roadbed on which to lay the rails, which are of heavy weight capable of carrying an enormous traffic. This was demonstrated very clearly during the recent war when our American cousins shipped a vast number of tons of heavy freight to Churchill for their works in that area. So much was this the case that I believe in 1943, the year of greatest traffic, the road paid a profit of $112,000, of course on operating expenses only. That is a clear demonstration that if the road could obtain the freight, this country would not have to meet annual deficits which, using arbitrary but fairly correct figures, run from $250,000 to perhaps $550,000 for operating costs alone. In my judgment that is not a heavy deficit, but there is no reason why we should have any deficit whatever.

At the port itself unquestionably Canada possesses one of the largest and certainly one of the best built elevators in the world. This elevator was constructed at that remote northern location by a member of this House of Commons, an engineer of note, none other than the present Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe). One thing I like about the minister is that he does know a great deal about construction, and that elevator at Churchill is a tribute not only to those who planned it but to those who built it. I have not seen a better elevator anywhere, and I have seen a great many of them. The sad thing about it is that the elevator is not used to anything like the extent it should be. I believe from 1931 to 1945 the total amount of wheat shipped over that road was only something like 24,000,000 bushels. The maximum use was back in 1932, I believe, when the road carried something less than 5,500,000 bushels of wheat. The capacity is a great deal more than that, and that capacity should be used.

I should like to see some new policy in connection with the operation of the Hudson Bay railway, Mr. Speaker, under which we could arrange to deliver over that route all that it could handle and ship. The shipping capacity is perhaps not as great as some would think, though it may be greater than will be admitted by those who have not been using the shipping facilities to their limit. The general opinion is that the port is good for a maximum of about four months a year. This might be lengthened, of course, through the use of ice-breakers, to break up the very heavy off-shore ice formations, and to break up the ice in the bay itself. Ice comes down from the north toward the south end of the bay, and shipping using the port late in the season and entering Hudson bay itself would have to sail south and out around great sheets of ice. If those sheets were broken up by ice-breakers such as are in operation at Petsamo in northern Finland—at present owned by Russia—or at Archangel, the port might be kept open to some such time as was mentioned by the hon. member who introduced the resolution.

I do not feel competent to say how long the port should be kept open, but I am satisfied we could use it to the greatest advantage for between three and four months a year. If we did that we would be able to ship not less than 15 million to 20 million bushels of wheat in a season. The elevator capacity is sufficient, running in the neighbourhood of about three million bushels or more. I believe there is that much in it at the present time. So that throughout a shipping season, if we started

out with a full elevator it would be an easy matter to handle between 15 to 20 million bushels of wheat a year. That operation would save the country an annual deficit both on capital and in operating costs. It seems to me that in all the years I have been in the house capital and interest charges have run as high as $5 million or $6 million a year—although I do not remember the exact figure.

If fifteen to twenty million bushels of wheat were shipped over that route in a year—and more should be shipped, if possible—the operations would save the country an annual deficit, and would seem to me to be amply justified, and the procedure which would be dictated by ordinary common business sense. In addition to that, through constant use of the route during the shipping season and the natural increase in knowledge acquired by those sailors and by those associated with shipping who would use the route, the length of time during which it could be used would undoubtedly increase. In any event I maintain it should be used.

While I had not expected this resolution would be reached to-day and, as a result, have not my notes before me, my memory is that the three western provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, backed with their crown lands the money that was invested in the building of the route, $50,000,000. At that time, when the construction of the route was proposed, the federal government did not feel inclined to advance the required sum of money, and it was for that reason that the provinces gave this guarantee, in order that the country might be opened up. For that reason those prairie provinces are keenly interested in the use of the route and, in my judgment, a greater use of it would open up new trade channels.

As the previous speaker has said, it is much shorter by rail and sea from Saskatoon or other western Canada points to the European market than it is from Chicago to that market. The water route is longer, but of course it is cheaper. The rail route from Saskatoon, or from Manitoba elevator points, down to the bay, is much shorter.

This applies not only to the shipping of wheat. I remember well having seen fine cattle pens up there, and having listened to the men at the port tell how they were able to ship cattle, and I remember their statement that the cattle arrived overseas in first-class condition. I see no reason why a number of ships could not carry cattle and other farm stock from that port to the old country, thereby putting more money into the pockets of the western farmers.

I am one who believes that the more money we leave in western Canada or with western farmers the better it will be for eastern Canada. People have said to me, "What business is it of yours whether the west develops or not?" Well, it is every man's business; it is the business of every easterner, and particularly if he is engaged in business. If he is neither manufacturing nor in production, he may not be so keenly interested. I was in my time in the manufacturing class, and naturally the advancement of the west meant a great deal to the business in which I was engaged. The greater the amount of money that is put into the pockets of western farmers, the more they will buy; the more they buy, the more men are given employment in Ontario and Quebec and other eastern provinces.

Cattle and wheat could be sent over that route. I have examined it carefully. I know that not less than 250 of the 500 miles is fairly good timber country, good fishing country, and not altogether improvident agricultural country. I have seen crops of every description in the area, and I have no doubt that if the roadway were used to a greater extent, so that all the little towns and villages along its route would have more to do and more men employed, greater and greater trade would be built up. Certainly large quantities of timber could be shipped from the area.

I do not know who would be responsible for the improvement of the Pas. It is situated at a natural trade crossing on the Saskatchewan river. That river would be a great trade artery, if used — and it is not, although I hope it will be some day. I hope the time is not far distant when it may be a shipping route of note. However the fact is that east and west of the Pas little has been done to develop trade. There is no railway east or west, only to the north—nothing but the river itself. Then, the equipment on the river is not what it should be. One reason for the lack of development is that the docks are a disgrace to that part of the country. I have no doubt the Minister of Reconstruction is familiar with them. Those docks are built on the Pasquia river, and they are a menace to life. To enter a boat at The Pas to go either east or west on the river—and those boats are small—one almost takes his life in his hands. The docks are indeed in a dilapidated and dangerous condition.

I believe the whole country could be built up and traffic developed for the railway if an

honest effort were made to open up the country east and west of the town of The Pas, which has a population of 5,000 to 8,000. One must be careful in making an estimate of the size of a town; if it is too high, it is ridiculous, and if it is too low, the townspeople are offended. However, my leader would know more about that, because he represented the area for some time in the local legislature. Perhaps if I said the population is around 5,000 or 6,000 I would not be far out.

Mr. BRACKEN: That is about correct.

Mr. MacNICOL: People moved in there with high hopes. If The Pas had half a chance and was backed up as it should be, it would soon become an important distributing centre. If given a chance, there is no reason why it should not equal the size of that fine city of Prince Albert or, better still, become something like Edmonton.

The north area is undoubtedly one of the best mineral areas in the world. I do not know of any place where so much mineral wealth is concentrated in such a small area as that around Flin Flon and Sherritt Gordon. There are a score of new mines opening up along the Hudson Bay railway and along the old canoe route from the Pas to Churchill. That district is fine minerally and not too bad agriculturally, particularly the southern end. There is not a great deal of timber, but there is sufficient to meet the requirements of the country. There is a splendid road bed, an excellent elevator, and the best equipment of the Canadian National rolls down to that port.

I am going to ask the minister in charge when preparing his estimates for next year—I imagine it is too late to do anything this year, because by this time probably everything is frozen—to make arrangements to use that route to a much greater extent. We should arrange to ship fifteen to twenty million bushels of wheat over that route next year to start with. I discussed this matter with wheat importers in Liverpool, and at Birkenhead with cattle importers, and I was told that this route has great merit. So far the route has been more damned than praised, but I am always going to praise it until it is used more than it is to-day.

I do not know that there is a great deal more I can say. I have a warm feeling for that whole country. The power possibilities are tremendous. The railroad passes by two of the most marvellous power sites in Canada, the Kettle and the Manitou rapids. The banks are solid rock and the dams could be built as high as one wanted them. I may be exaggerating, but I believe that these sites are capable of producing from two to two and a half million horsepower each. I am thinking of the possible height of the dams that could be built and the reservoirs that could be built up behind them, running back almost to lake Winnipeg. In fact, the lakes almost join together and between is what might be called a river So that there is vast power there. Long before you come to Manitou or Kettle rapids there is an excellent power site at White Mud rapids where a vast amount of power could be developed. So, Mr. Speaker, that territory has a great wealth of natural resources. The only route into it by rail is the Hudson Bay railway. The more we use the Hudson bay route for shipping across the sea, the more the Hudson Bay railway will be used; the more that railway is used, the greater the number of the people who will go into that country the more the country will be opened up, and the more it is opened up the greater the volume of business that will come down to Davenport riding and elsewhere. I have to think of Davenport riding, sir, because it has I know many manufacturing plants of every description.

Mr. CASSELMAN: One of the better ridings.

Mr. MacNICOL: As my hon. freind says, one of the better ridings. I have never yet said that it is the best riding, because I think if I did Mr. Deputy Speaker, who is occupying the chair at the moment, would say "next to Brantford". But it is a wonderful riding so far as the working men in it and industry are concerned. I have never asked for anything for my riding in this house. I have never even asked for a post office. I have asked for nothing for my riding except jobs for the workmen I represent, and there are from forty to forty-five thousand of them working in plants and factories in my riding. I can see no way of getting jobs for them unless the companies that employ them get orders, and I know of no better way of getting orders for those companies than by opening up and developing this country. I will strongly support the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) or the Minister of Transport, whichever minister is responsible, in doing every thing he can in bringing about a greater use of the Hudson Bay railway and of the magnificent port of Churchill.

I shall not take time to speak of the history and the great many advantages of that port. It has a depth of thirty-five feet of water right at the docks, and modern equipment has been installed for the unloading of wheat cars.

Four cars of wheat can be unloaded on each side at the one time, approximately, 40,000 bushels of grain or more an hour, and grain can be loaded into two ships at the same time at the rate of 150,000 bushels to 160,000 bushels an hour. These are great port facilities—too splendid to have them standing idle, particularly when our western elevators are filled with wheat and are crying out for the wheat to be put on trains and shipped to Europe.

I cannot see how the opening up of the Hudson Bay railway and the port of Churchill would be anything but of great benefit to western Canada, and whatever is of great benefit to western Canada, whatever puts more money into the pockets of the farmers and business men of western Canada, means in the last analysis more orders for the factories in the riding of Brantford, Mr. Deputy Speaker, more orders for the factories in Davenport riding—

Mr. CASSELMAN: And Grenville-Dundas. Better include them all.

Mr. MacNICOL: More orders for Grenville-Dundas, more orders for Hamilton riding, for Peterborough, et cetera. I do not know a riding in Ontario that would not benefit from the development of western Canada, because every such development means more orders for the plants and factories in Ontario ridings and more jobs for the men whom I and my hon. friends represent in this House of Commons.

Mr. A. M. NICHOLSON (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I believe that the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) has won the name of parliament's ambassador of good will. It has been his good fortune to travel perhaps more extensively in Canada than any other member of parliament. He has invariably found it possible in the course of his travels to become familiar with the problems of the people living in those areas, and upon returning to parliament he has always come to the defence of those who live in remote places and puts in a word, as he has to-day, for greater consideration for the frontiers of Canada.

Having gone to public and high school in this province perhaps I might be forgiven for saying that a great many people here think that the most important part of the world is confined within the boundaries of Ontario. In view of the fact that there are 147 members in the House of Commons from Ontario and Quebec and 98 from all other parts of Canada, it is only natural that those of us who represent constituencies outside these two provinces should find it necessary from time to time to bring to the attention of the government and the house the problems of other parts of the country as we see them.

I would remind the house that two years after Champlain founded the city of Quebec, Henry Hudson left Great Britain with the *Discovery* in quest of a new and shorter route to Japan and China and the far east. He left on April 17, and two months later his party had reached Iceland. There they managed to gather some wild fowl to replenish their diminishing larder. On July 5, they reached the east coast of Ungava. By the 19th of July they had passed Cape Hope's Advance, and the optimism of Hudson was marked by the name he gave to that point. Then after zigzagging back and forth for five months hoping to find an opening that would lead to the far east, he was eventually disappointed and was forced to winter in the southwest corner of James bay. Hudson's journal indicates that on the 10th of November his ship was frozen in. Later in the year one of the Indians in the region came and looked for the first time upon these strange white faces with their long beards, and he was sent away feeling very happy, carrying with him a knife and a looking glass and some buttons, the gift of Hudson. He returned the following day with two beaver skins, which he gave to Hudson to express his appreciation of his kindness the previous day. He also had two deer skins with him, which were exchanged for a hatchet, and so during these winter months of 1610-11 the first trading took place up in the far north.

The records tell us that the crew had a very difficult winter, and some of its members became most unruly. When they finally set out in the spring, Hudson, his young son and seven of the sick men were cast adrift in the ship's boat. The carpenter offered to join Hudson if his tool chest were given to him. The other members of the crew were glad to have one mouth less to feed and gave the carpenter his chest, and the carpenter then joined Hudson and his companions. What happened to them is one of the unsolved mysteries of the north. No one has ever been able to guess what happened to Hudson and his small company. But the *Discovery*, with the other members of the crew, reached Digges Island later in the spring. Three men went ashore to see if the Eskimos there would not give them some supplies to tide them over, and the three of them were killed by the Eskimos. The mate, Juet, who was chiefly responsible for plotting against Hudson, died of starvation while crossing the Atlantic, and only four out of the original twenty-three reached Plymouth in the following summer.

It would be impossible for me in the time at my disposal to go into the fascinating

history of this great north country but mention should be made of the founder of Churchill, Jens Munck. In 1619, as the commander of the *Unicorn* and *Lamprey,* he set out to find the Northwest passage. The ships were fitted out by the king. They reached Churchill and spent the winter there. They had a very difficult time. They were short of food all through the winter, and on the 6th of May, 1619, Munck wrote in his journal:

The bodies of the dead lie uncovered because none of us had strength to bury them.

By June, Munck and two of his crew were all that was left. The grass was beginning to sprout; two of the sailors crawled ashore and collected some of the grass and sea nettles, and this vegetable diet seems to have checked their disease. They returned to their ship and succeeded in restoring to health their commander, who had said "Good night to all the world" and commended his soul to God, as he did not think there was any chance of coming home alive. However, the two sailors and Munck out of the crew of sixty-four reached Norway in September, 1620, on the *Lamprey.*

As I said, I have not the time to go into the history of the Hudson Bay railway and the port of Churchill. The hon. member for Davenport and the hon. member for Churchill (Mr. Moore) have dealt with certain aspects of the matter. There is no doubt at all that the people of Canada have a very large investment in the Hudson Bay railway and in port facilities, and that the route provides a feasible means of transportation between the prairie provinces and Great Britain.

I have on my desk a number of reports of the imperial shipping committee. I shall quote from the General Report in 1930 signed by H. J. Mackinder, Chairman. The committee comprised representatives of the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, South Africa and India, two shipowners, one shipbuilder, one manufacturer and a merchant. The report was signed at London on May 23, 1930. I quote from the summary of its recommendations:

For two hundred years the Hudson's Bay Company has transported its cargoes to and from Europe by the Hudson Bay route. For probably one hundred and fifty years of this period these cargoes were successfully carried in sailing ships, consequently it does not seem unreasonable to suppose that modern ships, modern equipment and modern ideas should meet with a considerably greater degree of success, and that a very great and important route will eventually be developed, provided always that in the initial stages of the development every precaution is taken to provide for the protection of the vessels using it.

Then there were certain recommendations regarding charting, aids to navigation, icebreakers and fuel bases. I think it must be said to the credit of the departments concerned here that the recommendations regarding aids to navigation and so forth have been carried out to a very considerable extent.

In 1939, on July 19, just before the war broke out, another report was made by the imperial shipping committee. I should like to quote a few sections from the report:

13. There have been during the nine seasons since the route was opened 64 voyages to Churchill, and in our opinion the stage of development may now be considered as over. The way is adequately charted and equipped with the usual aids to navigation, and the exceptional circumstances on account of which the warranty is imposed—ice, fog and magnetic disturbance—are known and have been provided against by the gyro compass, direction finding by radio and the very efficient services of the Canadian patrol vessels. With the sole exception, therefore, of the difficulty which might arise of securing adequate salvage if a vessel should be wrecked late in the season, it is the view of the committee that the Hudson Bay route need not be considered as more risky than the St. Lawrence.

14. The Underwriter's representatives have agreed to regard the past nine seasons as closing the development period of the route, the casualties which have occurred being regarded as paid for by the premiums received. It is clear, however, that before any substantial reduction in the rate of premium for suspending the warranty to Churchill can be secured, an increased number of voyages to and from Churchill will be necessary. There are at present (July, 1939) approximately eight cargoes of wheat in the elevator at Churchill available for shipment when the season opens, and if there is a fairly good harvest this year, it should be practicable to set up a new record in the number of voyages in the season.

15. In view of the very small number of cargoes available for transport from Churchill in 1937 and 1938, the Joint Hull Committee have not been able to see their way to recommend to the Underwriters a further reduction in the premium for suspending the warranty for the coming season 1939 and the rates to be charged will be the same as in 1938. But in consultation with our Chairman, the Joint Hull Committee have taken note of the fact that there are already at Churchill for shipment from the 1938 season's crop some eight cargoes of wheat, and they have agreed that if some twenty cargoes in all are brought away from Churchill in 1939 and no serious loss occurs, they will be prepared to give favourable consideration to the question of recommending a further reduction in 1940 from the rates of premium chargeable in 1939.

During the shipping season of 1939 war broke out and it was not possible to have the twenty vessels move through Churchill as was suggested.

I hold in my hand a memorandum written by D. J. Munro, C.M.G., a captain of the royal navy, and also a nautical assessor for the courts of Scotland. He made a careful study of the possibilities of the northern

routes. Hon. members might be interested in some of his remarks regarding Hudson bay and strait. This is what he says:

The safe navigation of Hudson straits is now greatly aided by four instruments perfected during the last few years, viz:

(1) Echo depth recording
(2) Wireless direction-finding stations
(3) Gyroscopic compass
(4) Radar. An instrument which enables dangers invisible by reason of darkness, fog, snow, rain, etc., to be indicated to the mariner, especially icebergs and land.

In comparing the hazards of this route with the hazards of routes in other parts of the world he mentions that commercial ships have now gone from Murmansk to Vladivostok. This is what he said:

Commercial ships have now gone from Murmansk to Vladivostok. In 1935 two ships left Murmansk and two left Vladivistok carrying 9,000 tons of freight between them. The *Vancetti* and *Iskra* arrived at the latter port on 11th September—the *Anadr* and *Stalingrade* entered Murmansk on 11th and 15th of September. These craft carried supplies for ports established at the mouths of the great rivers Ob, Yenisie, and Lena. The distance was over 3,000 miles, and they had not the latest up-to-date instruments to aid them. The Russians have kept their war performances on this route much to themselves, but there are various substantiated reports of submarines arriving by this route at Vladivostok.

The hon. member for Churchill pointed out, and I think rightly so, that on the ships that are now being decommissioned there is a valuable equipment that might be made available on the Bay route.

With regard to the hazards, I think we should not lose sight of the fact that there are hazards in sailing the St. Lawrence route. I crossed to Great Britain on a cattle boat one summer. We left Quebec city in June. We rode at anchor for some three days in the Newfoundland area. There were ice hazards nearby; we were in dense fog. It has never been suggested that the St. Lawrence route should be discontinued because of those hazards. The evidence that is available clearly indicates that the port of Churchill and Hudson strait can be navigated successfully, and many of us feel that it can navigated for a much longer period than has hitherto been accepted by government authority.

As the hon. member for Davenport pointed out, it is important to western agriculture that its products be placed on world markets with the costs reduced to a minimum. I hold in my hand one of the booklets put out a number of years ago by the "On to the Bay" association which made an intensive study of freight rates. They give the distances betwen various centres in western Canada and Liverpool via Churchill and Montreal. According to the rates which apparently prevailed in 1931, when this report was written, on a carload of live stock being shipped from Yorkton, Saskatchewan, to the old country, there would be a saving of $102; on butter and dressed poultry from Yorkton there would be a saving of $300; on eggs in carload lots there would be a saving of $134 and some cents.

I have here one of the reports of the board of grain commissioners for Canada dealing with the movement of grain. This report was presented with the compliments of the secretary, Mr. John Rayner, dated Fort William, Ontario, March, 1939. It gives the charges in connection with handling at country elevators, railway freight to Churchill, actual handling at Churchill, ocean freight rates and marine insurance approximate average transportation handling charges per bushel of wheat between the producer in western Canada and the arrival of the vessel at British ports, first by way of Churchill and then by way of Vancouver and Montreal. The Churchill rates as given here are 29·25 cents per bushel; Vancouver rate is 35·25 cents, and the Montreal rate by way of the great lakes, 35·25 cents.

It will be readily appreciated that these substantial savings in the getting of agricultural products from western Canada to the European buyer in the shortest possible time and at the lowest cost will be important factors in determining how much trade we are likely to have in the post-war period.

It is true that the people of Canada have spent considerable sums of money in this development, but I wish to suggest that it must never be regarded as an unwise expenditure. I might remind the house that we make very large appropriations for Montreal, Vancouver and Halifax. I hold in my hand a sessional paper which was brought down in 1940 in reply to a question of mine asking for the total amounts paid by parliament to Montreal between the years 1935 to 1939. In those years we appropriated for Montreal $7,000,000 and some odd; Churchill $926,000 and some odd; Vancouver $2,234,000 and some odd, and Halifax $4,954,000 and some odd. I am not complaining about these expenditures. I think it is important that the government vote money to see that the facilities at Halifax, Vancouver and Montreal are maintained in an efficient state.

Mr. ISNOR: May I ask the hon. member a question? Are the figures he gave capital expenditures?

Mr. NICHOLSON: The questions were as follows:

1. How much was spent by the dominion government for dredging the St. Lawrence river and Montreal harbour, and for operating and administering the St. Lawrence ship channel during the years from 1935 to 1939?

2. How much was spent during the years 1935 to 1939 under the Maritime Freight Rates Act to compensate railways for the difference between the tariff tolls and normal tolls on all traffic moved during the above mentioned years?

3. How much was spent during the years 1935 to 1939 to provide for construction and improvements in connection with the Hudson Bay Railway, and to provide for losses in connection with the operation of the railway during the above years?

4. How much money was advanced by the dominion government during the years 1935 to 1939 for the following: (a) Montreal harbour; (b) Churchill harbour; (c) Vancouver harbour; (d) Halifax harbour?

I have a table which I should be pleased to place on *Hansard* with the permission of the house.

Mr. CHEVRIER: It is already on.

Mr. MacKINNON: Is it already on?

Mr. NICHOLSON: Only the questions. The answers are as follows:

1.

	Dredging	Operation and administration
1935-36	$ 6,885,464 88	(See footnote)
1936-37	3,083,428 14	
1937-38	2,698,256 05	$394,488 29
1938-39	2,879,142 18	221,558 09
1939-40	3,211,030 44	236,286 45
	$18,757,321 69	$852,332 83

Operation and administration costs included in total annual costs prior to 1937-38: no separate record available.

2.

1935-36	$ 2,348,399 32
1936-37	2,505,823 05
1937-38	3,182,457 77
1938-39	2,582,897 39
1939-40	2,660,294 56
	$13,279,872 09

3.

	Capital construction	Operating deficit	Total
1935-36	$158,539 62	$ 239,702 75	$ 398,242 37
1936-37	82,380 76	252,854 81	335,235 57
1937-38	62,805 61	364,413 77	427,219 38
1938-39	20,388 43	285,035 01	305,423 44
1939-40	1,969 04	330,382 06	332,351 10
	$326,083 46	$1,472,388 40	$1,798,471 86

4.

	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	Total
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Montreal						
Advances-Interest Bearing-*re* Capital Works	74,000 00	852,791 41	516,012 85	838,474 34	728,194 70	3,009,473 30
Grants-Non-Interest Bearing-*re* " "	1,252,737 20	1,680,346 78	1,098,002 08	.....	.....	4,031,086 06
	1,326,737 20	2,533,138 19	1,614,014 93	838,474 34	728,194 70	7,040,559 36
Churchill						
Advance-Interest Bearing-*re* Capital Works	.....	.....	.....	9,443 94	.....	9,443 94
Grants-Non-Interest Bearing-*re* " "	199,529 05	121,200 82	.....	.....	.....	320,729 87
" " " -*re* Operations	188,210 09	166,176 56	.....	.....	.....	354,377 65
" " " " Deficits	.....	.....	140,889 61	55,009 92	46,491 58	242,391 11
	* 387,730 14	**287,377 38	140,889 61	64,453 86	46,491 58	926,942 57
*Fiscal year 1935-36						
** 9 mos. to Dec. 31, 1936						
Vancouver						
Advances-Interest Bearing-*re* Capital Works	417,971 30	580,974 26	210,873 31	35,969 62	63,508 86	1,309,297 35
" " " " Redempt. Bk. Loans	.....	.....	983,405 90	58,405 90	.....	925,000 00
	417,971 30	580,974 26	1,194,279 21	22,436 28	63,508 86	2,234,297 35
Halifax						
Advances-Interest Bearing-*re* Capital Works	73,211 63	68,242 95	14,335 73	.....	111,640 93	238,759 78
" " " Redempt. Bk. Loans for Capital Works	118,985 80	449,484 20	.....	.....	.....	568,470 00
" " " *re* Redempt. of Bonds	.....	.....	964,338 37	1,700,000 00	.....	2,664,338 37
Grants-Non-Interest Bearing-*re* Capital Works	626,164 08	268,285 98	.....	.....	.....	894,450 06
" " " *re* Redempt. Bk. Loans for Deficits	.....	573,227 50	.....	.....	.....	573,227 50
" " " *re* Deficits	.....	.....	14,934 33	.....	.....	14,934 33
	818,361 51	1,359,240 63	964,936 97	1,700,000 00	111,640 93	4,954,180 04

Mr. ISNOR: So far as Halifax is concerned, they were capital expenditures, not dredging.

Mr. NICHOLSON: As pointed out by one of the other speakers this afternoon, in 1908 prairie lands were definitely set aside and ear-marked to provide money for the Hudson Bay railway, and lands were sold to the amount of $42 million, of which $20 million was received in cash. I find this information in an address delivered by Mr. J. M. Stevenson, of the "On to the Bay" association, at its annual meeting in Saskatoon on December 7, 1940. This is what he said:

> But in 1908, prairie lands were definitely set aside and earmarked to provide money for the Hudson Bay railway, and such lands were sold in the form of purchased homesteads and preemptions, resulting in some $42 million, of which $22 million was received in cash. This area, therefore, can reasonably assert that it has paid almost the entire cost, and surely this constitutes a substantial reason why we may justifiably demand that the investment be not allowed to lapse.

The money that has been spent has made possible in the north country developments which have had a far-reaching effect on Canada's economy. If this railway had not been undertaken and built when it was, the very valuable deposits from Flin Flon, for example, would not have been available during these past years of war. I realize that Flin Flon is a long way from Churchill, but after the Hudson Bay railway was started it became possible for prospectors to go into the far north country, and several rich mineral areas have been developed. During the war the production of copper, zinc, silver, gold and cadmium by Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting company were important factors in Canada's war effort.

We have also very rich fishing grounds in the north. We have Reindeer lake, Beaver lake and a dozen other fresh water lakes that supply fish to the New York market. We have also very popular and promising tourist grounds. Few members apart from the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) have taken the trouble to visit Canada's great northland in the western provinces. I have been through the Alps; I am familiar with the Lake of the Woods country, the Thousand Island area in the St. Lawrence, and the Muskoka country; but I have not found any place more beautiful than northern Saskatchewan and Manitoba. Some day these places will be a resort for citizens from the United States who will come north to enjoy the fishing and hunting that are available.

Up in the northern part of my own constituency on the Churchill river we have the Island falls development. The plant supplies power for Flin Flon and Sherritt Gordon, and more than $8 million has been spent in developing this modern power project. Quite recently an article appeared in the Toronto *Daily Star* referring to that area as Canada's Shangri-la. All the houses are electrically heated. There are electric lights and various city conveniences. I believe every house has a frigidaire, and I have not found any place in Canada where the standard of living is higher than it is in the small community of Island Falls on the Churchill river.

I admit that this is a considerable distance from Churchill. Some who have visited Churchill say that they would not like to live in the far north. I think it is very fortunate that the people throughout the world do not all want to live in the same place. We have two daughters going to school in Saskatchewan. They have not been in Ottawa for some time, but they think that Ottawa is the last place in the world to live. In their opinion Canora in Mackenzie is the ideal place.

The last time I went into Churchill I travelled with a mounted policeman and his wife who had been away from the north a year and a half. They had gone down to visit relatives in the New England states and they said, "Thank goodness we do not have to live in New Jersey for the rest of our lives." They were most impatient to get back to the north country.

During the war a good deal of attention was paid to the improvement of this area. Just this afternoon an answer was brought down to a question of mine. I asked: "How much has the Canadian government agreed to pay to the United States for American bases at (a) the Pas; (b) Churchill, Manitoba; (c) Southampton island?" The figures are quite interesting. The amount in connection with the Pas is small, $415,000. We are paying the United States $6,206,800 for their work at Churchill and in connection with Southampton island, $5,318,870.

I was in Churchill while a good many Americans were there. My wife had the misfortune to be taken seriously ill while we were in the north and she spent several days in their hospital. She had at her service seven of the best qualified doctors to be found in the United States. They were in northern Canada to look after the health of United States soldiers who were guarding our northland. Needless to say she had the best medical and hospital services possible. Now that the war is over and Canada has agreed to pay $6,200,000 for what has been done at Churchill, I do not think it is unreasonable

to ask that we spend a little more money to give this northern route a chance to prove all that some of us have claimed.

Perhaps we are over-optimistic about the possibilities. The resolution before the house states that in the opinion of the house the government should take into immediate consideration the advisability of encouraging the fullest possible use of the harbour and port facilities at Churchill, Manitoba, or the transferring of the management and control of the said port to a joint board appointed by the governments of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta.

I have before me a proposal that has come from one of the organizations in western Canada. A number of resolutions have come to members of parliament from people in the west who for some reason or other think that Churchill is not getting a square deal. They think that parliament's decisions are weighted heavily by members like the senior member for Halifax, who has been here a good many years, and by members from Ontario and British Columbia who are fearful lest the development of Churchill might prejudice future developments of their own favoured localities. Let me quote from the brief I have before me:

> The case for a change in management is, briefly, as follows:
>
> The present management is the result more of accident than design. The national harbours board was set up becaouse of conditions at other ports, not because of conditions at Churchill. All these others were established ports. At all of them private enterprise had built up trade connections. To them, the substitution of the national harbours board for the independent local boards was, comparatively, a minor matter. Trade and the facilities for promoting trade, and for handling goods, remained in private hands. The businessmen at these ports carried on, little affected by any change.
>
> But Churchill, when it was taken over by the board, was in a very different condition. Churchill by no stretch of the imagination could be called an established seaport. Private enterprise was not and could not be established there; and, therefore, could have not built-up trade connections. There were no established businessmen to carry on in the same manner as they had always done. As the result of a positive policy to make it so, government ownership was complete, without exception.
>
> Obviously, a proper management for Churchill required an organization of a different character from that of the board set up to supervise the other ports. The national harbours board is intended to be a neutral body, a sort of referee between the ports; it cannot go out full-blast in the interests of one particular port.
>
> The port of Churchill is a new enterprise, still waiting to be set firmly on its feet. The principal problems it presents are those connected with the securing of trade to pass through new channels. Like any other enterprise in its early stages, it calls for a vast enthusiasm on the part of its promoters. Like any other venture in its infancy, it requires of its executive, vigour, initiative, drive, freedom in action, and, perhaps more than anything else, a partizanship bordering on the immoderate. The national harbours board is fitted to supply none of these things.

And a little later on:

> What is proposed is that the national harbours board shall cease to have any responsibility for the operation of the grain elevator; for the wharf with its sheds and freight-handling equipment; and, in general, for private enterprise. It is proposed that a new organization be set up to manage, use, and find business for these commercial facilities; and to handle the business it finds. Outside of this, the board can function as usual.

Mr. CHEVRIER: May I ask the hon. gentleman what proposal he is reading from?

Mr. NICHOLSON: This is a resolution of the "On to the Bay" association; I have not the date. It is fairly obvious that the national harbours board would be subject to criticism if it did go out and direct business to Churchill that might normally go to Halifax, Vancouver or Montreal, and I think the resolution before the house has a good deal of merit. I believe the western provinces are necessarily keenly interested in this project. It might be expected that they would have their offices in Europe, with a view to securing trade for the Hudson bay route, and to see that the ships coming to Churchill for wheat are not obliged to cross the Atlantic empty. I believe that has been one of our chief difficulties in the west, that up to the present it has been hard to arrange incoming cargoes at a time when the grain must go out. Therefore there is something in the suggestion that has been made, that some responsibility should be placed upon the shoulders of the western provinces to appropriate funds and set up a board to do this important work. I feel sure the province of Manitoba is very much interested in this development. In 1939 the Department of Transport issued a report on Churchill and the Hudson bay route, and on page 50 I find this:

> It was the wish of the government of Manitoba to develop Churchill townsite in an orderly and progressive manner.

I must congratulate the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) upon his wisdom, while premier, in seeing that free enterprise was not permitted to go in and retard the development by speculation. They planned to have it developed in an orderly way.

> To this end a sloping tract of land near the railway terminus was surveyed in lots and streets as an initial development in 1931. These lots are to remain in the possession of the provincial government, neither grant nor sale to

individuals or to corporations being allowed. Anyone who wishes to occupy one of these lots may obtain a lease by going through the regular formalities. In view of the severity of the climate in the winter, building regulations have been framed which require the settlers to put up substantial and warm houses. They must also take special precautions to reduce the fire hazard.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I urge all hon. members to plan, during the time they are in parliament, to travel as extensively as possible, and to become familiar with problems in all parts of this dominion. In planning their trips during the summer recesses I hope they will find it possible to include a trip to Churchill and Hudson bay, in order to decide for themselves whether or not we have great possibilities in that north country.

Mr. RENE N. JUTRAS (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, coming as I do from Manitoba, the keystone province, I think it only right, and it gives me great pleasure, to thank the hon. members who so far have extolled the beauties of the northern part of my province. I wish more particularly to thank the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol), because I know he has had a deep and sincere interest in the development of northern Canada. I know also that he has travelled extensively in this country and has covered most of the northern portion, so that he is quite familiar with that part of my province under discussion this afternoon. I am very sorry that I have not had the good fortune to visit that portion of Manitoba. It has been my hope some day to take a trip north, and I intend to do so at the very first opportunity, in order to see for myself the climatic and other conditions that exist at this famous seaport of Churchill. However, I have read a great deal of what has been said on this subject both in this house and in the senate. I find that it has been discussed in both houses for many years. I must say it seems that in these discussions a certain amount of discredit has been cast upon Churchill harbour in the interests of the St. Lawrence. Now that the war is over and we are getting back on a peace-time basis, I believe the time has come when this question must be grappled with earnestly.

The position of Hudson bay itself cannot fail to impress anyone who pays the slightest attention to the topography of our country. Many people fail to realize that Hudson bay is one of our greatest lakes. As a matter of fact, some have said that it is half the size of the Mediterranean, and it is situated right at the centre of this continent. To bring home the fact that it is not next door to the north pole, as some people may think, let me remind hon. members that it has a good two thousand miles of seacoast in the temperate zone, so that I think it is high time we stopped thinking about Churchill as a group of Eskimo igloos. After all, this country has invested close to if not more than $13,000,000 in that harbour, and the facilities it has to offer to-day are quite impressive. In order to put those facilities on record I want to read from the annual report of the national harbours board:

The facilities operated by the board include: 1,855 linear feet of wharf with a depth of water alongside of 30 feet at low tide, a steel transit shed 476 feet long by 173 feet wide, a grain elevator with storage capacity of 2,500,000 bushels, equipped with galleries and spouts allowing the loading of three ships at a time, railway tracks along the wharf, a locomotive crane of 20 tons capacity, a floating crane of 10 tons capacity, shear legs of 35 tons capacity, and a marine slipway capable of handling boats of up to 1,200 tons weight.

This harbour is not so far north, as I pointed out before, when we realize that its latitude is approxmiately the same as that of Devonshire in England. Anyone who has been in England, as I have, knows that the climate of Devonshire is indeed the best to be found in the British isles. So we can think of that part of Manitoba, not as a broad stretch of ice but, in certain months of the year, as a pleasant spot in which to live.

I shall not discuss the navigational period, because there seems to be some difference of opinion in the matter. Some experts contend that the harbour cannot be operated for more than one or two months, while others assure us that it may be operated successfully for three or four months. Some hold the view, one which is shared by the hon. member who preceded me, that at reasonable cost this route could be kept open for seven or eight months, or even for the entire year. I have no doubt that with the aid of new navigational equipment developed during the war the route can be made safe because, if I understand the situation correctly, one of the dangers has been that of floating ice in the channel out of the bay.

With the new developments in radar it is clear that vessels will be able to find their way safely in the fog. However, as I said earlier, this question is intricate and capable of considerable debate. But there is no doubt that this port and harbour can be kept open for a period of time longer than it has been in the past. I hold the view that this port has never been exploited to anything like the proper extent.

A moment ago mention was made of the Hudson Bay railway. It seems to me a most significant fact was missed by hon. members

who have spoken earlier. I am given to understand that this railway was most active during the war, and that it justified its existence as a railway. The annual report of the Department of Transport for the year ended March 31, 1944, shows that the volume of traffic, both passenger and freight, declined sharply in comparison with the 1942-43 traffic, and that operations in 1943-44 resulted in a deficit of $347,872.90 as compared with a surplus of $112,120.75 in the previous year.

I refer to this report to show that the Hudson Bay railway which, in the past, has repeatedly been described as a white elephant, had in 1942-43 an income of over $112,000, and thus proved that it can operate at a profit.

The same applies to the port of Churchill. If it were given the same chance as was given the Hudson Bay railway, I have no doubt that the port could operate at a profit, or could at least break even.

Further reference to the report of the national harbours board for 1944 would seem to disclose that the harbour of Churchill was not given a fair chance during the war. Shipping figures for the harbour, beginning with 1940, show that it handled in that year a little over 2,000 net registered tons. In 1941 approximately the same tonnage passed through the port. In 1942 there was an increase to 26,315 registered tons, and in 1943 a slight decrease to 25,026 tons. Then in 1944 there was a decided drop to 4,109 tons. The two heavy years were 1942 and 1943; but for some reason or another interest in the port after that time decreased, and I fear that the harbour is returning to its pre-war fate. I would draw further attention to the limited activities of the port, despite the facilities there offered. I am surprised indeed to find so limited a quantity of wheat passing through there, in spite of the fact that it has a grain elevator capacity of about 2,500,000 bushels.

The harbours board report contains a statement showing the quantities of grain handled at the terminal elevator. This table discloses that in 1940 there were no shipments, that there were none in 1941 or in 1942, and that in 1943, there were 740,219 bushels passing through the port. Then in 1944 we find the sum total of twenty-five bushels. This did not come by water, so that I would assume it must have come by aircraft, or by some other means of conveyance.

In the light of these circumstances the harbour in 1944 had a deficit of $59,266 as compared with one of $29,848 in 1943. I do not know whether there is any relationship between the Hudson Bay railway and the harbour, but the figures show that, in respect of each, the years 1942 and 1943 were the most active for some time.

The spending of $144,500,000 on the St. Lawrence seaways seems at the present time almost an accomplished fact. But let me say in passing that, while I do not begrudge this expenditure, and while I believe it is justified for the development of Canada, at the same time I cannot but view with a certain amount of alarm the constant centralization of industry in eastern Canada. The facts disclose that industry is concentrated in this part of the country, and when the St. Lawrence project comes into being, it will have a tendency to develop centralization in eastern Canada to an even greater degree. I fear for the 13,000,000 that has been spent on Churchill. I think the two are not incompatible. I am quite sure that Churchill harbour could be operated so that it would at least pay expenses, if not provide some income. As the hon. member for Davenport has just said, this would provide encouragement to industry in the west as well as to the people there. When we consider the statistics for 1941, we in the west cannot help viewing them with alarm. I strongly urge the minister to explore the full possibilities of Churchill harbour.

Mr. GORDON B. ISNOR (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, I am sure this has been an interesting afternoon so far as Canadian history is concerned. The hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) has travelled extensively throughout Canada and he always reviews his trips in an interesting and instructive manner. I could understand the hon. member for Churchill (Mr. Moore) introducing a resolution such as this, were it not for the last few words which suggest that a joint board appointed by the governments of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta should be given control of the port of Churchill. I think the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Nicholson) placed his finger upon the question which I have in mind. He referred to the possibilities of the port of Halifax and the lack of possibilities so far as the port of Churchill is concerned. He then went on to state that Halifax has always been more or less under private control, that the merchants of that port simply carried on even though the national harbours board took over that port in 1936 as a national enterprise.

I am not opposed to the first part of the resolution; in fact I am rather in favour of the government doing everything possible to encourage the fullest possible use of the port

facilities at Churchill. However, at a time like this when we are considering post-war plans and expenditures we should consider whether expenditures additional to the $13,000,000 already made should be made on the further development of this port. I am not going to debate that question, nor am I going to try to place the east against the west. The hon. member who spoke last placed the facts before us in a reasonable manner. Taking the case he has presented, I think it will be seen at once that the development of Churchill is not feasible or sound, nor is it wise for the government to spend further money.

Ships enter and leave the port of Halifax during the twelve months in the year, whereas they could use the port of Churchill for only three and a half months, from August 1 to October 15. It will, therefore, be readily understood that it would not be good business to add to the expenditures already made on an unwise development. The last speaker referred to the number of sailings. In the period 1940 to 1944 only 121 ships arrived at that port, or an average of 25·4 ships a year. The departures were 120 ships during the same five-year period. The financial returns show that there has been an investment of about $13,000,000. Approximately $10,000,000 was lost on the grain elevator, which shows an annual revenue of $47,320.94 as against operating expenses of $57,672.82. Roughly speaking, there was a deficit of $10,000 for the year.

The hon. member for Mackenzie said that I am jealous of the port of Halifax. I am jealous of the port of Halifax because of the wonderful record it made, not only during the first world war but during the recent war. I am anxious to see that port maintained at the highest possible state of efficiency. I do not want to see a repetition of what happened after the last war when a very busy port suddenly became stagnant. I do not place the responsibility entirely upon the Minister of Transport (Mr. Chevrier) or upon the national harbours board. When a merchant has a good article to sell, he should go out and sell it. It is up to the steamship companies and the other firms in Halifax to sell the advantages af that port to the rest of Canada. The Minister of Transport is head of the national harbours board, and I say to him that he should take advantage of that port which is open twelve months in the year and which has the most up-to-date facilities of any port in Canada.

The average sailing time for a sixteen-knot vessel from Montreal to London is 203 hours; from Saint John to London, 182 hours, and from Halifax to London, 172 hours. The difference between Halifax and Montreal is thirty-one hours. I mention that for two reasons. First, there is the advantage to be obtained by using the port of Halifax to bring back our troops from overseas. I do not want to say anything unkind about Quebec, but I cannot understand why certain ships sailing from England were rerouted from Halifax to Quebec about a month ago. With ships being needed so badly for the return of troops, I would have thought the authorities would have continued to bring all ships into Halifax. I bring this matter to the attention of the Minister of Transport, hoping that he in turn will bring it to the attention of the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Abbott). The greater the number of ships coming into Halifax, the more space will be available for the transport of troops from England to Canada.

Since the last speaker has placed on record the port facilities of Churchill, I think it is only fair that I should also place on record the port facilities of Halifax, so that anyone reading *Hansard* will at once appreciate the advantages of that fine eastern port, the gateway to Canada. I quote from the annual report of the national harbours board:

> The harbour of Halifax, situated on the Atlantic coast of Nova Scotia, is approached directly from the ocean by a channel with a minimum depth of fifty feet at low tide. It is open to navigation the year round and is served by both the Canadian National and Canadian Pacific railways. Here, the national harbours board operates seven main piers and wharves having about 16,000 linear feet of berthing—

I ask the hon. member for Mackenzie to compare that berthing space with Churchill's. The report goes on:

> —and being equipped with thirteen transit sheds with an aggregate floor area of about 1,100,000 square feet. In addition, the board operates a 2,200,000 bushel grain elevator with a maximum loading capacity of 75,000 bushels per hour and a marine tower with an unloading capacity of 15,000 bushels per hour; also a cold storage terminal warehouse, with about 1,050,000 cubic feet of storage space, completely fitted with freezing, storing and packing equipment and ample rail connections. A cattle shed with yards and runways, with a capacity of 1,000 head, is provided at a location convenient to both water and rail.

Thus the port of Halifax is well equipped to handle all types of freight, and as well it possesses a grain elevator, which I regret to say is not used to anything like capacity.

The hon. member for Mackenzie also mentioned that Churchill began its operations in 1749. If I recall rightly it was in exactly the same year, 1749, that the port of Halifax commenced operations, so that if any argument is to be made in favour of state versus private ownership, then I say that on the wonderful

success which Halifax has made in developing that port under private enterprise, the system of private enterprise should be continued. I recall that in 1936 we in Halifax thought it was a mistake that the national harbours board should take over our port. We thought we were doing well, but the present Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe), viewing the ports of this country nationally, thought it would be in the best interests of all the harbours that they should come under one authority, the national harbours board, and accordingly Halifax and Churchill along with the other ports were brought under the direction of the national board. I feel that it would be a mistake to divorce any one port from the administration of the national harbours board unless the whole question is to be thrown open again. Halifax would be quite willing to take its chance if all the harbours are to be made free of national control and we are told to go ahead and get what business we can. In that case Halifax, being the eastern terminal of the Canadian National Railways, as well as being connected with the Canadian Pacific railway, would have no fear of getting a fair share of the business. But if the national harbours board is to continue, I feel that all ports should remain under its administration. For that reason I do not think it would be wise for the minister to approve this resolution.

As I stated before, I am not against the west having its share. I might quote the revenue figures for the port of Halifax. The hon. member for Mackenzie said that Churchill had a deficit of $57,000 on last year's operations. Compare that with the port of Halifax, which last year showed an operating surplus of $86,756.

In connection with maintenance expenditures and the return quoted by the hon. member for Mackenzie, I would point out, although I have not the exact figures, that not in 1945, 1944, 1943, 1942, 1941 and 1940, not in one of those six years has one hundred dollars, let alone one hundred thousand dollars or four hundred thousand dollars or one million dollars been spent in dredging the port of Halifax. It is true that many millions of dollars have been spent in dredging the St. Lawrence, and that is all the more reason why we should make the fullest possible use of the port of Halifax.

I had not intended to take part in this debate. I was drawn into it because of the reference that I was concerned about the port of Halifax. I am always interested in the development of Halifax, and I thought I would just keep the record straight in regard to certain figures that had been given to the house to-day.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Would it not be in the interests of all the people of Canada if we were to develop Canada to the point at which there would be plenty of use of both Halifax and Churchill? We believe that if that were done, if we really developed the west, there would be plenty of use for both ports.

Mr. ISNOR: I am very glad that the hon. member has asked me that question. I am broad enough to answer it in the affirmative, and I would hope that my hon. friend and all his western friends will join with me in creating sufficient business in the west to keep the train crews of the Canadian National Railways and the Canadian Pacific railways busy transporting freight to the Atlantic coast, and supplying additional employment for large numbers of train crews running from the extreme west to the Atlantic port of Halifax.

Mr. BLACKMORE: We are doing our share now.

Mr. ISNOR: Before I take my seat may I again express the pleasure it was to me to listen to the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol). It is always interesting to listen to him. He has visited our fair province and the port of Halifax. I do not need to sell him the idea that we have a wonderful port in Halifax because he knows it. But there are a good many members from the extreme west who have not visited Halifax, although in 1940 it was my privilege to have forty-six members of the House of Commons visit that port. I do not think I need to sell them the idea that we have a great port.

Mr. MacNICOL: We are all proud of it.

Mr. ISNOR: You are all proud of it. Some members of the C.C.F. party have also visited the port of Halifax and taken part in certain activities there, and they could not help admiring the fine approach to our harbour and appreciate its many advantages.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Our sailors did not like Halifax.

Mr. ISNOR: The hon. member for Yorkton (Mr. Castleden) has paid at least two visits to the port of Halifax, and I do not think that last remark of his was becoming. It does not do the hon. member justice to criticize the judgment not only of a magistrate but of a judge of the supreme court of Nova Scotia. I doubt very much whether any hon. member who is not in possession of all of the facts is in a position to make a statement such as the hon. member has just made.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: They did not like your magistrates.

Mr. ISNOR: I did not intend to enter into a discussion on any question that has no bearing on this matter; therefore I shall close with the hope that we shall all work together for the port of Halifax and in the best interests of all of Canada.

An hon. MEMBER: What about Saint John?

Mr. ISNOR: I do not mind saying a word about Saint John. It is a fairly good port; it compares with other ports farther away from Halifax. Naturally, being in the maritimes, it ranks perhaps next to Halifax.

Mr. R. R. KNIGHT (Saskatoon City): I rise to support the resolution:

That, in the opinion of this house, the government should take into immediate consideration the advisability of encouraging the fullest possible use of the harbour and port facilities at Churchill, Manitoba, or the transferring of the management and control of the said port to a joint Board appointed by the governments of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta.

I should like to point out to the senior hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Isnor) who has just spoken, that this resolution is divided into two parts, and that his assumption is not necessarily correct that the hon. member for Churchill (Mr. Moore) wants to put the second part of the resolution first, namely, to put the cart before the horse. The resolution states:

That . . . the government should take into immediate consideration the advisability of encouraging the fullest possible use of the harbour and port facilities at Churchill, Manitoba, or . . .

You see, sir, the people in that part of the country have had a good many disappointments in regard to the port of Churchill, and they find it is better to have that "or" in the resolution. In other words, if the government is not prepared to do something about it, we have people out there who are prepared to do something about it in their stead.

Geographically speaking, this debate seems to have moved considerably east. The senior hon. member for Halifax suggests that vast sums of money are now being asked for. We are not asking for vast sums of money; we are asking for a sympathetic consideration from this government to handle our own business. The building of the railroad and the opening of the port are *fait accompli*. What we want is sympathetic encouragement from the government, and I am proud to be able to say that I believe we are going to get it.

The senior hon. member for Halifax said that only 24·5 ships arrived the year round. If that is true then there are certain other reasons for it and they are not all geographical. I would draw the attention of the hon. member to the fact that the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Jutras) pointed out that the route had not been used at all, or practically not at all, in the last four years. That, of course, is perfectly understandable, seeing that the British government, I am led to believe, requested that the port should not be used because they did not have the ships available to convoy commercial ships. Therefore those years cannot be counted in any calculation of that kind.

The senior hon. member for Halifax said that since the hon. member who spoke before him had praised Churchill he should be allowed to praise Halifax. By the same reasoning if the hon. member who spoke before me had the privilege of running down Churchill, I, too, have the privilege of saying a word to the detriment of Halifax. So far as westerners are concerned I would say this to him: the long rail haul to the Atlantic prohibitively raises the cost of production on all bulk commodities to such an extent that we cannot get very much benefit from using Halifax as a harbour. Another thing that was very well recognized by the United States government during the late war is that the port of Halifax is somewhat vulnerable during war time. It has a disadvantage there that Churchill has not. If shipping into Churchill were properly organized it could be more easily defended.

The argument of the hon. member breaks down when he compares Halifax with Churchill. Even speaking on the advantages of Halifax his argument is a very short-sighted one, because we believe that if our hopes are fulfilled in the years to come a healthy shipping trade will spring up between Churchill and Halifax.

I shall not speak, and the clock so reminds me, at any great length on this subject, because I had something to say on this subject when I made my maiden speech some time ago. Those remarks are recorded at page 199 of *Hansard*.

It is fitting that the resolution concerning the Hudson Bay route should be introduced by the hon. member for Churchill, because his port is the one that is under discussion. As the member for Saskatoon City, I could not allow the opportunity to go by without raising my voice in behalf of the development of this route, a development which is so vital to the people of my constituency and to the people of the northern and, indeed, of all parts of Saskatchewan. It is not purely a provincial project; it is one that on many counts should be classed as a national problem. Saskatoon is a city which is the centre of a large tract of fine wheat growing country. It has wholesale houses and supply houses for innumerable towns and villages, country stores and post offices. It is a distributing point for farm

machinery. It has two great flour mills which process a considerable part of the grain grown in that country for the export trade. It is the natural trading centre for that part of Saskatchewan, and it is in a position to benefit enormously in the way of trade by a lively increase in traffic over the Hudson bay route.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Would the hon. member permit a question? I am seeking information. With regard to the second part of the resolution, is the hon. member able to say whether the western provinces would be content to take over this port; do we know that?

Mr. KNIGHT: I have letters and correspondence which, if the hon. member would come to my room, I would be pleased to show him at any time. My information is that there is in Saskatoon a new Hudson bay route association. I did not want to interrupt an hon. member when he was speaking, but that is now the name of the main organization which is promoting this particular project; it is the heir of the previous "On to the Bay" association. I shall tell the hon. member quite candidly what my information is and which was contained in a letter the secretary wrote to me the other day. He said that he had approached the governments of the provinces on the matter, and that as far as he could see their consideration was favourable. They are also trying to work out some cooperative trade with the cooperatives in the old country. They are going to try to get together with the federated cooperatives of the provinces. They are going to try to persuade those cooperatives to appoint trade representatives to work this out, and if they refuse so to do they are going to persuade the governments of the provinces to agree to such trade commissions. I think that proves that the governments are also looking with a friendly eye upon the proposition. As a matter of fact, the letter stated that the reason the conference between the provinces and between the group of cooperatives was not already in effect was that Premier Garson of Manitoba is now busy with the election and could hardly be expected to give his time to this project, which is not a political one. I do not know whether I have answered the hon. member's question, but I have done as well as I could.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Thank you.

Mr. KNIGHT: The headquarters of the federated cooperatives which I have just mentioned are also at Saskatoon. It is a business whose expansion has been phenomenal. The wheat producers are operating a tremendous business there this year. I do not know whether hon. members are aware of it, but the wheat pool is making an attempt to start an industry there. They have started a project to build factories which are to produce grain alcohol and to extract oil from flax and to make paint and plastics.

The ground has been broken this year by the provincial government for the building of a medical school in connection with the university. Saskatchewan has never had a medical college, but it will have one soon, and the same provincial government has done a great deal to promote and encourage home industries of which we are greatly in need. A great airport with a runway a mile and a half in length is at this moment being constructed and we are to have a great air centre in a world air route. Now, to connect all this up with the port of Churchill, I must relate that the distance from Saskatoon, all rail, to Churchill, is 814 miles, and from Saskatoon all rail to Montreal is 1,828 miles. Hon. gentlemen across the way can compute for themselves how much more it would take to get to Halifax. By rail and water, the distance to Montreal is 2,133 miles. Therefore it will be seen from the point of view of distance why we are so much in favour of Churchill.

As to the water distance—and again I did not wish to correct hon. gentlemen who spoke previously—it has been said that there is a great deal of difference between water distances. As a matter of fact, the water distances from Churchill to Montreal and from Churchill to Liverpool are practically the same. There are of course optional routes, but the average distance is practically the same. There is not a hundred miles in the difference either way.

It would be just as reasonable for us in the west—I think hon. gentlemen from the east should listen to this—to expect people in Toronto and Hamilton and points between Toronto and Hamilton and further west to ship their stuff out west by railway, take it through Churchill and ship it to Liverpool by that route as it is to expect us to use the St. Lawrence waterway down from our home. That is literally true from the point of view of distance.

I have said that this is a matter of national and not of local concern. Canada has ports and, whether it be wise or not, she has a great mileage of railways per capita. She has a vast system of transportation, and what we need in this country, and particularly in the west, is more people. The people we have

now are divided too unevenly and the result is that we have an unbalanced economy. That is not altogether due to geographical conditions. In Saskatchewan, owing to the increased mechanization of farming, and owing to increased modern improvements in farm machinery, only a fraction of the people are now needed to grow the wheat who grew it before. When I first threshed in that province thirty years ago twenty-six men ran the threshing outfit; now an old man and a boy of eleven will do more work in a day than all of us did, put together.

The average age of the Saskatchewan or the western farmer, hon. members may be surprised to know, is very high indeed. The young men marched off to the war, in spite of the fact that they were farmers' sons, and boys and girls came east to get war work. Let me ask hon. gentlemen from the east this question: Have they ever considered what it would be like to have their sons and daughters going 2,000 miles to get a job? I wonder how those who come from Quebec would like that? It is an honest fact that if a boy wants a job in industry he has to go at an early age 2,000 miles from his own home and his family influences.

Mr. CLAXTON: Many people went from the east to the west to get jobs.

Mr. KNIGHT: I was speaking of industry. That is not a good national situation, and it is one which the development and encouragement of a new route would help to overcome. What I have said may give rise to the idea that some opposition may be raised in central Canada against government encouragement of the Hudson bay route, but I contend that such opposition would be purely selfish and in the long run short-sighted. For fifty years a golden stream of western wheat has flowed down through central Canada. This left a good deal of sediment in its path. It has turned into a stream of gold. When hon. members consider the long haul, the discriminatory freight rates, the protective tariff that has been in existence in this country so long, I think they will agree with me that the western wheat lands have contributed their share and more to the upbuilding of this nation.

And now we want from the east and central Canada and Halifax, not large sums of money but a little sympathy and support in the upbuilding of the west; for, as Sir Ashley Cooper, governor of the Hudson's Bay company, said a day or two ago to a western audience:

> Your imports will be governed largely by eastern Canada. The question of trade between western Canada and Britain is not so much a matter for Canada and Britain to deal with but one to be settled between eastern and western Canada. Great Britain will take all the products of western Canada she can pay for.

But the amount she can pay for will depend a good deal on the amount we in Canada are willing to import from her. I suggest that some of these imports could be profitably brought to the port of Churchill through Hudson bay. There was a good deal of opposition to the building of this road and the equipment of the port. For years the whole thing was a political football, but now we have *fait accompli*, a transportation system which by 1932 had proved that it would work.

Surely that selfish and petty opposition should now disappear. Surely we have reached the stage when we are prepared to put the public good before the private purse. It is queer, though, how men who will send their sons even cheerfully to war, and with some degree of resignation contemplate the fact that they will not return, will oppose tooth and nail any public scheme which will affect their own pockets.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. KNIGHT: Before six o'clock I was speaking in support of the resolution asking for sympathetic consideration and active support on the part of the government for the Hudson bay route. I had shown the importance of the route to my own community; I had discussed its importance from a national point of view, which to my mind is infinitely more important; I had pleaded for it as a means of bringing people and industries to my part of the country and to this nation as a whole, and to the best of my ability I had answered the arguments of the senior hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Isnor) in opposition. That attitude of opposition, Mr. Speaker, has done more injury than good to this country. It is the attitude which says, if we cannot have something for ourselves, then let no one else have it. What we need in this country, sir, are kindly hearts, open minds and, above all the vision that tells us that what is good for one is good for all, the vision that will make our country great. Good luck to Halifax as far as I am concerned; long may it prosper. For the hon. member who lives there I have nothing but best wishes and sympathy. I have been there twice. My own view is that it is rather depressing to think that between Halifax

harbour and Cape Race lie scattered the ribs of 280 gallant ships which have gone to Davy Jones' locker. I had hoped, nay I was almost convinced that such opposition had ceased. If you are interested in the opposite view I would recommend the reading of "Sea of Destiny" by Dyson Carter. He claims that a deliberate attempt to sabotage the route was made by eastern commercial and transportation interests and marine insurance companies, supported by the press. He even offers the terrible indictment that the sinking of the ship *Bright Fan* early in the history of the completed route was not altogether accidental. Of course I have no proof in regard to this statement, and he will have to take the responsibility for it himself. I do know there was joy in certain quarters in Montreal when the *Bright Fan* went down, but that joy was somewhat tempered some two weeks later by the news that the *Pennyworth* had gone down in a fog off Montreal. The *Pennyworth* had successfully cleared her cargo from Hudson bay just a short time before.

However that may be, shipping out of Churchill increased until in 1936 some fourteen ships steamed out of the port with 5,000,000 bushels of No. 1 wheat aboard. The Imperial shipping committee, investigating a wreck that occurred that year, declared:

As far as physical risks are concerned we are convinced that the Hudson's bay route is not more dangerous, and in some respects is less dangerous, than the St. Lawrence route.

I said, sir, I had hoped the opposition would cease. I am afraid that, like the poor, propoganda persists in being with us. I have in my hand a little pamphlet which just came to my desk. I do not know who sent it; no one knows. It just came. It did not cost a penny; I was very welcome to it. As a matter of fact, they hope I will read it. Perhaps it was sent to be received in time for this debate. Again, I do not know; but at any rate it is free. It represents this selfish viewpoint, this one-sided idea about which I was talking. It reminds me of certain other pamplets which you will remember were sent around in this country prior to June 11, except that this one is white in colour. It should have had a bit of that red mail-order paint on it to dress it up a little. No one knew who sent those other pamphlets, either; they just came, and we were welcome to them. Hon. gentlemen opposite did not know where they came from; hon. gentlemen to my right did not know where they came from, and they are all honourable men. Let me read a little from this pamphlet, choosing a place almost haphazardly. The writer seems to be interested in railroads; so am I He says:

We can realize that the C.P.R. made western Canada . . .

Well, that is a good sentence; it reads equally well in reverse. Then he goes on to say:

Public opinion on the prairies forced the government into backing great and even unwise ventures in providing competition for the C.P.R.

Then a little later comes the line that caught my eye; this is my reason for introducing this pamphlet into this debate:

Perhaps one day the line to Hudson bay will be available.

He goes on to speak of other railway ventures and then adds:

However, mistakes were made.

Then another line:

. . . and it is now taken for granted that we shall, forever, have two railways in western Canada.

The gentleman looks a long way ahead. He is also interested in tariffs and says:

As a matter of fact, even good free traders are apt to doubt whether a tariff which has been on for any length of time can be taken off completely, and overnight, without making things worse than they were . . . However, as things are, the fact has to be faced that there will not be a sudden and general removal of all tariffs . . .

He is also interested in the Winnipeg grain exchange, and says:

Unfortunately, western wheat grower opinion, still worrying about the depression of the thirties . . . has backed the idea of suspending open trading on the Winnipeg wheat market. This has almost certainly involved a heavy loss to the wheat growers.

And he feels very sorry for them.

To get back to the more serious question, although I believe what I have read has some bearing upon it, for a moment I should like to discuss the question of the danger to shipping, which of course is a vital factor in the situation, because the success of this project depends upon getting reasonable rates in marine insurance. Even before the war the dangers of the route, like those of the St. Lawrence, had been progressively mastered by scientific advance, with the installation of gyro compasses, radio direction finders and the employment of icebreakers. During the last war many devices must have been evolved making for the safety of ships at sea, devices which can be applied to the occasional fog and ice conditions encountered in Hudson bay. As some of the previous speakers have said, I imagine

radar holds immense possibilities in this connection and will open a whole new field of navigation.

The other day in this house I asked that the Minister of Transport produce copies of reports furnished by the United States government in regard to a survey made during the last war by that government of meteorological conditions over the route. We were told that such a survey had been made, and I understand that both the waters and the air were thoroughly investigated. I was promised a copy of the report and I know it will reach me in due course. Unfortunately it is not available for this debate. I expect and hope it will contain information encouraging the use of the Hudson bay route. Let me draw one thing to the attention of hon. members. During the war the Americans took no chances on leaving unguarded that great body of open water which leads directly into the heart of this continent. They know the potentialities and the virtues of that great route, and so they took that survey. I am told that the Americans went in there to Hudson bay, to a frozen sea as it has been called by so many people, in the heart of winter. I am not vouching for the truth of that statement, because I was not there; but I am offering it for what it is worth. I hope to get the information from the minister later on.

With all this new information, and with all these new inventions, surely the price of marine insurance will come down. If so, the success of the route will be assured, and the wish of the people in the prairie provinces will be fulfilled. I suggest to the government that if marine insurance is not cut down proportionately as, in the light of new inventions, it should be, the government should be doing something about it, and should say to the marine insurance companies, you will have to bring your rates down, proportionately, or we will see that there is some other company operating, or some manner in which marine insurance rates may be made reasonable.

The wish that the Hudson bay route be opened was expressed in a recommendation of the United Farmers of Canada, Saskatchewan branch, to the dominion-provincial conference, in a memorandum of August 4, 1945. May I quote the following from that recommendation:

> We recommend action to make full use of the Hudson Bay railway and all facilities at Port Churchill for shipment of products from, and goods to, Canada; that Canadian trade agents be appointed to facilitate trade through the Hudson Bay-Port Churchill route; that Canadian trade agents established in other countries be instructed to develop trade through the Hudson Bay-Port Churchill route, and that the project be operated under a board of western management.

[Mr. Knight.]

This request for a western board, about which some curiosity has been shown here to-day, in conjunction with the governments of the prairie provinces, is also put forth by the Hudson's bay route association, an organization which is leaving no stone unturned to bring about the resumption of traffic over that route. The board's being of that composition would procure action forthwith, I am sure, and would remove any suspicion that may linger in the west that pressure was being brought to hinder operations.

We hope, and have reason to believe, that the government will act upon the idea expressed in this resolution, particularly in respect of the first part of it. In that event the second part would not be necessary. I have in my possession correspondence which shows that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) attempted to find shipping to bring out of Churchill the grain that is held there. A letter from the Minister of Transport (Mr. Chevrier) states:

> The policy of the government in the matter of Churchill is to facilitate the use of this port in every way possible.

Good! We will look for action—and not next year when shipping opens up, but now, to prepare for the time when shipping opens up. May I add in passing that this has been one of the great drawbacks in the past. The authorities would wait until the weather was changing, and when ships might have been coming in there it was found that preliminary investigation and preparations had to be made. By the time that was done, the season was over.

The road is built and ready. In fact, it is now in use and it has been paid for out of the proceeds of western lands. There is at the port a fair nucleus of equipment with which to start business, and the government has assured us that the ban on shipping, which they say was a necessity owing to war, is now lifted.

We have hope of support from hon. members in the house. I hold in my hand an interesting pamphlet, somewhat yellowed with age, for it is dated 1926. This pamphlet deals with the Hudson bay route. May I quote haphazardly from the speech—for that is what it is:

> The problem of transportation is the great problem of western Canada . . .
>
> Since we are a democratic country governed by the wishes of the majority, and since all the produce of western Canada before the opening of the Panama canal had to move eastward, every attempt to open up new trade routes has met with opposition which has often been successful . . .
>
> Nor is the Hudson Bay railway the project of the west. It is national in its interest.

In this fashion the then premier of Saskatchewan, now the federal Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) proceeded to prove his point with earnestness and precision. In an eloquent conclusion he states, prophetically, in the light of recent inventions:

> Those seamen . . . will find ways and means to stretch the four month's season set down by tenderfoot engineers into six or more months.

So that in support of this cause we shall have within the government, and as an influence upon his colleagues, the driving force of the Minister of Agriculture. I have never heard it said of him—and I have heard plenty—that he has shown either reluctance or a lack of ability in fighting for a cause in which he believed.

There is another point of interest about this now historic pamphlet published by what was known as the "On-to-the-Bay" Association of Canada. On its reverse side we find the list of patrons, headed by the Hon. John Bracken, then premier of Manitoba. I do not believe that the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) changed his beliefs in regard to this route when he changed over to his present company. I hope he will give as aggressive leadership in the right direction to his Ontario cohorts as he did in Manitoba to his western gentlemen, and that in his important capacity in the house he will assist in stirring the government to action in this matter, for which there is strong support both in the house and in the country.

Mr. DANIEL McIVOR (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, I am not going to make a speech, but I should like to ask a question. The port of Churchill is an unnatural port, when we have two railroads which can deliver the grain to the breadbasket of the world, and to a point where we have the greatest wheat handling facilities found anywhere.

My question is this: Is it possible to heat up the Hudson bay and Baffin strait with atomic power, so as to keep the water free of ice? I would ask the Minister of Transport (Mr. Chevrier) or the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) if there is any possibility of that.

Mr. FRASER: That is the sixty-four dollar question.

Mr. ROBERT FAIR (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, before the minister speaks, I should like to add a word on behalf of this group in full support of the opening and the operation of the Churchill route.

I do not happen to be a resident of Port Arthur, but I do happen to be—perhaps through good luck, or bad—one of those farmers in western Canada who have been adversely affected in the past because the Hudson bay route does not operate. If we would watch the wood-pile and pull the niggers out, perhaps we would learn just why gyro-compasses and other things have been discussed to-night. We in western Canada are satisfied that there is a nigger in the wood-pile, and that if we can get it out it will not be necessary to bother with the red herrings that have been thrown across the trail.

Our group is fully behind this project.

Hon. LIONEL CHEVRIER (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the house has listened with keen interest to the debate which has taken place this afternoon on the resolution moved by the hon. member for Churchill (Mr. Moore). I know I have enjoyed the speeches which have come both from this side of the house and from the other side.

Hon. members who have preceded me in the debate have paid tribute to those who have spoken, and I should like to add my word of commendation to the hon. member who introduced the resolution as well as to other hon. members who have spoken on the subject. The hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) has received so many congratulations that I hesitate to say anything about his contribution. When he does rise to speak in any debate he speaks with such experience that it is always interesting to listen to what he has to say.

The resolution which the hon. member for Churchill (Mr. Moore) has placed on the order paper may be termed academic to an extent. I am sure that he did not intend it as such, that what he is looking for is something of a practical nature. The resolution as I understand it can be divided into two parts, but perhaps I should read it to the house. It reads:

> That, in the opinion of this house, the government should take into immediate consideration the advisability of encouraging the fullest possible use of the harbour and port facilities at Churchill, Manitoba, or the transferring of the management and control of the said port to a joint board appointed by the governments of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta.

The first part deals with the policy of the government, while the second part asks, in the alternative, that the port be turned over to a board representative of the three prairie provinces. So far as the first part is concerned, I may tell hon. gentlemen that the policy of the government with reference to Churchill is to use the port facilities and the railway facilities to every possible advantage. I may tell the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat and who has asked that the

government give the proposition sympathetic consideration, that the government has done that in the past, is doing it at the moment and will continue to do it in the future.

Before I discuss the two alternatives in the resolution I should like to say a word with reference to the second part which the hon. gentleman who introduced it failed to deal with. It is true that the hon. gentleman for Saskatoon City (Mr. Knight) did refer to the second part, but I want to make a statement with reference to it. So far as I am aware there has never been any joint policy or any united or concerted action by the governments of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta with reference to turning over the port to a joint board. There may have been resolutions by boards of trade, but certainly there has been no concerted policy on the part of those three governments.

It would strike me that perhaps a certain part of Alberta would not be favourable to the second part of the resolution. If the information which I have is correct, the westerly one-third of Saskatchewan and all of Alberta, because of the freight rate structure in that part of western Canada, would have a greater advantage in moving their grain and other products to Vancouver than by the Churchill route. Before I go into those two angles, there are certain statements of a general and statistical nature which I should like to make to the house. Before I do that, perhaps I should say that being an easterner I do not presume to know as much about the history and topography of this country as hon. gentlemen who have preceded me in this debate.

I believe it would be opportune at this time to outline briefly the background of the project. Apparently with the growth of western Canada and the consequent increase of agricultural production the need for larger markets was felt, and those markets were the European markets. Those markets were difficult of access because of lack of railway facilities and the question arose as to how they could be made more accessible. The result was the proposed construction of the Hudson Bay railway and the development of the port of Churchill.

This project was not a new one because as far back as the eighties a great deal of talk had been going on in our country with reference to the construction of a railway to Hudson bay. As long ago as 1886, and from that year to 1908, the federal government made a standing offer of a land grant to any individual or corporation who would build a railway to Hudson bay. That offer was taken up in part by the Canadian Northern railway which constructed the line from Hudson Bay Junction to the Pas. The land grant provision was withdrawn in 1908; the Department of Railways and Canals commenced their investigation by survey parties and other explorations, and in 1909 railway location surveys were started. In 1910 a contract was let for the construction of a bridge over the Saskatchewan river at the Pas, and in 1911 a contract for 185 miles of grading was awarded.

I consider it unnecessary to traverse the different changes in policy which took place following the great war and the change of the ocean terminal from Nelson to Churchill on the recommendation of Sir Frederick Palmer, the eminent authority on port construction who was designated by the then government to investigate the best possible location for the terminal and other related matters. To do so would occupy too much time of hon. gentlemen at this juncture.

Suffice it to say that steel was laid into Churchill on March 29, 1929, and by September, 1931, harbour facilities were sufficiently developed to handle a test shipment of wheat. Two cargoes amounting to 544,770 bushels of wheat were dispatched in that year. By the end of 1932 Churchill had developed into a harbour capable of accommodating and loading three grain ships at one time with an extra ship's berth at which bulk cargo might be unloaded, with a good channel approach to the dock and a basin in front of the dock thirty feet deep at extreme low tide. There was a fast grain handling plant, a modern freight shed, as well as water, light and other necessary port facilities. The grain elevator at the port was capable of handling two and a half million bushels of wheat.

The total expenditures on the Hudson bay project, including interest on capital investment of $3,914,000 but exclusive of cost of Hudson strait investigation, aids to navigation and icebreaker, amount to $56,583,000. As has been stated by the hon. member for Davenport, there was only one year in which there was a surplus for both railway and harbour. This was in 1942 when the United States forces were constructing an airport at Churchill and landing fields on Southampton island, and one on the north and one on the south side of Hudson strait. This surplus was brought about by the tremendous tonnage of material handled by the railway and through the harbour in that year.

As the house knows, the Hudson Bay railway is operated by Canadian National Railways as agent for the government, while the port is administered by the national harbours board.

Mr. WRIGHT: Have you the tonnage handled in 1942?

Mr. CHEVRIER: I propose to put on *Hansard* at a later date a detailed statement of the facilities as well as an answer to the hon. gentleman's question.

Mr. COLDWELL: At a later date, or later in your speech?

Mr. CHERVIER: Later in the debate.

Mr. REID: And the grain too.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I would draw special attention to the fact that in 1944 the deficit of the Hudson Bay railway was over a half million dollars. namely, $564,940.02. That coupled with the deficit of $58,907.04 on the harbour operations made a total deficit of $623,847.06 on the railway and harbour operations alone from 1944. With the permission of the house I should like to table for inclusion in *Hansard* the following: (1) construction cost of the Hudson bay project to March 31, 1945; (2) net deficit or surplus; (3) summary of the number of ocean ships and business handled each year since the first shipment of grain in 1931; (4) ice out of harbour; (5) closing of navigation; (6) traffic on Hudson Bay railway, 1930 to 1944; (7) distance tables:

The construction cost of the Hudson bay project to March 31, 1945, has been as follows:

Hudson Bay railway	$33,602,516 92
Terminal works, Churchill harbour	12,826,418 17
Terminal works at Port Nelson.	6,240,170 86
	$52,669,105 95

Net Deficit or Surplus

	Churchill harbour	Hudson Bay Railway	Total
Fiscal year 1932-33	$ 76,257 58	.....	$ 76,257 58
1933-34	68,063 39	.....	68,063 39
1934-35	76,332 64	.....	76,332 65
1935-36	101,156 41	$ 239,702 75	340,859 16
1936-37	46,720 79	252,854 81	299,575 60
*1937	140,889 61	364,413 77	505,303 38
*1938	55,009 92	285,035 01	340,044 93
*1939	46,491 58	330,382 06	376,873 64
*1940	39,913 62	417,558 50	457,472 12
*1941	32,515 38	459,859 28	492,374 66
*1942	+ 7,668 74	+ 112,120 75	+ 119,789 49
*1943	29,488 66	347,872 90	377,361 56
*1944	58,907 04	564,940 02	623,847 06
	$764,077 89	$3,150,498 35	$3,914,576 24

* Churchill harbour figures on calendar year basis while Hudson Bay railway figures are on fiscal year.

Although four freighters were unloaded at Churchill in 1928 and two in 1929, the harbour was undeveloped and the cargoes were entirely for local consumption in the construction of the Harbour Works. A summary of the number of ocean ships and business handled each year since the first shipment of grain in 1931 is given below:

Statement Covering Total Exports and Imports from and to Foreign Ports
Year 1931 to 1944, both inclusive

	Exports							Imports	
Year	No. of ships	Wheat bushels	Oats bushels	Grain Prod. tons	Cattle head	Lumber F.B.M.	General tons	General tons	Steam Coal tons
1931	2	544,769·10							390·3
1932	10	2,736,029·50		987				418·9	
1933	10	2,707,291·00			200	181,570	65·2	1,441·5	1,178·0
1934	15	4,049,877·30	4,076·16	4,253·3	580	2,399,544	141·0	956·23	1,510·72
1935	8	2,407,000·00						1,651·92	950·7
1936	14	4,293,501·20							619·4
1937	2	603,981·50							224·0
1938	3	916,912·40							
1939	6	1,772,460·40						1,113·0	448·0
1940	0	Nil							
1941	0	Nil							
1942	0	Nil							
1943	8	740,219·00					992·0	1,232·0	
1944	0	Nil							
Totals	78	20,772,041·40	4,076·16	5,240·3	780	2,581,114	1,198·2	10,252·35	5,321·12

In addition to the above in 1942 there were 10 ships which took out 25,396 tons of war materials for the U.S. Army and in 1943 there were 9 small freighters that took out 8,300 tons of war materials.

Ice out of harbour		Closing of navigation	
Year	Date	Year	Date
1928.....	June 17	1928.....	October 17
1929.....	June 20	1929.....	October 27
1930.....	June 9	1930.....	October 17
1931.....	June 11	1931.....	October 3
1932.....	June 7	1932.....	October 14
1933.....	June 17	1933.....	October 21
1934.....	June 21	1934.....	October 27
1935.....	June 8	1935.....	October 15
1936.....	June 18	1936.....	October 10
1937.....	May 27	1937.....	October 13
1938.....	June 5	1938.....	October 26
1939.....	June 11	1939.....	October 13
1940.....	June 4	1940.....	October 17
1941.....	June 6	1941.....	October 24
1942.....	June 8	1942.....	October 24
1943.....	June 17	1943.....	November 3
1944.....	June 4	1944.....	October 28

Traffic on Hudson Bay Railway

Year	Total freight rev. tonnage	Grain bushels	Passengers rev. passengers
1930.....	38,799	.....	....
1931.....	59,916	544,925	....
1932.....	175,093	5,299,903	6,099
1933.....	97,521	2,842,730	5,398
1934.....	141,017	4,058,989	8,070
1935.....	88,580	2,351,633	7,733
1936.....	98,009	2,683,415	7,244
1937.....	11,976	.....	6,956
1938.....	108,165	3,201,167	6,146
1939.....	74,048	2,101,089	4,752
1940.....	12,714	120,315	4,620
1941.....	10,160	.....	6,141
1942.....	110,841	.....	13,389
1943.....	67,181	.....	17,615
1944.....	21,053	.....	10,821

Distance Tables

From—	To Liverpool
Churchill	2,936
Montreal—	
Via Belle Isle Strait	2,760
Via Cabot Strait	3,007
Halifax	2,490
Saint John, N.B.	2,756
Vancouver	8,547
New York	3,040

Distances from Principal Western Canadian Points to Liverpool

From—	Via Montreal (Great Lakes Route)	Via Churchill
Regina	4,750	3,779
Saskatoon	4,878	3,750
Prince Albert	4,911	3,696
Moose Jaw	4,792	3,821
Winnipeg	4,393	3,913
Portage la Prairie ..	4,449	3,859
Brandon	4,527	3,873
Calgary	5,226	4,150
Edmonton	5,224	4,073

The advantage in rail haul will be seen from the following figures showing the distances from principal western Canadian points to Churchill as compared with Montreal.

From—	Churchill all rail miles	Montreal all rail miles	Montreal via Great Lakes miles
Regina.....	843	1,713	1,990
Saskatoon..	814	1,828	2,105
Prince Albert	760	1,871	2,148
Moose Jaw..	885	1,756	2,032
Winnipeg...	977	1,357	1,633
Portage la Prairie...	923	1,412	1,689
Brandon....	937	1,492	1,767
Calgary.....	1,214	2,220	2,497
Edmonton..	1,137	2,147	2,424

I should like to deal briefly, not with each one of the tables I have just filed, but with one or two subjects having to do with them which I think will throw some light upon this discussion.

I referred a moment ago to the total cost of the facilities at the port and on the railway to date. But I should like to go a step further and say that the construction cost of the Hudson bay project to March 31 has been as follows: the railway: $33,602,000; terminal works at Churchill harbour, $12,826,000; terminal works at Port Nelson, $6,240,000; making in round figures a total capital investment of $52,669,000.

The second table to which the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Jutras) referred this afternoon has to do with the total exports and imports from and to foreign ports from 1931 to 1944. I think a close examination of this table will disclose one of the main reasons why shipowners and shippers find it difficult and hesitate to use the port of Churchill. It is this, that if there are wheat and other commodities as an outgoing cargo, there is very little ingoing cargo. A casual look at this table will show, for instance, that from 1931 to 1944 there were imported through the port of Churchill only 10,252 tons of general merchandise and 5,321 tons of coal.

Another table which is extremely enlightening is that having to do with ice out of the harbour and the closing of navigation. That has been dealt with by several hon. gentlemen this evening, and I do not want to go into it any great length save to say this, that I think we are all agreed that the navigation season for the port of Churchill is extremely short, namely from about twelve to fourteen weeks.

The combination of ice conditions in Hudson strait and in Hudson bay and the harbour itself limits the period of navigation from early August to the middle of October, which,

roughly speaking, is twelve to fourteen weeks. In the spring the ice goes out of the harbour on the average, as the table will show, about the 10th day of June, but at that time heavy ice is in the bay and shipping will not be able to come in through the strait and the bay. Our records further show that over a period of seventeen years the earliest closing date of navigation would be October 10 and the latest date, November 3.

Mr. MacNICOL: If the minister will permit a question just for information, now that he is giving the periods of open water, may I ask if the entrance to the bay is not frozen over for the year between the three islands across its entrance. At what time does the ice open up across the mouth of the bay?

Mr. CHEVRIER: As I stated a moment ago, the time at which the ice opens up in the bay is much later than in the harbour. I have before me the report of the engineer of the transport department who made a complete survey of conditions in the harbour and who has prepared certain notes for my use. In his statement he says that in the spring the ice leaves the harbour about the 10th of June, but at that time heavy ice is in the bay and also in the strait and a ship would not be able to go through there. But even if it did, with the aid of an ice-breaker, a ship, if anything happened to it because of ice running, would not be able to get back to port. That is the information I have at hand.

I want to say something about insurance rates, which is another important feature, whether or not ships can get insurance before they move. Insurance for Churchill can be obtained from August 5 to October 15 only, and on ships going in and passing Cape Chidley at the eastern end of Hudson strait on August 5 and can be kept on ships leaving Churchill until October 7 without extra premium. From October 8 to October 15 the extra premium is twenty-five per cent. Thus the season is set for insurance purposes as from August 5 at Chidley to October 15 leaving Churchill.

May I return now to the resolution of the hon. gentleman?

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I live out in that country and I have listened to the statistics given by the hon. gentleman. Would he mind telling us if he thinks this thing is any good or not? I have been utterly unable to find out what his view is.

Mr. CHEVRIER: If the hon. gentleman would permit me to conclude I think he will learn what my views are on the subject.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I beg pardon. I thought the hon. gentleman was turning to another subject.

Mr. CHEVRIER: No; I was about to turn to the first part of the resolution which deals with the advisability of encouraging the fullest possible use of the harbour and port facilities at Churchill.

This terminal was transferred to the national harbours board for administration, management and control in 1937, and by 1939 there was in sight the biggest programme of grain shipments from the port of Churchill in its history. At that time fifteen cargo-carrying ships were assigned by various shipping companies to load grain at Churchill for Europe. Nine of them were actually named and before the war it looked as though the port of Churchill was going to enjoy a really busy period. Unfortunately, however, war broke out; after a few cargoes of grain had been shipped, one ship was torpedoed on the way out to Hudson bay and the sailings of the others were cancelled because of the hazards of war. Then followed the long years of war when, although the elevator was filled with grain, nothing moved out until 1942, when between seven and eight hundred thousand bushels were loaded on United States ships and carried to New England ports for United States government account.

Shortly after the close of the German war the Canadian wheat board, the national harbours board, and other Canadian agencies made very strong and persistent efforts to secure ships for Churchill in 1945, but owing to lack of shipping, and the necessary scientific navigational equipment such as gyro-compasses, shipping definitely declined to use the port of Churchill in 1945.

I pause here to say a word about the efforts made by the national harbours board and by the Canadian wheat board to do everything in their power to get shipments of grain to Churchill. As the house knows, during the war and even at this time shipping is controlled by virtue of the united maritime shipping agreement, and is in the hands of the British ministry of transport. Notwithstanding the representations made by both agencies, the national harbours board and the Canadian wheat board, the British ministry of shipping thought there were pertinent reasons why shipping to Churchill should be declined. I should like to give the house some of the reasons why that conclusion was arrived at. They are as follows:

First, the ministry of transport was of the opinion that the hazardous nature of the voyage justified taking into account the possible damage or complete loss of the vessel.

Second, although no damage or loss may be suffered there, it is well known that there is a great risk of delay from almost continuous fog.

The hon. member for Churchill (Mr. Moore) suggested that that might be circumvented by the use of radar. That is certainly a suggestion which deserves consideration. I continue with the reasons:

Third, there is no chance—

I emphasize this because it is extremely important.

There is no chance, or very little chance of securing an outward cargo. Shippers further insist on having gyroscopic compass, together with an efficient direction-finding installation; and ships should also be fitted with an efficient echo sounder. The number of vessels . . .

Mr. KNIGHT: Does the minister mean "inward" cargoes?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Yes. I am now referring to the reasons why the British ministry of transport think the route is a hazardous one.

Mr. COLDWELL: Their outward, our inward cargoes.

Mr. KNIGHT: May I ask the minister another question. The minister stated there was no possibility of obtaining an outward cargo.

Mr. CHEVRIER: No; I did not say "no possibility".

Mr. KNIGHT: Have our trade commissioners in Great Britain ever made any effort to obtain such cargoes?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Well, the answer to that question is that in war time there were few or no possibilities because of the urgent requirements of ships elsewhere. There was no possibility of obtaining the ships. That would apply to them as it did to us.

Mr. KNIGHT: But before the war.

Mr. CHEVRIER: As I stated a moment ago, the national harbours board has had the administration of this port from only a short time prior to the war.

Mr. KNIGHT: May I ask one other question?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. KNIGHT: Have I the minister's permission?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Yes.

Mr. KNIGHT: Is the minister aware that certain English and Scotch cooperative representatives were out to this country this summer looking for business and that they stated they were prepared to ship goods into the western country to help pay for our natural products?

[Mr. Chevrier.]

Mr. REID: Not Scotch; they turned it down.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I am glad to hear from the hon. member for Saskatoon City, that such is the case. If it is so, I can assure the hon. gentleman that no one will be happier than myself. I wish to assure the house that I am not trying to make a case against the port of Churchill; I am pointing to some of the difficulties that lie in the way. I may say that it is the view and the opinion of the national harbours board that if the western people could get commodities to go out to the east it would then be much easier to obtain owners of ships to go in and out of Churchill.

I was dealing with the last reason given by the British authorities, namely, that the number of vessels suitable for proceeding to Churchill during the war, and even to date are extremely limited. In the pre-war days these suitable vessels worked into position weeks or months prior to a contemplated loading date. To-day that is not possible because of existing conditions. Shipping companies do not like to put their ships into a trade which will mean only one-way cargoes. Unfortunately this one-way cargo operation has been the experience in the port of Churchill. However, if the people of the prairie provinces would find the need of British manufactures, and have the goods shipped through the Hudson bay route and over the Hudson Bay railway—

Mr. COLDWELL: And a low enough tariff to get them in afterwards.

Mr. CHEVRIER: —it would be one of the biggest aids toward popularizing this route, and I emphasize this point as one of the main remedies for the inactivity of the port of Churchill.

I now come to the second part of the resolution, which I think is more or less of a hypothetical nature.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Before the minister leaves the first part, may I ask if he is for or against it?

Mr. CHEVRIER: If the hon. member will read the resolution he will see that it is couched in such terms that it is not the easiest thing to reply either in the affirmative or in the negative. But I did state a while ago that the policy of the government is to aid the port of Churchill and to use the facilities there to the fullest possible extent.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): "Now, have I answered your question?"

Mr. CHEVRIER: I am not sure whether in the second part of the resolution the hon.

member meant to include, although he did not, the Hudson Bay railway. I presume, however, that he did because one goes with the other.

Mr. COLDWELL: Not necessarily.

Mr. WRIGHT: Not necessarily.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Well, that may be so. The port of Churchill would not be worth very much if the Hudson Bay railway were not there.

Mr. COLDWELL: Nor would the port of Montreal without the Canadian Pacific railway or the Canadian National railway.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Nevertheless I wish to emphasize by way of explanation what I meant by referring to the second part of the resolution as hypothetical. It is this: so far as the Department of Transport is concerned there never has been a policy in western Canada agreed to collectively by the governments of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, requesting the federal government to transfer either the port of Churchill or the Hudson Bay railway to the three prairie provinces.

Mr. MacNICOL: One would not be of much use without the other.

Mr. CHEVRIER: It is a fact that at various times and by various agencies resolutions have been passed, suggestions put forward and possibly approaches made to the federal government recommending the change in policy suggested by the hon. member in his resolution; but there never has been any united front policy with regard to the transfer of the port of Churchill or the Hudson Bay railway by the federal government to the three prairie provinces.

Since several hon. members have placed on *Hansard* resolutions coming from various organizations and associations in western Canada, I will put on *Hansard* the following resolution from the Winnipeg Board of Trade. It is dated November 28, 1944, and was addressed to my predecessor, the Hon. Mr. Michaud. I will not read the whole resolution. I will quote only two paragraphs of it:

Whereas a resolution was adopted by the Hudson bay route association at an organization meeting in Saskatoon on November 15, 1944, calling on the Saskatchewan government, in cooperation with the Manitoba and Alberta governments, if possible to secure forthwith from the dominion government power to operate the Hudson Bay railway and Churchill harbour, the railway and port should be maintained, operated and administered under a strong representative western board of management.

Pretty much the same language as in the second part of the resolution.

Therefore be it resolved that while reiterating the long-standing policy of the Winnipeg board of trade to support all measures advantageous to the province of Manitoba and western Canada, the board urge that no commitments be entered into by the government and the people of Manitoba with respect to the proposal for the control and operation of the Hudson Bay railway and the port of Churchill until all the relevant facts and data required for the formation of an intelligent opinion are available.

It would seem therefore, from this resolution, that the Winnipeg board of trade are certainly not in favour of implementing the second part of the hon. gentleman's motion at this time.

There are just one or two other statements that I should like to make before I resume my seat. The Hudson Bay railway is operated by the Canadian National Railways as the agent for the government of Canada, and I think the Canadian National Railways operate the Hudson Bay railway in as efficient a manner and as cheaply as any organization could. That is one thing which must be taken into consideration when one deals with the administration by a board other than the Canadian National Railways.

Here I should like to say a word with reference to the manner in which the Canadian National Railways have operated the Hudson Bay railway and compare it with what would happen under separate operation. Under separate operation the Hudson Bay railway would probably be faced with a number of increased costs, some of which I might enumerate. Supervision and technical services now provided by Canadian National officers would, under separate operation, require the creation of a staff to handle the functions of transportation, maintenance of way and structures, maintenance of equipment, purchasing of stores, and accounting, to mention only the major items which would be involved. This would likely produce two effects. Costs would likely be greater than the $1,000 a month charged against operations by the Canadian National for these services; and, further, it is hardly to be expected that there would be such a fund of technical skill and experience as is now available.

The general conclusion on the economics of the operation of the Hudson Bay railway is that the present type of operation is cheaper than any alternative and contains no profit element to the Canadian National Railways. The most that can be said for the resolution is that it has had the effect of bringing before the house the facilities of the railway and the harbour. The facilities, I am happy to say, are in excellent shape, and the report which

I have on my desk would indicate that the elevator as well as the other facilities at Churchill are in very good condition. I need only refer to what the hon. member for Davenport said in reference to the elevator. In his own words, he said that there was no finer in the world than that constructed at Churchill.

It is the intention of the national harbours board to use these facilities. Up until this time it has made every effort, in conjunction with the Canadian wheat board, to bring shipping to Churchill. It has already made representations for shipping early next spring, and I am hopeful that ocean-going tonnage which is still pooled will be released for shipping by next year. If that is so, then I feel sure that an allocation of tonnage to move the existing stocks at Churchill will be forthcoming early next year.

I have attempted to deal with this resolution in as fair a manner as possible. I started by saying at the outset that I was not familiar or conversant with the local history, as my hon. friends were, but I wish to assure the hon. member for Saskatoon City that the department of Transport and the national harbours board are fully sympathetic to the use of the facilities there and will do everything in their power to maintain those facilities.

Mr. BRACKEN: Perhaps the minister would answer one question before he concludes. I did not gather from what he had to say that he gave the record of storage grain in that elevator since the war began. I wonder if in a few brief words he could summarize the situation there.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I do not know whether the hon. gentleman was in the house when I tabled the statement covering total exports and imports. It covered the number of bushels of wheat shipped out of Churchill from 1931 to 1944. The total was 20,772,041 bushels, and, roughly speaking, the individual amounts were:

Year	Bushels
1931	500,000
1932	2,500,000
1933	2,500,000
1934	4,000,000
1935	2,500,000
1936	4,000,000
1937	600,000
1938	900,000
1939	1,772,000
1940	None
1941	None
1942	None
1943	740,000
1944	None

[Mr. Chevrier.]

Mr. P. E. WRIGHT (Melfort): I have listened with a great deal of interest to the statement just given by the minister with respect to the route, but like the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Smith) I am still in doubt where he stands on the matter. He spent about one minute of his time, when he started, saying that the government was in favour of the route but that he himself knew very little of the topography and very little about the circumstances of the route, and then he proceeded for thirty minutes to give facts and figures supplied to him by his officials, which are an absolute condemnation of the route. It has been in the minds of a great many people in western Canada for a number of years that there are certain officials in the department at Ottawa who are doing their best to kill the Hudson bay route, and certainly the minister's statement to-night would bear out that contention. I think anyone who listened to the minister's statement could not help agreeing that he tried, in an indirect way, to show that the route is not feasible. He gave us figures showing a deficit in 1944, for instance. Of course there was a deficit; and probably he used that year because it showed the largest deficit they ever had on that route, simply because it was not used because of war conditions; it could not be used. If the route were given a fair show; if the government would go all out, by means of their trade commissioners in the old country, to see that tonnage was brought into that port as well as going out of it, if they would encourage the cooperatives over there to make shipments through that point, and take action in other ways, there is no doubt that the deficit as far as Port Churchill is concerned could be reduced materially.

The resolution placed on the order paper by the hon. member for Churchill (Mr. Moore) states:

> That, in the opinion of this house, the govment should take into immediate consideration the advisability of encouraging the fullest possible use of the harbour and port facilities at Churchill, Manitoba—

That is the first part of it. Then it goes on and suggests that if they fail to do this—

> —or the transferring of the management and control of the said port to a joint board appointed by the governments of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta.

The last part is inserted just in case the government are not prepared to go ahead and see that this port is used to the greatest possible extent. If the government should be prepared to do this, then the second part of the resolution does not become operative at all. For a number of years in western

Canada we have had an organization which has been particularly interested in this port at Churchill. It was organized back in the 1920's, after the last war, when it seemed that the government of that day were going to abandon the project entirely. It was then called the "On to the Bay" association, and was organized to arouse public opinion in western Canada to the point where the government would be forced to continue the route and develop it for shipments to the old country. The association was successful in this. Fort Nelson, which had proved a failure, was dropped. Lord Palmer, I believe it was, carried on an investigation for a suitable port, and Churchill was chosen; the railroad was continued to that port, and the development of the route continued. To-day this organization is known as the Hudson bay route association, and again it is organizing public opinion in western Canada so that the route will not be dropped after this war as it was after the last war. It is urging that the development be continued, because the new inventions brought out during the war, together with the investigation carried on through the meteorological branches established in the north during the war by the United States forces, have placed a great deal of new information at the disposal of the government, and in western Canada it is felt that this route can and should be used now that the war is over.

This organization suggests that if the government at Ottawa are not prepared to go ahead and do the necessary advertising and, if necessary, charter vessels to come to Churchill, the management of the port—not of the railway—should be turned over to a western organization. They have some definite proposals with respect to the type of organization they would like to see take charge of the port, and those proposals have been set out in a brief they have prepared and submitted to at least all western members. They say:

> A change such as is proposed should seem highly desirable to the dominion government. The Hudson Bay railway, the railway's port at Churchill, and the bay route in its entirety, are likely to remain a matter of contention, embarrassing to the dominion government as long as that government remains responsible for the success of the bay route . . .
>
> To the provinces assuming administration of the commercial facilities of the port of Churchill it is suggested that they set up an ordinary joint stock company. A full half of the shares should remain with the government, or governments, and this form of organization allows a simple method for dividing and allocating shares between two or more provinces.
>
> Of the remaining half of the shares, a portion, or all, might be offered to such business organizations as are mentioned previously, to be acquired by actual purchase. Such shares, to add to their attractiveness, might have priority rights for dividends up to a moderate limit such as five per cent. Capital so raised would provide a working fund; and a cash investment would guarantee the continuing interest of the contributors. With assurance of such interest on the part of practical businessmen, many of the minor problems of administration would be removed from the shoulders of the provincial governments, to be carried by those whose training fits them to deal best with such problems.
>
> The governments should have a majority of directors. Three might be enough, if one represented business interests.
>
> Title to government-built properties should not pass to a joint stock company. Its rights to use of the Saskatoon and Churchill facilities should be limited to leasehold rights, with provision for cancellation.

In other words, they have definite suggestions to offer in regard to the development of the port and the facilities established there. The minister has said that the government have given sympathetic consideration to the port of Churchill. I want to point out one way at least in which they have failed to do so. If I, as a grower of grain in northeastern Saskatchewan, desire to ship to Port Churchill, the freight rate from my shipping point is eighteen cents per 100 pounds, while the freight rate to Fort William or Port Arthur is twenty-one cents. If I sell a carload of grain to go through Churchill, however, I pay the twenty-one cent freight rate to Fort William, even though my grain goes to Churchill. Therefore I do not reap the benefit of having that port contiguous to my farm in western Canada. The same applies to the whole of northeastern Saskatchewan. If the same consideration were given to the port of Churchill that is given to Fort William, Port Arthur and Vancouver, then those of us who live closer to Churchill would pay only the freight rate to that port, just as the people in Alberta who are closer to Vancouver pay the freight rate to Vancouver, even though their grain may be shipped to Port Arthur. Therefore I say that if the government were prepared to give a fair deal to the port of Churchill they would amend the Canada Grain Act of 1940 in such a way as to put shipments to Churchill on the same basis as shipments to any of the other main exporting ports.

Another way they could help materially would be by the extension of the Canadian National railway line which runs from Saskatoon to Carrot River, on to the Pas in Manitoba, to connect with the Hudson Bay railway. This would mean that the haul for grain from the northern part of Saskatchewan and Alberta would be much shorter. In addition, if this railway were continued from Carrot River to the Pas a large area of very good

agricultural land would be opened up. As a matter of fact, this is the largest agricultural area in any part of Saskatchewan remaining uncultivated. It is very good land and would be opened up and developed if the railway were continued from Carrot River through to the Pas.

Those are only two ways in which the present government, if they wished to develop the Port of Churchill, could assist in that matter.

The organization in western Canada known as the Hudson bay route association, is entirely non-political; and I am glad to note that the debate in the house to a great extent has remained non-political. It just so happens that members of this group represent many of the constituencies which are particularly affected by this matter. Nevertheless, when members from other political groups represented the same constituencies they, too, spoke in favour of this route.

I have under my hand a speech delivered by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) back in 1926, at which time he strongly recommended to the dominion government that the port be developed for shipments of both outgoing and incoming cargoes. For many years the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) has been a supporter of the Hudson bay route. The former Minister of Mines and Resources in the house, who is now a member of the senate, and represented Churchill for a number of years, was also a strong supporter of this route.

I would ask the Minister of Transport (Mr. Chevrier) to give this matter sympathetic consideration, and not to listen to everything that may have been said by members of his department and staff. He, himself, should go to Churchill, see the position there and judge for himself whether or not this is a feasible route. We in western Canada are never going to be satisfied until it is definitely proven that it is not. I contend that, to date, that has not been proven. As a matter of fact, with modern radar and the new meteorological stations which have been established in the northern areas, we feel quite sure that this route can be used to a far greater extent than it has ever been used in the past.

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended taking part in the debate. I always feel that people who are most familiar with the subject under discussion had best not impose their views in a manner that may tend to ruin an exchange of theories.

My association with Churchill dates back to the middle twenties. I have been there, not only at the end of August or in early September when all the tourists visit there, but also in April. I may say my face is still scarred from a frost-bite I got while walking from the train at Churchill to the nearest bunkhouse; and that was in late April.

There are certain facts in the situation which, I suggest, must be faced, particularly in view of the suggestion that the government has not endeavoured to develop Churchill as a port. June is a lovely month in Churchill; the sun shines day and night; there is no hour of the day or night when one cannot read a newspaper. But at that very time ice stretches as far as the eye can see, and that continues on to the end of June. In early July the Churchill river begins to discharge its ice. The ice breaks up and drifts out in large blocks, blocks of a size that no icebreaker with which I am familiar could be expected to cope.

The result is that insurance goes in effect on August 5, and I believe no ship would venture into the port earlier than that date. Those are facts; they are not theories in the mind of any official of the Department of Transport. I can vouch for those facts, personally; and I hope my reputation as an engineer is such that I would not be guilty of stating a fact, of which I had knowledge, without stating it correctly.

The season is closed in the fall by slush ice coming down from the Churchill river. The ice forms in the river and is carried out by the current. It would be an unfortunate boat, indeed, which got caught in that slush ice, because most certainly it would have to remain there during the next winter. It is impossible to manoeuvre.

Therefore the length of the season is pretty well determined. It is a matter of about two and a half months; and it would be an exceptional season, indeed, when navigation would be possible for a full three months.

However, we realize that much can be done in two and a half months. The government is aware of the facts, and it was aware of them when it went there. It did not make only a gesture toward developing the port; it made a magnificent job of developing it. Anyone riding to Churchill on the Hudson Bay railway and viewing the harbour facilities would not accuse the government of not having built the port in the full belief that it would be a valuable asset to Canada.

The railroad is as well built as any similar railroad in Canada. The harbour facilities are first-class. Some 1,200 feet of dock were built, and were well built under great difficulties. A grain elevator having all the facilities to be found in any grain elevator in

Canada was built at that port, and was built with the knowledge that the season would be short and that the handling of grain must therefore be rapid. With that in mind four automatic car dumpers were installed there, at a time when car dumpers were a novelty in the grain trade. Loading facilities are exceptionally fast. A boat can be loaded at that port in a day without any difficulty. It was known that boats could not afford to stay long at the port, and ample loading facilities were provided so that boats could be cleared quickly. So much for the port facilities.

As I have said, they were built by a Liberal government, and they were built well. They were built with the intention of making Churchill a port of continuing value to Canada. I know something, too, about the efforts made to send business through that port. I know of the negotiations which went on with British shipping lines. Out of all those negotiations we were able to interest only one shipping line in sending boats to that port; that was the Dalgleish line. The government did make an earnest endeavour to do business through Churchill, and succeeded in doing a considerable amount of business in each season until war conditions made it impossible to operate.

The fact that no other shipping line would interest itself in the port is an indication to me that the shipping profits on the route could not have been fabulous. I know something of the efforts made to bring down insurance rates. Rates were coming down each year, until a boat was lost in the strait, and the insurance rates zoomed up again. Hon. members will understand that insurance rates are based upon the average experience of the route, and the experience on the route into Churchill has not been good, measured in terms of percentages.

I contend that every effort has been made to make Churchill an asset to Canada. Despite those efforts, however, I think hon. members will agree that up to the present time the movement of grain through Churchill has not increased the price of grain at any country loading points in Canada. There are certain points in northern Saskatchewan and northeastern Alberta which furnish the movement. If the shipping rates could be reduced, that area served would widen. But for the greater part of the west, the movement through Churchill can mean very little in the matter of increasing the price of grain at country points.

There are certain factors that have emerged from the war that will offer opportunity for a more intensive use of the route in future years. We now have a considerable fleet of ships suitable for trading into Hudson bay. These ships are owned by the government, and it will be at the option of the government whether it wishes to insure them or not. We have operated boats through the war years without insurance, and I presume the government will not hesitate to operate into Churchill without insurance.

There are certain devices that have been developed during the war, such as radar, which make it possible for a ship to detect floating ice and to obtain its own position without the use of a compass. In that way a ship is in a stronger position to undertake ventures into new routes than was the case before the war. All this will be in favour of a real trial to make the Churchill route the success that was hoped for when the facilities were built.

In spite of the short season I think it may be possible to reach the objective of those who developed the route, which was a movement of 20,000,000 bushels of grain in the season. That does not sound much when compared with the movement through Port Arthur and Fort William or through Vancouver, but 20,000,000 bushels is a considerable movement for any port. Few ports on the continent have larger movements than that. Therefore I am not suggesting that the outlook for Churchill is hopeless; far from it. I feel that in post-war years the port will develop as far as its physical limitations will permit, and I can assure the house that the government will make every effort to see that that development is pressed actively and vigorously.

As far as the "On to the Bay" association is concerned, I think the government has accepted all the practical representaitons which that body has made. It was suggested at one time that the government should employ an active agent who would be located in the western provinces and who would seek for imports into Canada. I recall that for some years the government employed one of the officers of the Saskatchewan government to perform that duty. The grain office for the port was located in Winnipeg, and a competent officer of the board of grain commissioners was given the exclusive duty of developing grain business to move through Churchill.

I hardly think the latter part of the resolution is a practical suggestion. I can assure my hon. friend that if he believes that is the best way to develop Churchill, and he can find a responsible group who wish to lease the facilities of Churchill on a basis of $1 a year, I will do my best to influence my colleagues to accept the proposal. In saying

that, I am mindful of the fact that it is an expensive port to operate. There are no year-round residents at Churchill. All operators must be moved in at the beginning of the season; they must be gathered up all over the prairies and moved to the port. While the power plant is maintained in operating condition during the winter, the real crew must be moved in in the spring. The crew for the grain elevator must be moved in. All supplies must be moved in, as well as all coal to bunker ships.

Mr. MacNICOL: And all the water drained out of the mains.

Mr. HOWE: That is done at places besides Churchill. Before any boat can come in we must send one of our large icebreakers to patrol the strait. We must send up supplies of oil for the icebreaker and for other emergency purposes. Operating the port of Churchill is not a simple operation, and in my opinion its best chance of success is in the hands of the dominion government.

This has been a most interesting debate and I hardly think the mover of the resolution will wish to press it to a vote. I suggest that he withdraw his resolution.

Mr. JACKMAN: How long would the lease be that the minister mentioned, for 999 years?

Mr. HOWE: An offer has not been received.

Mr. BRACKEN: I do not know whether the hon. member who introduced the resolution is going to withdraw it. The Minister of Transport was good enough to try to answer a question I asked, but he did not answer it completely. He gave the exports of grain from Churchill, but it was the storage I wanted. My information is that the elevator was filled at the early part of the war and that it remained substantially full during the whole period of the war.

Mr. MacKINNON: I think that is correct.

Mr. HOWE: That is true.

Mr. BRACKEN: Is it full now?

Mr. HOWE: I think the United States ships moved out less than a million bushels, so that it is perhaps two-thirds full now.

Mr. BRACKEN: The capacity is what?

Mr. HOWE: Two and a half million bushels.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the house that the hon. member shall have leave to withdraw his motion?

Mr. COLDWELL: He has not asked for leave to withdraw it.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Moore), which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Abbott
Beaudoin
Bertrand (Prescott)
Black (Chateauguay-Huntingdon)
Black (Yukon)
Blackmore
Blair
Blanchette
Bonnier
Boucher
Bourget
Bowerman
Bradette
Bradshaw
Bridges
Bryce
Burton
Campbell
Case
Castleden
Charlton
Claxton
Cloutier
Cockeram
Coldwell
Daniel
Dechene
Dion (Lake St. John-Roberval)
Douglas
Dubois
Fair
Farquhar
Ferguson
Fleming
Fournier (Hull)
Fraser
Fulton
Gibson (Comox-Alberni)
Gibson (Hamilton West)
Gingues
Glen
Harkness
Harris (Grey-Bruce)
Hlynka
Howe
Jackman
Jaenicke
Johnston
Jutras
Kidd
Knight
Lafontaine
Langlois
Lapointe
Leger
Lennard
Little
Low
McCuaig
McCullough (Assiniboia)
Macdonald (Brantford City)
McGarry
McIlraith
McIvor
McKay
Mackenzie
MacKinnon
McLure
MacNicol
Manross
Martin
Matthews (Brandon)
Matthews (Kootenay East)
Maybank
Menary
Merritt
Moore
Nicholson
Nixon
Quelch
Raymond (Wright)
Robinson (Simcoe East)
Rose
St. Laurent
Senn
Shaw
Sinnott
Smith (Calgary West)
Smith (York North)
Stephenson
Stewart (Winnipeg North)
Strum, Mrs.
Thatcher
Townley-Smith
Tremblay
Tucker
Tustin
Webb
Weir
White (Hastings-Peterborough)
White (Middlesex East)
Winkler
Wright
Wylie
Zaplitny—105.

NAYS

Messrs:

Belzile
Breithaupt
Coté (Matapedia-Matane)
Emmerson
Gagnon
Gladstone
Golding
Healy
Lesage
McCann
McCubbin
Macdonald (Halifax)
McDonald (Pontiac)
MacLean
McNaught
Mayhew
Parent
Pinard
Reid
Rinfret
Ross (Hamilton East)
Viau
Whitman
Winters—24.

Mr. BRACKEN: I am paired with the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. GRAYDON: I was paired with the Postmaster General (Mr. Bertrand). Had I voted I would have voted in favour of the motion.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I was paired with the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Casselman). Had I voted I would have voted in favour of the motion.

Mr. McGREGOR: I was paired with the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) Had we voted we would have voted for the motion.

Mr. ISNOR: I was paired with the hon. member for Colchester-Hants (Mr. Stanfield). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. GREEN: I was paired with the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Cruickshank). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I was paired with the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. McCulloch). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. ADAMSON: I was paired with the hon. member for Winnipeg South, (Mr. Mutch). Had I voted I would have voted in favour of the motion.

ST. MARY RIVER

PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF RESERVOIR

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge) moved:

That, in the opinion of this house, the government should take into immediate consideration the advisability of proceeding with the construction of the St. Mary river reservoir, the key structure of the Lethbridge southeast water conservation project in southern Alberta.

He said. May I give the house somewhat of the background of this resolution. There are in southern Alberta wide areas of land rich and easy to work, relatively near to railways and schools; lands most of which have already been settled and brought under cultivation. But the rainfall in that area is scanty. Crop failure is far too common. The climate is well adapted to the production of field crops of various kinds, including sugar beets, canning crops like peas, beans, corn and tomatoes and all manner of vegetables that grow in moderate climates, alfalfa and grains. As a result of all this, the area is one of great productive potentiality. It would be possible to make that particular region one of the finest sources of food in the dominion and perhaps on the North American continent. But it requires more water.

There are in the Lethbridge district four major irrigation projects; Lethbridge, Coaldale, Raymond, Magrath and Taber, comprising in all 120,000 acres. All of this land is irrigated from the St. Mary river through a canal which was constructed early in this century, about 1901 or 1902, by what was known at that time as the A.R. and I., or the Albert Railway and Irrigation company. In most years there is too little water for the area which has been brought under irrigation, so that in the months of July, August and September there is frequently such a scarcity of water that great loss results. Sometimes the scarcity is most acute. Especially is this so when the snow supply, which ordinarily is found in the Rocky mountains, is melted away for one reason or another, thereby causing the water in the river to be low. Sometimes the shortage will be forty per cent, at least, below what it ought to be.

It happens that in the system which they are using there is no reservoir. Water has to be taken out of the river just as the river runs, and consequently when the river is low the water supply is also low.

There is considerable water available in Alberta, enough of it to turn great stretches of semi-arid land into verdant blooming garden land. There are four international rivers in my constituency flowing through southwestern Alberta: Waterton river, Belly river, the St. Mary river and the Milk river. From these rivers there is available for the project which we are discussing to-night, namely, the Lethbridge southeast water conservation project, a total of 795,700 acre feet of water. This quantity, allowing for wastages through evaporation, seepage and the like would be sufficient to supply 465,000 acres of land.

To the waters of the St. Mary river and the Milk river the United States has a considerable claim. This is how it came about. The two rivers rise, of course, in the United States, but the United States made no serious claims to the waters of these rivers, so far as I know, until back in 1901 when the Alberta Railway and Irrigation company began to build the canal from which Magrath, Raymond and Lethbridge are now watered. Then the United States people began to be concerned; a reclamation act was passed by congress in 1902, and the St. Mary and Milk river project in Montana was authorized in 1903. There then arose protests of citizens on both sides of the line, each thinking that the other nation was getting too much water.

Consequently a treaty was signed on January 11, 1909, embodying an article known as article 6, setting up an international joint commission to deal with boundary waters. It also provided for the apportionment of waters between the two countries under the direction of this international commission. In the final act of the international joint commission, October 4, 1921, certain definite rules were laid down for dividing the waters between Canada and the United States. In accordance with the final act Canada between 1922 and 1940 would have received annually 403,200 acre feet from the St. Mary and Milk rivers, and the United States would have received 324,100 acre feet. During the years 1922 to 1940 and since, Canada has wasted and is still wasting fifty-five per cent of her share of the St. Mary river and practically ninety-five per cent of her share of the Milk river.

This is serious, Mr. Speaker, for two reasons. In the first place Canada has been losing all the production which would have resulted from the beneficial use of that vast amount of water. In addition, Canada has been in danger all through those years of losing her right to the waters of those two rivers; for it is recognized among nations that if a nation desires to retain its right to water it must make beneficial use of that water. In neglecting to make such beneficial use, Canada, in accordance with the understanding among nations, really has forfeited her right to it. For twenty-five years Canada has neglected to make beneficial use of her share of the water. Surely such negligence is unpardonable. How much longer are we to continue to do this exceedingly foolish thing? How much longer are those in power in Canada to delay; how much longer are they to trifle with the interests of generations yet unborn?

Meanwhile, what has the United States been doing about her share? The United States authorized her St. Mary and Milk river project in 1903, commenced to build it in 1906 and completed it in 1920. She has built the Sherburne reservoir with a capacity of 66,000 acre feet near the head of the St. Mary river and a diversion canal from the St. Mary to the Milk river. This has enabled her to carry her share of the St. Mary river into the Milk river so that she can use it more easily. Then near the Milk river she has built the Fresno reservoir with a capacity of 126,000 acre feet and the Nelson reservoir with a capacity of 66,800 acre feet. It is estimated and very much feared by people who are giving this matter careful attention that the United States is now equipped to store and use not only her share of these rivers but Canada's share as well. Hon. members can calculate what that may mean. The United States share of these two rivers is being beneficially used, and she has great need for more water than is available. The United States is finding irrigation profitable. Already her people in many parts are beginning to agitate for a request to Canada that the allocation of the waters be reconsidered. If this demand ever becomes sufficient, as it easily may, I think hon. members can see that there is cause for more than a little concern.

Why is it so important to proceed with the St. Mary reservoir in this connection? That is the key reservoir to the whole system known as the Lethbridge southeast water conservation project. The St. Mary river reservoir will be situated on the St. Mary river at Spring Coulee, in my constituency. The capacity will be 270,000 acre feet. If we could build that reservoir and store that amount of water in it, then I believe we could successfully resist any claim on the part of the United States that we were not beneficially using our share of the water.

Into this reservoir can be diverted water from the Waterton and Belly rivers. From it the water can be carried to supply the four existing projects I mentioned previously, and it can be carried to seven of the subsidiary reservoirs which will be used in storing and distributing the water in the Lethbridge southeast water conservation project when that project is completed.

This reservoir would require between three and four years to build, which means that if this government is to build the reservoir it is time it got at it. The construction of the reservoir and the expenditures thereon would be somewhat as follows, according to estimates of the engineers, and calculated at pre-war prices. In the first year $750,000 would be spent. In the second year $2,250,000 would be spent in bringing the reservoir toward completion and building certain outlet canals. In the third year the reservoir would be finished, the canals enlarged, and distribution systems would be put in to carry water to 24,598 acres. The operation of the third year would cost $2,256,485.

May I emphasize once more the fact that this reservoir will take at least three years to build. Our need is to have this reservoir right now; it should be in operation next year. We really cannot afford to wait for three years. Already one year has been lost or will be lost unless something is done this fall, which is likely now to be rather difficult because of approaching cold weather. There is another reason why this reservoir is very important. Once it was built both the domin-

ion and provincial governments would be committed to effective action. Governments do not spend in the neighbourhood of $5,000,000 without going forward with the work. People do not see water available in a great reservoir without demanding that the water be distributed on the land. The construction of this reservoir would, therefore, be extremely important.

It is sometimes argued by politically minded people and newspapers that one reason why the government is delaying the construction of this reservoir and this system is that the provincial government of Alberta is not co-operating. I think all we need to do is to point to the fact that this year the Alberta government is proceeding with the construction of the East Pothole reservoir, which is the nearest one of the series of several reservoirs which will constitute the whole system. This reservoir will store 14,000 acre feet. Those who would argue that the provincial government is not ready to cooperate will have a good deal of explaining to do.

When these reservoirs and canals are all built, and the Lethbridge Southeast water conservation project is finished, first of all there will be developed a water supply for the 120,000 acres which are now being irrigated in four major irrigation projects. Then there will be water distributed over 345,000 acres of new land which now, because of repeated droughts, is of very little value to the country.

What I am about to say in the next minute or two may be a little bit gloomy; but I think we shall have to face the facts as they are. There is a food situation developing in the world, which, according to all the information I am able to get, is cause for the gravest anxiety. There is developing and probably has already developed the possibility of a genuine famine which might involve the lives of scores of millions of people.

There is no area on the American continent capable of being brought into the production of food and kept in the production of food any more readily than is this particular area. Crop hazards are low; we have very little difficulty with insects, with diseases, with hailstorms, or with other agencies which tend to destroy crops. We are reasonably sure of crops if we can get the water on the land. I draw this matter to the attention of the government with the most earnest seriousness. If we do not have food for the nations who are going to need food, then to the extent to which we fail to provide we shall be responsible for the lives of those people.

There is another very serious matter, and it is this: I believe too many people in this country, and probably in the world are assuming to-day that wars are past. Let me warn that there is very little justification for any assurance that wars are past, right now, in our generation. In 1936 and 1937 I warned the country that in the event of war we would be without sugar. Well, we have lived to see ourselves without sugar, and we have lived to see ourselves engaged in a war.

I am not predicting, but I would say it is only the part of plain common sense to develop this area in case we need it in a time of war. There is another aspect of the problem, namely, the one of rehabilitating those boys who will come home from overseas. The boys who are returning want land now; they do not want it four years from now. Every year we delay the construction of this project we are keeping out of possible use 345,000 acres of land. I maintain that the time is ripe for building this project right now.

I believe I have said enough to indicate that there is plenty of reason for the resolution.

Some time after 1941 the dominion government set up a committee known as the St. Mary and Milk rivers water development committee. This committee consisted of Victor Meek, George Spence and William E. Hunter. They submitted their report in February, 1942. Having gone through the report, I feel we are justified in commending the committee very highly upon the care and thoroughness with which they did their work. I should like at this time to read a passage or two from the report. Turning to page 4, I read as follows, from the findings:

7. That Canada should construct at an early date the necessary irrigation works to protect by beneficial use its share of the St. Mary and Milk rivers.

8. That there have been acute shortages in the water supply for existing projects served by the St. Mary river and that upon completion of the proposed St. Mary reservoir sufficient water would be available to supply these shortages and serve an additional area of 94,000 acres of new land.

9. That there is tributary to the St. Mary and Milk rivers a larger area of good irrigable land than can be irrigated by the total water available from Canada's share of these rivers supplemented by waters of the Belly and Waterton rivers.

10. That upon the completion of the ultimate development a total of 345,000 acres would be available for post-war settlement and for the reestablishment of many farmers at present on submarginal lands.

11. That a reservoir on the St. Mary river in Canada is the most important feature in the development and the site proposed and dealt with by this report is the most feasible for purposes of storing Canada's share of the St. Mary river and tributaries and waters from the Belly and Waterton rivers.

I should like now to read from the recommendations of the committee, as they are found at page 8:

> The construction of the main reservoirs and connecting canals would provide the necessary facilities to store in Canada, Canada's share of these international waters and would thereby be an insurance against the loss of a valuable resource.

Near the bottom of the same page I read as follows:

> That the dominion undertake and assume as a 100 per cent responsibility the construction of the main reservoirs and connecting canals to provide storage facilities for Canada's share of the waters of the St. Mary and Milk rivers as apportioned under the order of the international joint commission of October 4, 1921.

Again on page nine:

> That the dominion's part in the construction of the project be carried out as a federal post-war development, and that the cost thereof be regarded as non-recoverable.

I believe the material which I have given is such as to justify the house in passing this resolution, which reads:

> That, in the opinion of this house, the government should take into immediate consideration the advisability of proceeding with the construction of the St. Mary river reservoir, the key structure of the Lethbridge southeast water conservation project in southern Alberta.

Mr. J. R. MacNICOL (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the resolution introduced by the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore). I am happy to see the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) in his seat because, if anything is done in connection with the St. Mary river project, it will be done under his department. I am going to direct my remarks principally to him and I know the other members of the house will not mind. After all, it is always good politics and good business to talk to the man who has to do.

If you convince the man who has to do, then you have the job half done.

To advocate irrigation for southern Alberta should not be a difficult job, nor should it be particularly hard to convince anyone who knows anything about the problem of southern Alberta. It is a great problem. I intend to go a little outside the resolution and be more general than the resolution. I do not believe the Minister of Reconstruction can separate this one project from another project which is equally important. They should both be carried on at the same time. The irrigation of southern Alberta is a vital problem. It is of vast importance to Canada. Much of the business built up in eastern Canada, in your own city, Mr. Speaker, and in many other cities in eastern Canada; many of the plants in your city and in my city—if I were dealing with my own riding I could speak most forcibly—have been expanded because of what little irrigation—it is not little, except when compared with what has been done south of the line—has been done in southern Alberta.

I shall first confine my remarks to the resolution which asks for the construction of a reservoir on the St. Mary river. The previous speaker has already told the house that four rivers flow into Canada from the United States, all starting in the same glaciers south of Waterton park. The three westerly rivers are the Waterton, the Belly and the St. Mary, and these are the most important to Canada, more so than the Milk river.

I shall say a word about the Milk river and then leave it out from the rest of my argument. The Milk river enters Canada and after flowing through Canada for about 150 miles, or about 125 miles in a straight line, it returns to the United States. The water in that river is all United States water except for the water of some small tributaries that flow in in southern Alberta and southern Saskatchewan. None of these Canadian tributaries has water of any great volume. In my opinion the duty of Canada is to proceed with that which will mean the most to Canada, namely, the St. Mary river project.

On the St. Mary river, about ten miles more or less north of the beautiful little town of Cardston, there is an excellent site for a reservoir. I do not like to make any comment about engineering problems without knowing something about the matter, and I have visited this site. The banks are quite high and the engineers who were with me said that they could build a dam 150 feet high. They showed me where they had drilled to find foundation sites. If that could be done they could store in that reservoir about 270,000 acre feet of water. What is an acre foot of water? It means the water sufficient to cover one acre of land one foot deep. To convert 270,000 acre feet into cubic feet you would have to multiply 270,000 by 43,560, which is the number of square feet in an acre. In other words, this would be a vast volume of water.

But it is not sufficient to take care of the land which is irrigable but which is not now irrigated in southern Alberta south of the main line of the South Saskatchewan river. More reservoirs would have to be built. Besides the Spring Coulee reservoir north of Cardston, to which I have just referred, other reservoirs could be built southeast of Lethbridge, one at Chin Coulee, which would be sufficient to conserve 150,000 acre feet, and

one at Verdigris, good for 140,000 acre feet. There are quite a number of other smaller sites, some of substantial capacity. The total of all reservoir capacity that could be built south of the South Saskatchewan river—quite apart from the Milk river project which I am not dealing with at the present time—is about 650,000 acre feet. That is more than would be required to take care of the possible acreage which is irrigable but which is not now irrigated, namely, about 345,000 acres. This would take care of all the additional irrigable land south of the main line of the South Saskatchewan river—Old Man river. Old Man river is the principal Saskatchewan tributary in that part of Alberta. As I say, those 345,000 acres could be irrigated by water stored from the St. Mary river, plus water diverted from the Belly river and sent into the reservoirs just mentioned. The engineering plans are ready for this project. In other words, Canada will have no trouble whatever in finding reservoir capacity in southern Alberta in which to store sufficient water to take care of the 345,000 acres of irrigable land in southern Alberta south of the main line of the Saskatchewan river.

Something was said about the cost of the Spring Coulee reservoir on the St. Mary river. The cost of all the additional reservoirs and irrigation canals in southern Alberta south of the main line of the South Saskatchewan river necessary to store water to irrigate right down to the neighbourhood of Medicine Hat would be around $15,000,000. If that can be done for $15,000,000, the Minister of Reconstruction would receive the support of this whole country. There is not a question of doubt in my mind as to the wisdom of entering into agreements and contracts for the building of irrigation works south of the main line of the south Saskatchewan river. I do not mean that Canada should pay for that, nor do I think the province of Alberta would expect to pay for it, nor do I think the people of southern Alberta would expect Canada to pay for it. But they are not in a position to do it themselves. Therefore the money required to construct these works would have to be guaranteed by the dominion government. It would not in the last analysis cost this country one dollar. Take the Taber area, where the present irrigation canals end just a short distance east of the town, south of the main line of the South Saskatchewan river. From there to Medicine Hat is a fine country, with A-1 land, containing all the chemical ingredients required to produce in abundance. That has been clearly demonstrated in the vicinity of Taber itself, where the products produced on irrigated farms are marvellous. I visited a field where something new not only for that part of the country but for Canada was being produced, namely a field of large cucumbers—I believe they call them dill.

Mr. WEIR: Dill pickles.

Mr. MacNICOL: Yes. They have recently built in the village of Taber, a thriving village that clearly demonstrates the tremendous business that accrues to any village, town or city in an irrigated area, thirty very large vats, each one capable of containing some twelve tons of large cucumbers. They have also started to grow sweet potatoes in that area and are having success, which goes to show that the land in southern Alberta is A-1, excellent land. All that is required is the water. That district in southern Alberta around Taber would not grow anything of any consequence were it not for the irrigation canals that are there now. In 1943 the precipitation for that area was a little over three inches. You could not grow anything on land with a precipitation of only three inches a year, except perhaps prairie grass, wild sage and rose bush. But with irrigation, see how that area has developed! The same can be done elsewhere. There is just as good land around Raymond and Magrath and Cardston. The whole area in southern Alberta which is now irrigated demonstrates clearly what the land will produce if it has water. If it has water and produces like the one or two examples I have given anyone can readily see that the cost of irrigation works would be liquidated in time.

I am also going to ask for consideration for the territory on the north side of the river, south of the Red Deer area, which I am not going to touch at the moment. I am in favour of irrigating the Red Deer area of Alberta too, but at the moment I confine my remarks to the present irrigation canals north of the main line of the South Saskatchewan river, all of which I have covered very carefully.

The water is taken out of the Bow river on the north side of the main line of the South Saskatchewan river and diverted first to McGregor lake and from there into Little Bow lake. These two lakes have a capacity of 350,000 acre feet of water. In the area, north of the general line of the South Saskatchewan river there are 245,000 additional acres of land which is just as good land as that south of the main line of the South Saskatchewan river, and it should be covered by this general irrigation scheme for southern Alberta. You would have north of the river 245,000 acres, for which there is ample water

and ample reservoir capacity, not all developed but all of which can easily be developed, and then south of the main line of the river you would have 345,000 acres, or a total of about 600,000 acres in southern Alberta which could be and should be irrigated and for which an ample supply of water is guaranteed, provided that the reservoirs are built, particularly commencing with one at Spring Coulee on the south side of the main line of the river; second, at Chin Coulee; third, at Verdegris, and fourth, at any of ten other reservoir sites.

The north side of the river is peculiarly suited right now for the extension of the irrigation system because the main line of irrigation canals are already constructed. The first area to be taken in by the new project would be the Retlaw-Lomond area, with which my hon. friends from Alberta are quite familiar. That is an excellent area of land. I have been over it, and I observed that it has an excellent fall which is peculiarly and particularly adapted for irrigation purposes. I am convinced that God Almighty in His all-wise providence, when He designed that part of Canada and endowed the soil of Alberta with that richness in chemicals which enables it to grow anything, knowing that it did not have the water it requires from precipitation, provided for it to have water, first, by providing the water in the mountains from which the South Saskatchewan river starts, and then by giving a fall to the land for not less than two hundred miles so that the water could flow down without having to be pumped.

The first area, the Retlaw-Lomond area, can easily be taken care of. It is just lying there waiting for the subsidiary canals to be built from the main canal that flows south and east from McGregor lake and from Little Bow lake. The main canal is completed right east to the Bow river, but when it reached the Bow river it stopped, for lack of money. That is to say, the connection of the canal west of the Bow river with the canal east of the Bow river did not take place. The water stops west of the Bow river, but the canal itself is completed east of the Bow river and for another fifty miles in a direct line, but perhaps sixty miles following the circuitous course which the canal takes to within sight of Medicine Hat. If the minister pays a visit to Medicine Hat and takes a motor trip on the north side of the Saskatchewan river with that brilliant and capable irrigationist, one of the ablest in Canada—I do not think there is a better one anywhere—Mr. David Hayes, of the Canada Land and Irrigation Company, he will take him, as he took me, over the route of the canal which ends very close to Medicine Hat, having started east of the Bow river. It is not connected with the water canal west of the Bow river, as I said, because of lack of money.

In my judgment the first project that should be completed is the Spring Coulee reservoir on the St. Mary river. After the works south of the river are completed, the second project is to proceed to the north and connect up with the main canal of the Canada Land and Irrigation Company so that the water will then syphon east over the Bow River and connect up to the present dry canal east of the Bow river. By that means you would place under irrigation another 100,000 acres of land. In other words north of the South Saskatchewan river you would have 245,000 acres of irrigable land, and south of the main line of the South Saskatchewan river you would have 345,000 acres of land also irrigated; in other words, about 600,000 acres of new land.

That will be an additional 600,000 acres of what I call "sure crop" land. It is just as sure crop land as it is possible for land to be. The sun shines nearly all day long. I have never travelled anywhere where I have seen as much sunlight as I saw in southern Alberta. It is no wonder that their flag contains the sun bursting in the sky. The sun as I say, shines nearly all day long. With the sun, the land and the water what place in America could ensure more certain crops than southern Alberta can? For that reason I would not hesitate at all in proceeding with the construction of irrigation works for southern Alberta, both north and south of the main line of the South Saskatchewan river.

Now Mr. Speaker, when we know what the land produces—my hon. friend, I believe, told us what the land produces and perhaps I should not repeat it—

Mr. BLACKMORE: I did not tell it all.

Mr. MacNICOL: The hon. member referred to corn. Vast crops of highgrade corn are grown there. They are developing a market for Alberta corn. It is called Taber sunshine table corn and it is in great demand all through the west and right down to Ontario. In sugar beets they produce up to eighteen tons per acre. In potatoes and all kinds of grains the crops are tremendous on the irrigated land, while across the road, so to speak, on the non-irrigated lands, sage and wild rose and grass grows.

Some will say that you can irrigate that 600,000 acres of land, but what about other millions of acres of land? I believe the time

is coming, perhaps not yet, when we can do the same thing for Canada that they are doing south of the border. The minister is perhaps better posted on the marvellous results in the half dozen or more states south of the international boundary down to southern Arizona than most hon. members, but I am familiar with it too. There they have built some thirty-six major projects, and they are irrigating over three million acres of new land. On to those three million acres they are transferring over a million citizens, if one counts their families, from the dried-out areas in the dust-bowl. They are going a lot farther; they are now introducing into congress at Washington a bill asking for the expenditure of $1,900,000,000 for irrigation in the California valley drained by the St. Joachim and the Sacramento rivers. That gives the house an idea of what our United States cousins think of the value of irrigation. They have created an enormous market in the last few years for the products and the manufactures of the eastern states. They have created in brand-new business of manufactured goods a new yearly market to the total of over $200 million. That is a lot of new business. That is a lot of jobs in the towns and cities of the eastern states.

If we irrigated 600,000 acres of land that are ready for irrigation in southern Alberta, that are crying out for irrigation, we would create in Alberta alone a market that would affect not only every factory in Ontario, but in Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, because they all manufacture and ship material out there. I have seen and have made it my business to go into the merchant stores, wholesale and retail especially, to ascertain what they had on their shelves that was made in eastern Canada. If they did not have a market for it they would not have it there, would they? We can greatly increase that market by irrigating the 600,000 acres of land. But I would not stop there. I think the grand old province of Saskatchewan needs consideration. If there is any province in Canada to-day that needs consideration it is Saskatchewan. Again this year what have they? One-third of their whole southern area depressed by drought. It is heart-breaking. I myself have travelled slowly south from Regina to Estevan, and I have been very much depressed with what I saw, all dried-out land upon which farmers, with all the hope that their hearts could have, have sown their seed in the expectation that they would receive some return, but they have received little. It is land that has less than ten inches of water a year; it is land that should have a minimum of eighteen inches of water a year. That would not be enough to give them great crops, but it would give them somethnig. Take a route straight from the South Saskatchewan river from Riverhurst, right through to Estevan. There are two million acres of land that could be sure crop land. If it were irrigated it would be sure crop land. Why is it not irrigated? It could be done.

The minister is an engineer; it is fortunate that he is, because he will know better than any other member of the government of the possibilities of engineering. I count on him standing up against anybody telling him that a dam could not be built there. I could build a dam on that river if I were given enough money to do it. That is all that is required. What does it matter if the dam at Riverhurst does cost $5,000,000? What does it matter if the dam has to be 2,000 feet wide, rather thick at the base; what does it matter if it has to be 3,000 feet thick? It does not matter what the width has to be, for they have them on the Tennessee river far wider than that; they have them in the western states far wider than that. What does it matter anyway? The cost is a capital investment. I would build a dam on the South Saskatchewan river somewhere near Riverhurst, and I would build it high enough to divert water not by flow but by pumping. They are doing it down through the United States. Look at the Black Canyon dam in Idaho. That dam is 183 feet high and is irrigating 20,000 acres of land complete and another 20,000 acres of land by pumping. If they can do it there we can do it here, and I would not let anything stop me. I would give those good people between Riverhurst and Estevan a chance to live. I would carry the irrigation works in southern Saskatchewan across that country and provide a sufficient domestic water supply for Regina and Moose Jaw, giving those people also a chance to live, and an opportunity to expand, which they cannot do at the same rate as they would if they had an adequate water supply.

I am sure that if the Minister of Reconstruction would take the bit in his teeth he could do it. He could build irrigation works that would be successful in both southern Alberta and southern Saskatchewan. I am very happy indeed that the minister is here, and it is encouraging, at this late hour, to see the large number of members in the chamber. It goes to show that the heart of the House of Commons is sound. It shows that there are enough men in this House of Commons—I include the lady member also—

who are thoroughly alive to and interested in giving the western provinces a chance for existence. I may say that I was associated with manufacturing in a big way in eastern Canada, and I know perfectly well what western Canada has meant to the building up not only of that plant with which I had been associated but of every other large manufacturing concern in the east. I know, from close contact with business which came from the west, that the plant with which I was associated grew from a small beginning to huge proportions, and I know that the same is true of scores of others, through the development of the west.

The people of the west have been up against it pretty hard. They must have hearts of steel to stand what they have stood. I could not do it. I could not plant crops year in and year out without having any return. Those people must come of a strong and rugged race, and I can well imagine what they would be as a greater buying population if they were assured of huge crops every year: wheat, fifty bushels to the acre; sugar beets, eighteen tons to the acre; corn, 750 cases to the acre, each case containing twenty-four cans; peas, twice as much; dill pickles, sweet potatoes and everything that goes to make for wealth in the country. Millions of new dollars additional could be produced in the west by means of irrigation, wealth which otherwise could not be produced. To me it looks as plain as a-b-c, a matter of ordinary business. The money invested in these projects would give these people a chance to live.

The first job, in my opinion, is the Spring Coulee-St. Mary river reservoir. If we do not tackle that first job to begin with, then I do not see why we should expect our United States cousins to put up with the present situation much longer. They have completed their reservoirs. I know, because I have seen them. They have stored everything they can store and they want more water. Is it not natural, therefore, for them to look across the line and say to us, "You are a prodigal people, allowing all this water to run to the sea since 1921; now the time has come to call a halt and we shall have that water ourselves unless you conserve it." And they could take it by the international treaty already signed by us.

In conclusion, let me express my faith in the minister. He is an engineer and he has go; I repeat, if he will take the bit in his teeth and begin by building the Spring Coulee and Chin Coulee project, and the other little reservoirs, and go on to the north side of the river and complete the programme there, there will be water to the Medicine Hat area and the whole programme will cost about $20 million, which is not much more than we paid for one cruiser. And three or four cruisers belonging to Canada or Great Britain were sunk off the coast of France and we never batted an eyelash. Why should we bat an eyelash at spending $20 million to rehabilitate southern Alberta? Or why should we bat an eyelash at the expenditure of the necessary millions to start a similar programme in Saskatchewan so that we might give the people in Alberta and that part of Saskatchewan a chance to live in the sun?

Hon. C. D. HOWE: I have only a minute or two to say what I have to say. I had hoped to make some remarks on this subject, but I may say that the government has rather anticipated this resolution by taking active steps to build the St. Mary river dam, which, as the resolution suggests, is the first step and the key to the entire project. Plans have been prepared in years gone by, perhaps never very seriously, because it was quite impossible to divert the man-power required by the project during war years. But the plans are well advanced. They are being studied now, and discussions are taking place with the province, because on a project of this kind the province and the federal government must work in complete agreement. It is no small engineering project. As I recall, the dam is 120 feet high, which for an earth dam is a substantial engineering undertaking.

Hon. members will agree with me that the best engineering opinions must be had from men experienced in that type of work. Not only is it a difficult engineering project to build such a dam, but the conditions under which the dam must operate are very trying in connection with an earth dam. There is a fluctuation of head that is considerable, a fluctuation of head under extreme weather conditions. The danger, as regards a dam of that type, is that the earth will slough as the water level rises and falls, and if that begins nothing can save an earth dam. Therefore the particular material must be studied carefully. It has been studied, and in my opinion the best expert engineering judgment must be brought to bear on the problem. That is being done, and I sincerely hope that a real start can be made toward the construction of the dam during the next building season.

I have given some study to the project. The hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) seems to study every interesting project and has given the house a good deal of the back-

ground of this question, and I should like to show the house how much I know about it. But since it is now eleven o'clock I shall have to reserve that for another occasion.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BRACKEN: I should just like to say, that one of the two best governments in Canada has been returned to power to-day in one of the best provinces of Canada. The latest report I have indicates that the government in question has elected twenty-one members and is leading in fifteen constituencies, while the opposition is leading in four. It has been a great day for democracy.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. BRACKEN: I hope hon. members will applaud after the next statement. The government of Canada defeated as well, by the representatives of the common people.

It being three minutes after eleven o'clock, the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Tuesday, October 16, 1945.

The house met at three o'clock.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

PRECEDENCE OF GOVERNMENT NOTICES OF MOTION AND GOVERNMENT ORDERS ON MONDAYS ON AND AFTER OCTOBER 22

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs) moved:

That on Monday, October 22 instant, and every Monday thereafter to the end of the session, government notices of motions and government orders shall have precedence over all other business except introduction of bills, questions by members and notices of motions for the production of papers.

Mr. DONALD M. FLEMING (Eglinton): Mr. Speaker before the motion is put, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Veterans Affairs. It is my understanding that it is not intended at present to interfere with Wednesdays as private members' days.

Mr. MACKENZIE: No, it is not the intention at present. I rather think, however, that, following the custom in preceding sessions and parliaments, a further motion will be put in a week's time. The following figures will indicate the number of Mondays and Wednesdays given in other years to private members' business before they were taken over for government business:

	Mondays	Wednesdays
1935	4	5
1936	5	3
1937	3	6
1938	6	7
1939	8	5

So far this session we have had five Mondays, Thanksgiving day having taken away one, and we have had a total of six Wednesdays, so in that respect we are up to the average of prewar years. I think reasonable consideration has been given to the rights of private members.

Motion agreed to.

RAILWAYS AND SHIPPING

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS AND ESTIMATES OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED TRANSPORTATION LINES

Hon. LIONEL CHEVRIER (Minister of Transport) moved:

That a sessional committee on railways and shipping owned, operated and controlled by the government be appointed to consider the accounts and estimates and bills relating thereto of the Canadian National Railways, the Canadian National (West Indies) Steamships, and Trans-Canada Air Lines, saving always the powers of the committee of supply in relation to the voting of public moneys; and that the said committee be empowered to send for persons, papers and records, and to report from time to time, and that, notwithstanding standing order 63, the said committee consist of Messrs. Chevrier, Clark, Coyle, Beaudoin, Belzile, Bourget, Emmerson, Gibson (Comox-Alberni), Harkness, Harris (Grey-Bruce), Harris (Danforth), Hazen, Jackman, Lacroix, Lockhart, Maybank, McCulloch (Pictou), Moore, Mutch, Nicholson, Picard, Reid, Shaw.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister what the powers of this committee are to be. When a similar committee was first appointed around the year 1929, it was given the task of going over the budget of the Canadian National Railways. Since that time they have added steamship, ocean and hotel services, and now they are going to add civil aviation. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been invested by this country in the Canadian National Railways, in its ocean and hotel services, and especially in civil aviation services. Unless we solve this civil aviation question aright and have a proper civil aviation policy the British empire will face liquidation. When this committee was first appointed I asked whether the House of Commons was divesting itself of all public control over this great national system of railways, ocean services and hotel services—and now we have aviation services, on which the future of the British empire depends. I asked when this committee was appointed for the first time if

individual members of parliament would have the right to go before it and ask questions, and the minister replied that they would.

I have read the reports of this committee and I fail to see where there has been any proper investigation of the affairs of this railway system. The membership of this committee, like that of other committees, is made up largely of laymen, although there are a few members who know something about transportation. However, hardly anyone who has served on this committee is an outspoken public-ownership man. Many who have served on this committee have had experience in municipal affairs, but I have been unable in other years to find any outstanding supporter of public ownership who has been a member of this committee.

As to the way the committee is conducted, I may say that I have visited the committee dozens of times. The members were all smoking cigars and they seemed to be having a good time. They travel around the country a lot, but I have failed to find any recommendations made by this committee to the high court of parliament which show that a proper detailed investigation has been made of this great public utility which is so necessary to the building up of this country and the development of its natural resources.

I warn the House of Commons that if this committee is appointed its report will be brought down a day or two before the house closes, with no time to discuss it. There will not be time to examine it as it should be examined. I notice that they are adding the consideration of expenditure relating to civil aviation. They have appointed a board to handle civil aviation. All parliament does if we pass this motion is to divest itself of all authority and hand the whole system over to boards. Who are the officers of the board? Let us look over the list of the permanent officers. Some of them have been promoted to the office of vice-president, but I doubt if they ever had the necessary experience. This is a great public utility.

You can appoint this committee if you like. No doubt it will be appointed, but the investigations by this committee in former years were practically no investigation at all of the system. I have read the reports dozens of times. It reminds me of the war expenditures committee, by which we divested ourselves of control.

Mr. SPEAKER: Standing order 38 reads:

The following motions are debatable:
Every motion
(a) standing on the order of proceedings for the day, except government notices of motion for the house to go into committee at a later date.

[Mr. Church.]

Mr. CHURCH: You are quite right, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, we are divesting ourselves of all control over expenditures of this system.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member admits that I am right, he should resume his seat.

Mr. CHURCH: I have spoken on this motion every year, sir. I have objected to the appointment of this committee which takes from the control of parliament the whole policies of the national railway system.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have been generous with the hon. gentleman, and he should resume his seat.

Mr. CHURCH: I do not intend to allow this motion to pass without a protest from one who has been a public ownership man all his life. I fail to see where the public ownership principle in administration has been carried out by the system.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): Mr. Speaker, it is with great diffidence that I rise in view of your ruling a moment ago in connection with freedom in discussing a resolution of this kind to set up a committee. I well recall, and I am sure that Your Honour will recall, that in previous sessions not only have a few moments or a few hours been taken up in debating the setting up of a committee; we have spent as much as three or four days in such a debate. With this explanation, I should like to take two ar three minutes of the time of the house, because this seems to be the only opportunity I may have, to place upon the record what I think is a well deserved tribute to a group of our Canadian citizens.

Of the contribution which has been made by other branches of our civilian population, none will occupy a greater or more glorious page on Canada's home front history of the war than that of those engaged in the various branches of our transportation services. When I say this I am but reflecting the widespread and general public opinion on this point. But it is not alone on the home front that those in transport service have done their bit. Let me take as only one example those employed by the railway systems of this dominion. It is a proud record to which railwaymen right across Canada may point when it is recorded that almost 43,000 of their number have served in the armed forces of Canada in this war. Taking as a basis the number of employees on both roads at the beginning of the war, more than one out of every four railway workers in Canada enlisted in our armed

forces. It is doubtful if a better record can be shown by any other branch of our national activity.

While their brothers were fighting for Canada the railway workers at home performed an almost impossible task of transportation. The strain and pressure of war was nowhere felt at home more acutely than by our railway transportation systems. How they mastered the task was little less than a miracle; for in 1938—I would like the house to pay special attention to these figures, because they are next to miraculous—the railways of Canada carried 78 million tons of freight, while in 1944 the freight tonnage had jumped from 78 million tons to 152 million tons. Passenger traffic increases tell a similar story. In 1938 the railways carried 17½ million passengers: in 1944 they carried 54½ million passengers, or more than three times the volume of the last peace time year.

Let us not forget that with all the urgency and all the strain and all the pressure attendant upon war-time operation of our Canadian railways, only seven passengers were killed in Canada through railway accidents in the year 1944. The ratio of those killed and injured in railway accidents, whether passengers or not, is very much lower in 1944 than in the smaller peace-time traffic year of 1938. This is a silent but eloquent tribute to the efficiency of the railways of Canada which needs no elaboration from me.

It will be interesting to hon. members to know, too, that during the last calendar year, 3,100 dining car employees in the two great systems of Canada served en route with notable efficiency and service no less than nine million meals. Were time to permit, the story would go on through every branch of transportation activity to show the superb war-time job which was done.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself and my hon. friends with the tribute that has just been paid by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon) to the work of the men in charge of our transportation systems. Many of us who had to travel from time to time across this country before the war as well as and particularly, during the war, were amazed at the efficiency of the conductors, engineers, sleeping-car porters, dining-car stewards, and those charged with the responsibility of looking after railway offices and providing us with reservations. I am sure that what the hon. member for Peel has said is echoed by every member of this house no matter where he sits.

But what I really rose to do was to support the appointment of this committee, and I do so because of the remarks of the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church). It would be a mistake if at any time we in this House of Commons, elected in a legislative capacity, were called upon to try to operate an economic utility owned by the country. The method we have adopted in Canada of establishing government-owned corporations which by statute are free from active interference on the part of members of this House of Commons is the sane and proper method of handling publicly-owned institutions. The members who are elected to this house have no right, in my opinion, to interfere with the internal management of organizations such as this, and it is our duty to see to it that politics, in the sense in which we use the term in this chamber, does not enter into the running of our railways or our broadcasting system or any other publicly-owned utility which we have established or may establish in the future. As time passes, more and more of these great economic organizations will come under the ownership and control of the people, and they should be operated entirely apart from the legislative arm; for the two arms, legislative and economic, are quite distinct. As long as we have the right to investigate the proceedings of these organizations to see that they give the people service and do a good job, our responsibility in connection with them as elected members of this house ends. As a warm supporter of the social ownership of industry I believe that in setting up these corporations under public ownership and control, under a statute of this parliament, and making them responsible to parliament through a committee of the house, we are doing what is the only sane thing to do. It is with pleasure, therefore, that I concur in the appointment of this committee.

Mr. W. CHESTER S. McLURE (Queens): Mr. Speaker, before this motion passes I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. Every province is supposed to be interested in this committee and every province is supposed to have a representative on it. I notice that eight provinces are represented on the committee, but Prince Edward Island—again we come back to Prince Edward Island—is not. We from Prince Edward Island are interested in this railway, and I would like to ask the Minister of Transport why that province is not represented on the committee.

Hon. LIONEL CHEVRIER (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon) as well as the leader of the C.C.F. party (Mr. Cold-

well), for the tribute which they have just paid to the transportation workers in Canada during the war years. The tribute that each of them has paid is a well-deserved one, and unquestionably the service which these workers have rendered should be referred to in this house. When I made a statement in the house some two or three weeks ago in reference to the extension of an order in council on travel, I paid a tribute to the work being done by the railway and transportation workers across Canada. I think I should add a word now as to what is being done by the railways in the repatriation of our troops from overseas. I am sure the house will agree that what was done in that respect could not have been better done.

The leader of the C.C.F. party a moment ago pointed to a very important feature in the setting up of this committee, namely, that parliament should retain the right to see that the internal management of the railways is not interfered with, and the proper way to make sure of that is by the appointment of a committee such as this. It strikes me that the setting up of this committee—I know the house will agree, and the motion is in exactly the same form as in previous years—will ensure the purpose for which it is being established.

The hon. member for Queens (Mr. McLure) asked why it was that there was no representative on the committee from Prince Edward Island. The Minister of Transport is not responsible for naming the membership of the committee. That is a matter for the whips, and should they agree upon a change I shall have not the slightest objection.

Mr. JACKMAN: May I ask the minister whether or not the Hudson Bay railway accounts will come before this committee, as was agreed upon at the last sitting of the house?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Yes.

Mr. JACKMAN: And it will not be necessary to set that out in the resolution?

Mr. CHEVRIER: No.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before putting the motion to the house may I tell the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon) that I appreciate the very generous way in which he called my attention to my poor interpretation of standing order 38. I apologize to the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church), and I hope knowing his kindness, that he will continue to be generous to the Speaker, who unfortunately is not infallible.

Motion agreed to.

[Mr. Chevrier.]

TAXATION

SIXTEEN PER CENT INCOME TAX ABATEMENT—DEDUCTION AT THE SOURCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition). I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice, who I understand is the acting Minister of Finance. My question is meant to clear up certain confusion which has arisen in respect of the budget proposal to abate the income tax levy by 16 per cent. To make clear my question let me read from the statement of the Minister of Finance in presenting his budget. He said at page 1006 of *Hansard:*

> I think it wise therefore to recommend an interim measure of prompt and unquestionable relief. It is proposed that the tax levy shall be abated by 16 per cent dating from October 1, 1945. This abatement of 16 per cent will be applied to the current tax deductions at the source just as soon as the necessary change can be made. Since the change is applicable from October 1, the abatement on the whole tax liability for 1945 will amount to 4 per cent. For a full year, the abatement will be 16 per cent of the tax liability.
>
> This is an interim measure to be applied immediately and to continue until it is possible to combine further abatement with a thorough overhaul of the whole rate structure of the personal income tax.

As a result of that statement taxpayers were led to believe that the abatement would apply in respect of the current month's tax deductions at the source. However, on Saturday morning, Mr. Fraser Elliott, deputy minister, taxation division, national revenue department, in a statement reported in the press, in apparent direct contradiction of the minister, said that the policy would not apply to tax deductions at the source until January 1, 1946. His statement as reported is as follows:

> Employers will continue to use the present existing tables of tax deductions until the end of this calendar year without any change. Thus employees will then have paid substantially 100 per cent of their tax liability on the pay-as-you-earn basis, and the tax reduction provided by the present budget for 1945 will mean that they will have less to pay at the time of filing their returns on or before April 30.

My question is this: would the minister inform the house whether the statement of the minister in his budget speech is correct, or whether the statement of the deputy minister of the taxation division of the Department of National Revenue is correct?

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the statement of the Minister of Finance as reported at page 1006 of *Hansard* which has just been read by the leader of the opposition correctly set forth

the intention of the government in the budget proposals which were put before the house by the Minister of Finance on Friday night. It will be noted that in that statement the minister said that the abatement of 16 per cent will be applied to all current tax deductions at the source just as soon as the necessary change can be made. As a matter of fact the deductions at the source are made in accordance with tables which have been prepared and authorized by order in council as regulations for the collection of the income tax, and the commissioner of income tax would have no authority to depart from what is prescribed by the order in council and the tables until some change is made in the regulations.

Though it is always declared in budget proposals that it is intended when the proper legislation is enacted that it will be retroactive to a certain date, it is not in fact legislation until it has passed through the houses of parliament and received the royal assent. Because of that, the commissioner of taxation apparently felt that it would be more convenient, and would make in fact no difference to each ratepayer or each employer, if deductions continued to be made according to the same table to the end of the year, because these deductions are calculated to represent only ninety-five per cent of the liability; in fact one could go on making to the end of the year deductions at the same rate, and the only consequence would be that the ratepayer would not have as much as five per cent to pay to satisfy the whole of his tax liability. There have been however a large number of representations and protestations made against this proposal or this suggestion of the commissioner of income tax, that though the Minister of Finance had not said from what date a change in the amount to be deducted might be made, he had said that it would be effective as soon as the necessary change can be made.

Mr. BRACKEN: He said it would apply immediately.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Yes, it would apply and it does apply, and both the minister and the commissioner intend that it shall in fact affect the amount of tax to be paid. The only question is whether it will be deducted at the source or whether it is something that a man will have to pay after he gets it—which he will have to return to the tax gatherer after he has received it from his employer. There have been a number of protestations that, though it does not affect in any way the liability of the taxpayer, the amount of deductions should be reduced at once by 16 per cent. It is intended at the earliest possible moment, because of the apparent psychological effect of maintaining the deduction at the old rate, to recommend to His Excellency a modification in the order in council, under which employers will be authorized to reduce their deductions immediately by 16 per cent without issuing the new table, because it would take some considerable time to calculate and print the new table and get it into the hands of every employer. But representations have been made that many employers are willing to have their pay clerks make the calculation, and the intention is to recommend to His Excellency an immediate modification of the regulation which will be authority, until such time as parliament has dealt with the recommendations of the Minister of Finance, to the employers to reduce their reductions by the 16 per cent. I hope to-morrow to be able to lay on the table of the house, if His Excellency will be pleased to approve it, an order making that change in the regulations.

Mr. BRACKEN: Just to be clear, Mr. Speaker: is it understood that the statement made by the deputy minister of the taxation division of the Department of National Revenue will be altered by your proposed procedure?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: It is proposed that the procedure he had suggested in his statement will not be followed but that authority will be granted by order in council to all employers to reduce their deductions immediately by 16 per cent.

Mr. GRAYDON: There is nothing wrong after all with Fraser Elliott's statement.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: There was nothing wrong with it, and in fact it would not make one cent's difference to anyone.

Mr. GRAYDON: The minister did not make it very clear, though.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: But the psychological effect, we are told, is substantial; many employees say that if there is to be a reduction of 16 per cent they should be trusted and should have the tax deducted only in accordance with the rate which will apply, they themselves to pay whatever balance they may owe as balance of income tax at the appropriate time.

EXCISE TAX—PRESS REPORT AS TO LEAK IN BUDGET INFORMATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): May I also ask a question of the minister

arising out of the budget? I sent him notice of this question. I wonder if the attention of the government has been drawn to a report which appeared on page 12 of the Ottawa *Citizen* of October 13 last, Saturday, to the effect that the Ottawa branch of the Standard Fur Dealers knew on Thursday evening that Friday's budget would contain a reduction of the excise tax on certain furs from 25 per cent to 10 per cent. If so, does the government propose to investigate this serious charge of a leak in budget information? This report appeared in the Ottawa *Citizen* of last Saturday.

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs): The report had already been noted to be discussed with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) just as soon as he returns. As the hon. member knows, the Minister of Finance is on a speaking tour to promote the victory loan, and is expected back, if not at the end of the week, early next week. The matter will be placed before him and discussed with him to determine what should be done in the circumstances.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is satisfactory.

WAR VETERANS

REFUSAL OF SLAUGHTERING LICENCE TO RETURNED SERVICEMAN OPENING BUTCHER SHOP

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): I wish to direct a question to the Acting Minister of Finance. It is an urgent matter connected with the right of men returning from overseas to go into business. I am asking the indulgence of the house to put the question for the reason that since coming in here I have received a telegram in connection with it. On September 26 last I pointed out that the wartime prices and trade board had neglected to issue a licence to a butcher who upon his return from overseas, after five years of service, put all his gratuity money into a butcher shop and was then—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Mr. Speaker, this is a matter affecting every soldier in the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Will Your Honour permit me to place it before the house? It is the only opportunity I have, and this soldier's business has been closed down because the wartime prices and trade board will not act. That is the reason I am bringing the matter to the attention of the house, the only place in which complaints from citizens can be cleared up. This soldier came back from overseas in August and started in business. He endeavoured to get a slaughtering licence, as I pointed out at page 482 of *Hansard*, but the matter was postponed from week to week, and finally to-day this man, after five years of service, has to close up because the wartime prices and trade board refuse to grant him a slaughtering licence. My question is this: Will the government immediately give consideration to the removal of orders and controls such as these in so far as they affect men who served this country and are returning and endeavouring to carry on the business they previously operated? The telegram I have before me comes from the Overseer of the town of Hawarden, Saskatchewan. I will not read it in detail, but it states in part:

> Our butcher forced to close unable to get slaughtering licence. Will you bring this matter before parliament?

It affects every man coming back from overseas. I ask the government: Will a general order be issued with a view to enabling soldiers to carry on the business that they operated before they went into the service?

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Minister of Justice): I have not joined in the applause which has followed the hon. member's question, because I am not informed of the facts. I am quite prepared to take the hon. member's question as notice, but I would also ask him to give me the particulars of the case in question so that I can have it investigated.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I did so on September 26, and I have been trying to get action ever since.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I am not in a position to supply information about the case mentioned. If, however, the hon. member will now give me the particulars, I will at once have the matter looked into and endeavour to get a statement of the facts as they appear from the official records.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I believe this is the case mentioned by my hon. friend in a previous debate. I asked him then, when he referred to a certain letter, for the production immediately of that letter so that I could discuss it.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: This is not the same matter.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I have not heard from the hon. gentleman in regard to that case.

SHIPPING

INQUIRY AS TO ESTABLISHING RESERVE POOL OF SHIPS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. K. FRASER (Peterborough West): I wish to ask the following question of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Chevrier). When ships are released from united nations shipping pool, will the dominion government establish a reserve pool of ships in Canada similar to that which the United States shipping administrator intends to establish in that country?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. FRASER: This is important.

Hon. LIONEL CHEVRIER (Minister of Transport): The hon. gentleman sent me no notice of the question.

Mr. FRASER: It is not according to the rules to send notice.

Mr. CHEVRIER: It is the practice. If the hon. member will put the question on the order paper I will see that a reply is given.

Mr. FRASER: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. According to standing orders, ministers are not bound to answer questions. It is a matter of courtesy if they do so.

Mr. HOMUTH: And so often they cannot.

Mr. MACKENZIE: You certainly could not answer any of them.

HOGS

DECREASE IN PRICES IN PRAIRIE PROVINCES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. MAX CAMPBELL (The Battlefords): In the absence of the Minister of Agriculture I should like to address a question to the government. Why did the price of hogs in the three prairie provinces on October 11 drop by from $1.15 to $1.40 per hundred pounds? What held the markets at approximately the same level as the previous week at Vancouver, Toronto, Montreal, and Moncton—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask the hon. member to put the question on the order paper.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PROCEDURE IN QUESTIONS ON THE ORDERS OF THE DAY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): Before you go on to the orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege I should like to call Your Honour's attention to a remark you made a moment ago in respect of the rights and privileges of those of us who sit on this side of the house, or of members generally who are not members of the government, in the matter of seeking information and receiving it from the government. I should like to make this suggestion to Your Honour, that you reconsider the statement you made with regard to our rights being only by way of courtesy. Whatever may be the letter of the rules, whatever may be the strict wording and technicalities which surround many of our deliberations here, I think it would be highly inadvisable for the Speaker of the house, Your Honour, or anyone else here, to suggest that the opposition have no rights, except by way of courtesy, in questioning the government.

Mr. CHEVRIER: He made no such statement. You are lecturing the Speaker.

Mr. GRAYDON: Just a moment. If the Speaker allows me to speak I will ask hon. members to refrain from interrupting. I should like to make this suggestion to Your Honour, with all possible diffidence, because I fear that a matter of this kind might easily grow into something much greater and much more important as time goes on. I think it ought to be established once for all that the opposition has a right, not just by way of courtesy but a right that has grown up through the years of our parliamentary institutions, to quesion the government at any time on the orders of the day on anything of national importance.

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend was in the house a year ago and was acting leader of His Majesty's Loyal Opposition when this question came up and Your Honour's predecessor, the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Glen) gave a most comprehensive ruling on the whole subject of questions asked on the orders of the day. His ruling on that occasion I believe met with general satisfaction in the house. There is no innovation in the remarks Your Honour made a few minutes ago; they were in keeping with the ruling given at the time by the then Speaker.

Hon. J. A. GLEN (Marquette): Mr. Speaker, may I refer Your Honour to citation 296 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, third edition:

The Speaker, in common with his duties of supervision over the proceedings of the house, may rule out any question which violates the privileges of parliament in the same way as he deals with irregularities in motions and amendments. (M. 239; 2 Red. 243). He may make an alteration in the question (M. 240) or refer it back to the member for correction (b. 313). A member may call the attention of the house to the matter and may challenge the action of the Speaker.

Citation 297 reads as follows:

A certain number of oral questions are permitted in practice by members, without notice, before the orders of the day are called; but these are merely allowed by courtesy in connection with the business of the house or with very urgent and important matters of public concern.

As I understood His Honour the Speaker, he actually quoted what is contained in citation 297 of Beauchesne. I repeat:

. . . but these are merely allowed by courtesy in connection with the business of the house or with very urgent and important matters of public concern.

Some hon. MEMBERS: "Or".

Mr. GLEN: I continue:

They are always brief, no debate being permitted, and the replies are as concise as possible. The minister interrogated may reply at once or may direct that the usual notice be given. Such questions are governed by the same rules of order as questions of which notice has been given.

It has been the practice in this house for many years to allow questions on the orders of the day; if they are of immediate public concern and must necessarily have an immediate answer, they are allowed by courtesy of the house. But where the matter is not urgent, and where the question can well be placed on the order paper, the practice is—and it is a good practice—that it should be placed upon the order paper so that the government and the minister in charge may be in a position to give the answer to which the member asking is entitled. That practice has been established, and His Honour the Speaker has to-day followed exactly the practice that has been in vogue in this parliament for many years.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): I should like to ask under what standing order this ruling is made. I quite agree that it is a matter of courtesy, and I think it expedites the giving of answers if we send notices of the questions, as I usually try to do. I believe that what has been read to us are citations. An hon. member can take the rule book of this parliament and can read citations to prove anything. This brings before us once more the necessity of going into these rules and citations to protect His Honour the Speaker and the hon. members, particularly hon. members on this side of the house, so that we may know exactly where we stand.

May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that while we must have rules of order, and courtesies must be observed—because those courtesies, as I have just said, enable the minister to answer in an expeditious and authoritative way—latitude should be allowed to hon. members who feel that they have something of urgent importance to bring to the attention of the house.

The hon. member for The Battlefords (Mr. Campbell) raised a question a few moments ago which was in his opinion an urgent one. As a matter of fact he discussed with me whether it should be put on the order paper, and I thought it was of such importance to the western hog raisers that it should be asked on the orders of the day. It does bring before us once again the necessity of examining these rules with a view to their revision. May I reiterate what I said the other day? I do not think the decisions of a Speaker of one parliament ought to bind parliament forever. We have rules and standing orders. Those rules or standing orders should govern this institution, not the variable rulings—and some of them are variable—of former Speakers of this house. Each parliament, in my opinion, is master of its own procedure.

Mr. THOMAS REID (New Westminster): May I say one word in reply to the hon. member who has just spoken? If the rules of the house are to be made wide enough to allow all questions to be asked on the orders of the day, then hon. members on this side will of course discard the usual practice of finding the proper answers by going directly to the minister. Hon. members on this side no doubt get the same telegrams and requests as do hon. members on the other side. The procedure is for hon. members of the opposition to get up—and we have all done it—to ask questions for publicity's sake.

Mr. COLDWELL: Oh, no.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. REID: We all get the same telegrams as do the members of the opposition, and we could rise on the orders of the day and ask the same questions; but we do not. We go at it in a practical way and ask the minister who is responsible.

Some hon. MEMBERS: So do we.

Mr. REID: Just be frank about this thing; let us face facts. I am facing facts right now.

With regard to the rules of the house, we had an experience last year of what happens when an attempt is made to amend the rules of the house. If the hon. members for Rosetown-Biggar can show us how the rules as amended will pass, I shall be very happy. I am referring to the debate that took place last year.

An hon. MEMBER: So what?

Mr. REID: That is that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to say that since the opening of this parliament—and I think the same thing has happened in the past—quite a lot of criticism has been offered on this same question. Unfortunately for the Speaker it is very hard to please everybody. Since the beginning of the session I have done everything I could to be fair to both sides of the house, and I think I have been generous, especially to the leaders of the parties when they were asking questions, even though I thought some of them were out of order. I felt that I should be generous to the leaders of the parties, and I tried to be. It is my duty to apply the rules of the house as they are written. So far as questions are concerned the rules are very clear. The Rules and Forms indicate that questions on the orders of the day, should be brief and to the point, and that hon. members should not quote from newspapers, telegrams, and the like. As the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar has said, if the house feels that, for the protection of our parliamentary institutions, these rules are not all that they should be, it is the duty of the house to form a committee and amend them.

WAR AND DEMOBILIZATION

PROVISION FOR APPROPRIATION OF $1,365,000,000 FOR WAR PURPOSES, DEMOBILIZATION, PROMOTION OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY, ETC.

The house resumed from Tuesday, October 9, consideration in committee of a resolution to grant to His Majesty certain sums of money for the carrying out of measures deemed necessary or advisable in consequence of the war—Mr. Ilsley—Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE (ARMY)

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Chairman, it has been the custom in past sessions in presenting the defence estimates to give a brief operational summary as to what has taken place since the last report was presented. I should like to follow that course to-day, probably for the last time.

Some hon. members will recall that at the last session I reviewed the operations of our forces from D-day to the beginning of March, at which time the German army had been swept clear from the west bank of the Rhine and north of the Moselle river. Following the clean-up of the west bank of the Rhine the Canadian forces were regrouped for the initial attack across the Rhine. Our forces participated in the crossings of the Rhine that started on March 23, and once again were on the left flank of the assault that was to end in the final defeat of the German armies. The Canadian paratroop battalion was also with the British airborne division that was dropped across the Rhine on the same day. Meanwhile the first Canadian corps was moving from Italy to northwest Europe and during March its units took over a sector on the extreme left of the long allied line. With the reversion of the second corps to the command of the first Canadian army on the first day of April, all the units of the Canadian Army were fighting together for the first time in its history.

Following the initial crossing and consolidation of the bridgehead across the Rhine, the Canadian army was given the task of clearing Holland. These operations may be broken down into two phases, the first consisting of the initial breaking of the hard crust of resistance and the sealing off of northwestern Holland, and the second being the rapid advances and clearing of northeastern Holland followed by the turn eastwards into Germany to invest the Emden and Wilhelmshaven pocket.

In the first phase our forces attacked from the Nijmegen-Emmerich sector northwestwards, and by April 19 they had reached the shores of the Zuider Zee, thus permanently sealing off the enemy forces caught in southwestern Holland. The first corps turned westwards to deal with this trapped enemy force and ran into stiff opposition, but to the north in Holland resistance was quickly broken. By the middle of April the second corps had reached the north coast of Holland on the Ems estuary and the Kusten canal further east in Germany.

During the second phase, northeast Holland was quickly cleared by our forces against light opposition. On the right very strong opposition was met along the Kusten canal. Similarly the first corps, working slowly into western Holland, also came up against stiff resistance. By the end of the month a truce was arranged to allow food convoys to enter this part of Holland to relieve conditions of extreme food

shortages among the Dutch civilians, and active operations were not again resumed in this sector.

To the north in Germany a bridgehead was established over the Kusten canal on the 17th of April which was expanding northwards into the Emden-Wilhelmshaven peninsula, when the German forces in northwest Germany and Holland surrendered unconditionally on the 5th of May.

It was fitting that the surrender of the remaining German forces in the Netherlands should be made to a Canadian commander, since our forces played such an important part in the liberation of the territory of this gallant ally. The surrender of all the German forces in the Netherlands, naval and air as well as army, was made by Colonel-General Johannes Blaskowitz to Lieutenant-General Foulkes, then commanding the first Canadian corps and now chief of the general staff. The number of German forces surrendered in the Netherlands was over 185,000.

Before leaving this brief review of the active operations of our forces, may I point out that in the ten months of continuous fighting since D-day the Canadian Army, always fighting on the left and vital—if less spectacular—flank of the allied armies, over the most difficult country, encountered and defeated no fewer than fifty-nine German divisions.

Immediately following the capitulation, our forces began to make their way into western Holland, where they were received with enthusiasm by the civilian population. The Canadian Army was then faced with the difficult task of disarming a greatly superior force of the enemy; the organization and relief of the large civilian population, hungry, and excited by the sudden turn of events, and the co-ordination of the underground forces, who were armed and eager to deal with the defeated enemy. This whole operation was accomplished without incident, and is greatly to the credit of the commanders and troops concerned.

The concentration and move out of Holland of the German 25th army was supervised and controlled by our forces, and this difficult undertaking was practically completed by the 15th of June. Meanwhile it was necessary to set up an effective military government in the area of Germany under Canadian command, to restore order in the Netherlands as well as in German territory, to prevent the spread of disease and to develop the essential services and the welfare of the civilian population. Added to these problems was the intricate question of the provision for handling the large numbers of prisoners of war and displaced persons who were migrating in large numbers over the area controlled by our forces. All these measures were carried out in the most efficient and satisfactory manner, so that by the 14th of June General Crerar's responsibility for military government in the German area was concluded and handed over to the occupational district corps command, and by the 30th of June the Dutch authorities were able to resume their functions after the long usurpation by the Germans.

During this time the important problems of reallocation and repatriation of the army's man-power were receiving attention, and all ranks were at once informed of the requirements for the Pacific war and for the army of occupation. On the 4th of July a composite batallion, made up of three different units and accompanied by a band, entered Berlin for a tour of duty of several weeks under command of headquarters of the British troops in Berlin. Machinery was set up in the Netherlands for the organization of the Canadian Army occupation force and for the early return of volunteers for the far east and of long service personnel.

The organization of the occupation force under command of Major-General C. Vokes was completed rapidly, and this force moved into Germany between the 5th and 12th of July to take up its occupation duties in the Emden-Wilhelmshaven area under command of the British 30th corps district.

Preparations were made for the immediate dispatch to United Kingdom repatriation depots of the volunteers for the Pacific force. This force was being organized in Canada as a division to operate against Japan under command of United States forces. It was therefore necessary to reorganize and to re-equip this force along United States lines, although the uniforms were to have been Canadian. As the units were formed and the volunteers were returned from the army overseas, they were concentrated in camps across Canada, together with the necessary reinforcements that it was proposed should move with the force. The units of this force with its reinforcements, after their organization and preliminary training, were to have moved to Camp Breckenridge in Kentucky to complete its organization and training under United States army command. At the time of the capitulation of Japan, this force was still in Canada and was accordingly disbanded.

That, Mr. Chairman, is briefly the record of the information available since the last report I gave the house at the previous session early in April.

Before discussing the problem of demobilization and outlining plans for the future, I should like to give the committee a short statistical resume of the development of the Canadian Army during the war.

In round figures one million men and forty-five thousand women have served in the armed forces since the outbreak of the war. This exceeds by more than 60 per cent the 620,000 who served in the war of 1914-18.

Enlistments and enrolments for the army alone number some 730,000 including 25,000 women. Of the total, 630,000 were volunteers while 100,000 men served under the provision of the National Resources Mobilization Act. In all, 158,000 men entered the army under the National Resources Mobilization Act, but over 57,000 of these enlisted for general service in the army. In addition nearly 6,000 more transferred to the navy or air force as volunteers. I am dealing, of course, in round figures.

Of the 730,000 who have served in the army, 45,000 served in commissioned ranks. Of this number, 26,000 were appointed from the reserve army or direct from civilian life and 19,000 from the ranks. However, excluding doctors, dentists, chaplains and nurses who are all appointed direct to commissioned ranks, over half of the remaining officers received their promotion from the ranks of the active army.

Until March, 1944, the strength of the army grew more or less continuously, reaching a total of 495,000 all ranks at that time. From that date forward total casualties and discharges were about equal to the numbers enlisting or being enrolled and the strength of the army remained almost constant until V-E day.

Over 370,000 all ranks served in the European zone—the highest strength at any one time being over 280,000. This strength was reached during the last few months before V-E day.

The maximum strength in Canada at any one time was 265,000 in May, 1943. This does not include those in so-called adjacent territories. This maximum strength was reached at a time when it was necessary to have comparatively large operational forces in Canada for the protection of our coasts as well as to have a large number in training for the completion of the army overseas and for reinforcements to maintain it. From May, 1943, forward, the strength of the army in Canada decreased because of the disbandment of various formations as the strategic situation improved and the dispatch overseas of units and reinforcements for the first Canadian army.

In addition to the troops in Canada, we had operational units in Alaska and in the islands of the Atlantic. At one time in November, 1943, we had over 14,000 troops in these areas, but this number decreased as it became more and more apparent that the enemy would not be able to bring an attack to bear in these regions.

Up to 30 September last, the total number of casualties reported was 80,530 including 22,553 fatal casualties. We may be thankful that the casualties in this war were so much lighter than in the war of 1914-18, when nearly 60,000 soldiers lost their lives, and the total casualties numbered nearly 200,000

The 80,530 include, besides the 22,553 fatal casualties, 51,487 wounded, 6,435 prisoners of war and 55 currently listed as missing.

There were 505 who died while prisoners of war. In the over-all casualty figures which I have given, these have been included in the fatal casualties rather than among the prisoners of war.

The grand total of 80,530 is made up of 76,514 casualties in the European zone, 1,990 in the Asiatic zone and 2,026 in the western hemisphere. The latter is made up of deaths from natural causes as well as from accidents in training, and the like.

In the total are included 6,071 men who were reported as casualties on two occasions, 492 on three occasions, 27 on four occasions, while two were wounded on five occasions. These are included two, three, four or five times as the case may be, in the total of 80,530 which I mentioned.

The two hardy young men, both born in 1919, who were wounded on five occasions each, seem to have had little respect for German ammunition, for one man remained on duty on two of the occasions on which he was wounded, while the other remained on duty on three of the five occasions. Both these young men have recovered from their wounds; one is still overseas at latest report, while the other returned to Canada in May of this year, and was discharged on grounds of long service in July. I might mention that one served with the composite American Canadian force, known as the special service battalion, while the other was with the good old Princess Patricia's Canadian light infantry.

I suppose that every soldier serving overseas tries to bring back with him some souvenir from the battlefield or from the places of interest he visited. There is one variety of prize of which I feel I should make special mention. I mentioned this a day or two ago. I refer to some 32,000 war brides from the British isles, along with 16,500 children. Both those figures are constantly increasing. Five

thousand army brides and 3,500 children had been brought to Canada up to V-E day, while another 7,000 wives and 4,600 children came between V-E day and the end of August. At that time there were 20,000 wives and 8,400 children still in the United Kingdom. These will be brought out to their new homes as rapidly as shipping will permit, although, at the present time, priority is being given to the returning soldiers.

In what I have just said I have tried to outline broadly the more important figures as to strengths, and the like. I shall now try to give the committee a little more detail of what has happened since V-E day.

At that time, the strength of the army was a little more than 490,000, over 280,000 of these in the European zone. Plans at that time called for the immediate formation of the Canadian Army Pacific force and the Canadian Army occupation force. In addition, attention had to be directed to the repatriation of other soldiers and to the demobilization of personnel not required for those forces or the continuing administration and training establishments.

A total of 83,370 volunteered for service with the Canadian Army, Pacific force, 37,304 among personnel serving in the European zone and 46,066 from personnel serving in Canada and adjacent territories. There were 8,253 women included in these totals. The number repatriated from Europe for the Pacific force was approximately 25,000.

Following the defeat of Japan, and the decision that Canada's share in occupational duties, would, in so far as the army was concerned, be confined to the European zone, the Canadian Army Pacific force was disbanded. The personnel of the force were reallocated to other duties, or if eligible for and desiring discharge, were put into the demobilization stream.

The occupation force in Germany consisting of a reformed third Canadian division and certain ancillary troops, numbered on the 30th of September, 1945, 21,549 all ranks. This included 6,777 personnel who volunteered for this duty, the remainder being detailed.

Already 111,000 men of the army have returned to Canada from the European zone since V-E day, leaving fewer than 175,000 there at the present time. The number repatriated up to the present has been somewhat in excess of our expectations as announced in July last by my predecessor.

Although I must speak with the greatest caution because there are so many demands for shipping for troops of all the united nations in the various parts of the world, I may say that if present plans mature all of the army overseas, with the exception of the occupation force and necessary staffs in England, should be repatriated by March or April 1946.

May I at this point appeal to the press to refrain from over-optimistic comments on our repatriation programme. I know it has not been intentional, but there has been a certain idea allowed to get abroad when we have made announcements that additional shipping has been obtained that we can get so many men home by Christmas or so many men home by a certain date. The department is cautious, and I am most cautious about making predictions. The one which I have just given to the committee represents the best view before us, that is to say, that we shall be able to get all our boys back, with the exception of those in the occupation forces and necessary staff, by late March or April, 1946.

Any mathematical calculations based upon the size of ships that may be allocated to us are apt to be misleading, so I appeal to those who may be discussing these matters to refrain from over-optimistic predictions as to what may result. I have a most vivid recollection of my own experience sitting in England from November, 1918 to June, 1919, and hearing about other people going home. I thought I had been forgotten; I thought that shipping had been allocated to everybody but to the Canadians to get them back home. I know when men are so far away as these men are it is unfortunate if unauthorized and perhaps over-optimistic statements are issued as to what the prospects are. The prospects are good because we are ahead of our expectations as announced last July. I hope that we shall at least maintain that, and perhaps improve it. I do not want to say that we will improve it until I know definitely that we are going to be able to do it.

Since V-E day the numbers being discharged have increased rapidly month by month, reaching 34,000 for the month of September. I think the best day we have had was last Friday, when something like 1,950 were discharged and some 500 put out on extended leave. We are running at the rate of approximately 2,500 for discharges and extended leave. The total discharged from V-E day to date is just over 100,000. Incidentally, I might mention that a reduction in strength of 100,000 corresponds to a saving of about $12,000,000 a month in day-to-day costs for pay and allowances, messing, quarters, clothing and the like.

In addition, the number on extended leave has been increased from 10,000 on V-E day to over 20,000 at the present time.

Although I have already dealt with the matter briefly in the debate on the address I think that perhaps the committee would like to have a somewhat more comprehensive statement of the principles upon which the process of demobilizing the Canadian army is being carried out. There are in this process three main aspects each of which involves its own distinct considerations. I shall refer only to the aspects of repatriation, which is the return to Canada of troops who have been serving overseas, and of discharge, which is the return of the individual to civil life. The third aspect, which is rehabilitation, is not within the army ambit, but comes under the administration of my colleague the Minister of Veterans Affairs.

The common principle underlying the whole scheme of demobilization has always been, and in future, will continue to be that subject to the exigencies of the service and to the national interests, the personnel with the longest and hardest service should be given first opportunity to return to civil life. However, the loose description of this as a policy of "first in-first out" is somewhat misleading, as it ignores the two essential qualifications to which the main principle has always been subject. It is inevitable that there should occasionally occur some combination of circumstances or unusual conditions wherein a general policy becomes inapplicable, or wherein an exception must be made. In such an event the interests of Canada or of the majority of personnel directly concerned must, in the final instance, receive preference over the single person or minor group affected. The circumstances must always be viewed as a whole—and judgment cannot be correctly passed in the light of a single factor or isolated incident.

It is, of course, highly essential to maintain the effective administration, welfare and discipline of the troops still awaiting repatriation or discharge and where this depends upon the particular ability or experience of any individuals, they must continue to be retained for a further period even though they might nominally be eligible, and presumably entitled, to repatriation or discharge. The commander in the field is the only man who can judge all the circumstances as a whole and properly decide whether, in a particular instance, the eligibility and wishes of the individual must give way to the greater needs of the army as represented by the mass of other servicemen in that formation or area in order to adequately supervise the remaining troops and take care of their material needs by experienced tradesmen and specialists.

The corollary of such a policy is that "freezing" of personnel should be kept to the minimum, and constant reviews made to release such personnel as soon as their services can be dispensed with or a replacement trained and made available. Some mistakes will be inevitable, but I am confident that the respective commanders in the field, whether in formation or in unit, by whom decisions in respect of individuals have to be made, will use their judgment in a capable, fair and impartial way.

Similarly, it may have to be determined by the government, on taking all circumstances into account, that a variation or exception to the basic principle is requisite in the national interest for purposes such as carrying on vital industries or developing basic resources to create added employment, easing the critical housing shortage, lessening the gap in higher education caused by the war, or meeting the man-power shortage in certain primary industries. It is a cardinal principle, however, that the soldier still overseas awaiting his turn for repatriation and discharge should not be prejudiced in obtaining employment through any such variation or exception.

The individual point score system is the means of giving expression to the basic principle that I have been discussing but this, being a relative measurement of service, does not, of itself, constitute an absolute right to discharge: it must be applied with due regard to the other qualifying factors which I have just mentioned as being inherent in the process of demobilization.

As all members of the committee, I think, are aware, the point score is determined by allotting three points for each month of service overseas and two points for each month of service in Canada. To the total of these, a further 20 per cent is added where the individual has marital status as a married man, a widower or a divorced man with a dependent child. The scoring is effective over the period from September 10, 1939, until the selected datum date, March 31, 1945.

Point scores are being used as a guide in determining priorities for repatriation as well as priorities for discharge, but these are two separate and distinct operations. The conditions and relative interests involved by one are not the same in extent and degree as those which concern the other. Therefore, the considerations which necessitate and justify an accelerated discharge in advance of the normal priority by score are applicable only in respect of discharge and would not ordinarily carry any entitlement to accelerated repatriation from overseas. The only

exceptions at present are cases of accelerated repatriation for return of "key" men in essential industry or for discharge on compassionate grounds. On the other hand, although a wide range of point scores may be possessed by personnel who have been returned to Canada as a unit, they will be required to await discharge here according to their relative scores or other qualifications for release.

The regulations governing discharge are established and administered by National Defence headquarters in conformity with the broad policies and objects determined by the government. But while the broad principles in respect of repatriation are first submitted for approval by the government and National Defence headquarters as appropriate, the operative regulations are developed through Canadian military headquarters at London, and their detailed application is carried out by Canadian military headquarters and by headquarters Canadian forces Netherlands through their local commanders in the field. They are best in a position to evaluate all the local circumstances as well as individual characteristics and experience when making final decision as to administrative needs or as to what individual may necessarily have to be retained beyond his normal expectation.

The basic plan for repatriation is, I believe, sound and straightforward, but its detailed application has involved most careful study and planning. The primary concern has been to return to Canada as soon as possible those men who had been separated from their homes and families for many long years. But precedence had necessarily to be given to the operational need of immediately moving the Canadian Army Pacific force volunteers to this country for their inclusion with the American force that was destined for the Pacific.

The limited shipping resources made it inevitable that some months must pass before the bulk of Canadian troops could be returned home and this necessitated continuation of their organization as formations and units overseas in order to adequately administer and maintain the troops during their period of waiting. Alternatively, hardship, inconvenience or discomfort might well result from breakdown of an improvised or sketchy organization. Consideration also had to be given to the interest in Canada in the return of units having a militia affiliation and territorial identity so that the invaluable provincial and community interest in such units would be recognized and formation of a strong peace-time militia assisted.

[Mr. Abbott.]

Thus it was decided in principle that following the return of men with very long service, which was to be carried out at far as feasible, the men with relatively shorter service should return by units or unit drafts in the order in which their original formations proceeded overseas, i.e., First Canadian Division, Second Canadian Division, Third Canadian Division, Fifth Armoured Division and Fourth Armoured Division. This repatriation plan, and the basis for point scoring, were duly notified to all ranks overseas by the pamphlet "After Victory in Europe" issued to them immediately following V-E day. I suppose that the committee has seen this pamphlet, which was issued by General Crerar early in May.

Exact adherence to the descending order of point scores in return of personnel would naturally result in depletion of officers both commissioned and non-commissioned, at a more rapid rate than would apply to private soldiers for, on the average, officers would have longer service. No army can function effectively without an adequate proportion of commissioned and non-commissioned officers, and accordingly a certain number of them proportionate to the total strength must be retained despite their length of service.

Moreover, the services necessary for maintenance of the health and comfort of the troops involve retention of a proper proportion of certain specialists or tradesmen, such as cooks, clerks, medical orderlies, etc. In fact, some tradesmen, such as clerks for instance, are required in even greater numbers than normal when troops are being demobilized owing to the great increase in documentation that is involved.

The exact stage at which the further return of individuals, according to height of point score, would begin to seriously affect organization and administration of the remaining troops, had to be determined by the commander in the field and it was with all these considerations in mind that General Crerar was finally obliged to decide that personnel with point scores below fifty would be retained for duty with the occupation force, and that for personnel with scores between 50 and 149 points, return would be carried out by units according to their respective formations. That movement is now in progress, and the majority of units of first Canadian division are now home.

With reduction not only in total numbers of personnel, but also in the numbers of units being maintained overseas, it becomes possible to correspondingly reduce the extent, though not the degree, of services provided. Thus it becomes possible, by interposting, to progres-

sively take out the next higher point score men from among the remaining units and return them in what we call Canada drafts between the moves of the divisions. This works out a balance between individuals and units with fairness to each of them.

Current moves, which are now virtually completed, have been, first, personnel with a point score of 150 and over who could be spared repatriated in Canada drafts, and second, units of the 1st Division group.

Future moves as at present planned are:

1. Canada drafts made up of personnel with 130 points and over who can be spared.

2. Units of 2nd Division group, followed by more Canada drafts made up of personnel with point score down to 110.

3. Units of 3rd Division group, followed by more Canada drafts with point score down to 90.

4. Units of 5th Division group and 4th Division group, followed by remaining personnel from headquarters and repatriation depots.

I should mention here that units of divisions moving as such will return to Canada with all personnel on strength at time of moving having a score of 50 points or over. Those with a score of less than 50 points will remain for further duty.

The units of army troops will be disbanded as the administrative requirements of the remaining formations permit and their services are no longer required. Individuals who can be spared will be repatriated in Canada drafts appropriate to their point score.

This repatriation plan which I have briefly outlined was first announced by General Crerar early in May and has also been explained in detail to the overseas troops by means of a pamphlet recently issued by Lieutenant-General Simonds, Commander of the Canadian forces in the Netherlands.

On V-E day there were of course more men with high point scores overseas than there were in Canada, but the shipping situation imposed a restriction on the number of them that could become available in Canada for early discharge. The sudden arrival of V-J day brought a great demand in Canada for man-power to assist in reconversion and development of industry. In these circumstances, it would obviously not be in the national interest to maintain a considerable number of soldiers in idleness in Canada, to await the return for discharge of slightly higher point score personnel from overseas. It was therefore decided that demobilization of some of the troops in Canada had to be carried out, but in so doing, the just claims of the overseas troops to priority in obtaining employment must be protected.

The classes now made eligible for discharge from those serving in Canada have therefore been restricted as far as possible to groups who would not compete for employment, that is, students or personnel returning to jobs in which they are entitled to be reinstated.

Discharge may now be obtained, subject to the needs of the service, on point score alone if it is 120 points or over (as of March 31, 1945) which means that even if the individual has served in Canada only, he must have entered the army before March 1941 if married, and before May 1940 if single. I do not think that anyone should object to the discharge of a man who has served four and a half years.

In the case of men who are eligible for release to return to their former civil employment, or to work of national importance upon application by the employer through the appropriate industrial selection and release committee, they are not granted a full discharge unless they have a score within 20 points of the current qualifying score which means at present that they must have at least 100 points. If they have a lesser score they are only given extended leave without pay and allowances and are not eligible for discharge until their point score is as great as the current qualifying limit which at present is 120 points.

Apart from the other normal grounds for discharge which have always existed during the war, a service man is now entitled to a discharge: (i) if he has been wounded, is a liberated prisoner of war or has served more than two years overseas; (ii) if he has served in the war 1914-1918; (iii) if he has attained 42 years of age; (iv) if he had not attained 19 years of age by V-J day; (v) if he was one of the very few who on V-J day were still in district depot awaiting transfer to a training unit.

Resumption of university or equivalent higher education has also been made a basis for immediate discharge and while this may be extended to a limited degree with respect to secondary schools, it does not include resumption of technical or business training. The reason for this is fairly obvious: while the war caused a complete gap for almost six years in university training, there has not been the same material diminution in secondary education and, taking into account the personnel trained in the army or in war plants, there has even likely been an increase in trades or technically trained people as a result of the war.

In other instances where there is an acute need of man-power soldiers can be placed on extended leave, without pay or allowances, but they still belong to the army and can be

recalled if they do not remain at the employment for which they were released. Supervision in this respect is maintained by national employment service, which is administered by the Department of Labour. Before any other employer could hire such a man he would have to obtain a permit from national employment service, and this would normally not be issued to permit him to leave the work for which he was released.

The soldier thus placed on extended leave does not accumulate war service gratuities or benefits during the period nor does he receive at the time any rehabilitation grant or other financial assistance available to a soldier on his discharge. Furthermore it is not until his particular point score is equal to or greater than the current nominal score fixed for discharge that he becomes entitled to obtain his discharge.

This extended leave without pay or allowances can be granted for several different purposes which are clearly indicated from the names by which they are known: compassionate leave; compassionate farm leave; hog, dairy and beef production leave; spring and harvest leave; industrial leave; emergency labour leave; construction leave; logging leave; coal mining leave. et cetera. While there is, of course, a different reason for each one, they have a common object, which is to make a soldier, presently in the army, available to meet specially urgent personal circumstances or temporary national needs (some of them seasonal in nature) without, however, releasing him from any future essential duties within the army or prejudicing the future employment of those soldiers now overseas who would be entitled to an earlier discharge.

I should also like to make some brief mention of the discharge procedure itself. Discharges are carried out through the Rehabilitation wing of the respective district depots, each of which has been extensively remodelled and reorganized since V-E day in order to best suit it for such purpose. The most apparent results are seen in the fact that the average normal discharge can be completed within 48 or at most 72 hours of the soldiers reporting at the depot, but the greatest benefits for the soldier lie, not in the speed of his discharge, but in what is done for him during the course of it.

While undergoing discharge the soldier is first given full information and assistance to aid his reorientation to the current conditions of Canadian civil life, then he receives a thorough medical inspection by means of a competent medical board to ascertain any physical conditions that may require future care or treatment or that may entitle him to a pension. In addition, an army counsellor individually discusses with him in detail any questions that he may have concerning his qualifications or prospects for the future and also brings to his attention all the benefits, advantages and privileges to which he will be entitled as a veteran and which, after discharge from the army, would become available to him through the rehabilitation policies which are under administration, not by the army, but by the Department of Veterans Affairs. Finally he has an interview with an employment officer representing the Department of Labour in order to assist him in his choice of work and to put him in touch with the local officers of the department wherever he desires to settle down, so that he may have their assitance in finding a suitable job.

It is following this thorough preparation for resumption of his life as a civilian that the soldier is given his financial settlement, his discharge certificate, et cetera, and his war service badge. And so, after receiving, in personal interview with a senior officer, the thanks of the Canadian Army upon behalf of all Canada for the service he has rendered, the soldier steps forth into civilian life as one of Canada's veterans.

Before dealing with future plans I think I should say a word about the important part which has been played by those concerned with scientific and technical research and development. In this war the application of scientific research, through development, to use by the troops in the field, has played a role more far-reaching and decisive than in any wars of the past. The Canadian Army, working as a team, at home and overseas, succeeded gradually in gathering together the professional and designing skills of the nation —in combining with those skills the military technology of our allies, and of our enemies too—so that when the guns were stilled, it can be said that we had not only contributed greatly to the scientific and technical resources of the united nations, but in some selected fields had taken the lead. Recent developments have demonstrated how vital it is that we should maintain an adequate organization for scientific research and development.

The desirability of placing research on the broadest possible basis, with close integration of the efforts of the three armed services and the national research council, is fully realized and further action to that end is now under active consideration.

As to the organization of our post-war army, it is, I think, recognized that as we disband our active forces we must concurrently develop the military establishments which it will be necessary for us to maintain in peace time.

However, the final determination of just what military establishments we will need in peace cannot yet be made, and will be influenced to a large extent by the nature of any obligations which we may later assume under a world or regional security arrangement—obligations which have not yet been clarified—and by the character of the new and terrible weapons which have so recently been developed.

There are, however, certain steps which in the interval can properly be taken, and which we propose to take, to set up and maintain a basic military establishment, and which can be added to or developed as future circumstances require. Detailed plans along these lines are now being considered.

While, as I have said, it is not yet possible to determine in detail just exactly what our requirements in numbers and types to be permanently employed will be, it is recognized that there are amongst those presently serving, and perhaps also amongst those recently discharged, a considerable number of well trained personnel whom it would be desirable and in the country's interest to continue in permanent military employment should they so desire.

As an interim measure, therefore, and pending final determination of the detailed requirements of the postwar active force, we have given an opportunity to a limited number of personnel to continue in the service for a period of up to two years terminating 30 September, 1947.

Present active service rates of pay and allowances including dependents' allowances and pensions will continue to apply to personnel electing to continue their service in this interim force.

The initial reorganization of our military forces will proceed on the basis of a plan which contemplates that an organized citizens' part-time reserve army will form the source from which a field force would be found in the event of war, with a supporting permanently employed force immediately available to meet minimum peace-time obligations and to provide the staffs and administrative and training assistance for the reserve army.

The post-war army will consequently consist of two main elements.

The first is the part-time reserve army whose organization will reflect the military potential of the country and whose staffs and units will form the basis of mobilization of a field force and of our coastal and anti-aircraft defences.

The second will be the permanently employed active force, whose duty it will be to assist in the training and administration of the reserve army and to supply the necessary staffs, services and scientific research and development personnel, augmented by a small formation of essential field units. This formation will be maintained as a trained field force, fully equipped, ready to meet whatever commitments may arise. Until we know more about our international obligations and consequent requirements, these active force units will be retained as a minimum and would be subject to whatever expansion might later be required in the light of any obligations which we might accept to assist in maintaining the peace of the world. Preliminary estimates indicate that the numbers involved in the active permanently employed force will be between 20,000 and 25,000 all ranks.

In broad outline the essential feature of the plan is the maintenance of the organizational structure of our potential field force and static home defence organization which will provide a basis of military war organization within which the training of the manpower of the country can be carried out.

Although I am not yet in a position to announce the exact terms and conditions of service in our postwar permanent forces, I am in a position to give the following information which is applicable to all three services.

1. A special committee has been set up to review the pay and allowances for the permanent armed forces with a view to obtaining a uniformity within the three services and simplification of the system. The pay structure will provide remuneration comparable to civil employment, and the pay will be good pay. We have no intention of trying to set up a cheap permanent force.

2. The present service pension plan has been under study by an interdepartmental committee for some time. The proposed plan will be applicable to all ranks, and service during the present war and in the interim force will count as qualifying service for pension.

3. The government will announce the terms and conditions of the service in the permanent forces not later than March 31, 1946, and upon this announcement personnel, who have been accepted for or are serving in the interim force, should they not wish to serve in the permanent force under the terms and conditions then announced, will be released from their engagement to serve until September, 1947.

4. Anyone who has been accepted for the interim force will be accepted into the permanent force, subject of course to continued good conduct, satisfactory medical category and military efficiency of the individual.

5. Promotion in the permanent forces will be on a basis of merit and ability and the policy for retirement of senior officers will ensure that there will be reasonable promotion for efficient junior officers during peace time.

In so far as the reserve army is concerned, it is to be organized as a force of six divisions with supporting armoured elements and selected corps and army troops for an army of two corps. In addition, the reserve army will include our operational coast and anti-aircraft artillery units and supporting services necessary for the static defence of the country.

So far as the plans have so far progressed, service in the reserve army will be on a part-time basis, and it is intended that the present three-year term of engagement will be continued. Adequate equipment of the latest type will be available on a generous scale to ensure that the training of the reserve army is realistic and interesting. It is intended to assist commanding officers of reserve army units in the training and administration of their personnel by providing for each unit full time (active force) officers and other ranks on an adequate scale.

Those who are familiar with the existing organization of the reserve army will appreciate that the new proposals follow generally the pattern of its present organization and are consistent with the arrangement of our active force during the war. A rearrangement of units will be necessary in order to secure the numbers and types required in the light of modern operational experience. I may add that it is intended to consult the representatives of the various defence associations, whose cooperation and assistance have been of great value to the department in the past, before the resulting changes in the present composition of the reserve army are finally decided.

I hope that many of those who have seen service in the present war will continue that service in the reserve army so that this important force which will form the background of any possible future military endeavour will, as far as possible, be led by commissioned and non-commissioned officers who have gained field experience in the active army under conditions of modern warfare.

This, Mr. Chairman, completes the review of operations and strengths and future plans, but with the permission of the committee, as in past sessions, I should like to place on *Hansard* the names of 2,433 members of the Canadian Army to whom honours and awards for gallantry, and foreign decorations and awards, have been granted.

Summary of Awards

Operational Gallantry Awards—		
Victoria Cross	3	
The Distinguished Service Order	107	
Bar to Distinguished Service Order	5	
The Military Cross	196	
Bar to the Military Cross	4	
The Distinguished Conduct Medal	44	
The Military Medal	233	
1st Bar to the Military Medal	6	
2nd Bar to the Military Medal	1	
British Empire Medal	6	
Mentions in Dispatches	1,666	
		2,271
Foreign Awards—		
U.S.A.	19	
French	111	
Polish	5	
Czechoslovokian	4	
Belgian	1	
Dutch	1	
		141
Non-Operational Gallantry Awards—		
George Medal	1	
British Empire Medal	6	
Commendations	14	
		21
		2,433

Published Previously *(Hansard)*

	No. 26 d/6 Mar 44	No. 122 d/12 Aug 44	No. 12 d/5 Apr 45	Present submission	Totals
Operational	365	384	2,347	2,271	5,367
Foreign	28	8	48	141	225
Non-Operational	88	31	33	21	173
Totals	481	423	2,428	2,433	5,765

APPENDIX "A"

Operational Gallantry Awards

Victoria Cross (VC)
Distinguished Service Order (DSO)
Bar to Distinguished Service Order
Military Cross (MC)
Bar to Military Cross
Distinguished Conduct Medal (DCM)
Military Medal (MM)
1st Bar to Military Medal
2nd Bar to Military Medal
British Empire Medal
Mentions in Dispatches

The Victoria Cross (VC)

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

B46495 Sgt. A. Cosens, Canadian Infantry, Corps, Latchford, Ont.

Capt. (A/Major) F. A. Tilston, Canadian Infantry Corps, 68 Helena Ave., Toronto, Ont.

D39039 Cpl. F. G. Topham, Canadian Infantry Corps, 631 Beresford Ave., Toronto, Ont.

The Distinguished Service Order (DSO)

Lt.-Col. R. P. Clark, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4611 Angus Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. R. B. Sellars, MC, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 3177 East Georgia St., Vancouver, B.C.

Lt.-Col. J. F. R. Akehurst, Canadian Infantry Corps, 107 Gor Rd., E., Kirkland Lake, Ont.

Major (A/Lt.-Col.) T. P. Gilday, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3295 Cedar Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

Major H. F. Hoskin, Canadian Infantry Corps, 523 Tenth St., New Westminster, B.C.

Major J. T. MacDougall, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 140 Broughton Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. V. Stott, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3033-6th St., W., Calgary, Alta.

Major E. G. Brooks, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 145 Wolseley Ave., Montreal West, P.Q.

Capt. (A/Major) E. J. Brady, Canadian Infantry Corps, Fort Erie South, Ont.

Brig. T. G. Gibson, Canadian Army, 754 Spadina Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Brig. E. C. Plow, Canadian Army, Kingston, Ont.

Brig. H. A. Sparling, Canadian Army, 75 St. John St., Ottawa, Ont.

Lt.-Col. A. H. Birks, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 20 Old Forest Hill Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Lt.-Col. D. K. Todd, The Royal Canadian Artillery, University Hill, Vancouver, B.C.

Lt.-Col. E. H. Webb, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 2 Harcroft Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. (A/Major) V. R. Schjelderup, MC, Canadian Infantry Corps, Courtenay, B.C.

Lt.-Col. (A/Brig.) R. W. Moncel, OBE, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Pine Cottage, Franklin St., Halifax, N.S.

Lt.-Col. J. E. C. Pangman, ED, Canadian Infantry Corps, 21 Relmar Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Lt.-Col. F. E. Wigle, OBE, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 88 Glenfern Ave, Hamilton, Ont.

Major E. G. Cowley, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Beaver Hall Hill, Montreal, P.Q.

Major J. O. Curry, Canadian Infantry Corps, 309 Riverside Dr., Toronto, Ont.

Lt.-Col. H. H. Angle, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Okanagen Mission, Kelowna, B.C.

Major J. L. Drewry, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 322-36th Ave., W., Calgary, Alta.

Major G. R. Hale, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 1102 Graham Blvd., Montreal, P.Q.

Major R. MacDuff, Canadian Infantry Corps, Ste. Anne de Bellevue, P.Q.

Major K. W. MacIntyre, Canadian Infantry Corps, 30 Whiteney Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Major R. B. Stock, Canadian Infantry Corps, 15 Pine St., N., Timmins, Ont.

Major A. J. Tedlie, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Jericks Beach, Vancouver, B.C.

Lt.-Col. G. O. Taschereau, Canadian Infantry Corps, 115 Claire Fontaine, Quebec, P.Q.

Major (A/Lt.-Col.) J. W. H. Rowley, Canadian Infantry Corps, 128 Wellington St., Ottawa, Ont.

Major R. D. Medland, Canadian Infantry Corps, 63 Parkwood Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Major W. A. Robinson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 13 Rosemount Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. (A/Major) G. E. Clarke, Canadian Infantry Corps, 313 7th St., N., Vernon, B.C.

Capt. (A/Major) L. H. Denison, Canadian Infantry Corps, Winnipeg, Man.

Lt.-Col. J. Bibeau, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1835 Prefontaine St., Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. L. G. D'Artois, General List, 1205 Drummond St., Montreal, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. B. M. Alway, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 41 Herkimer St., Hamilton, Ont.

Lt.-Col. W. T. Cromb, Canadian Infantry Corps, 10089 Jasper Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

Lt.-Col. E. M. Wilson, ED, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 11 Duncannon Drive, Toronto, Ont.

Lt.-Col. E. G. Johnson, OBE, Canadian Infantry Corps, 79 Burnaby Blvd., Toronto, Ont.

Lt.-Col. J. R. B. Jones, OBE, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 10044-147th St., Edmonton, Alta.

Lt.-Col. R. A. Keane, Canadian Infantry Corps, 126 Chatham St., Brantford, Ont.

Major B. F. MacDonald, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 9932-105th St., Edmonton, Alta.

Captain (A/Maj.) J. G. Baird, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2022 Retallack St., Regina, Sask.

Captain (A/Maj.) B. Dunkelman, Canadian Infantry Corps, 53 Russell Hill Road, Toronto, Ont.

Captain (A/Maj.) A. K. McTaggart, Canadian Infantry Corps, 627 King St. East, Kitchener, Ont.

Brigadier I. H. Cumberland, OBE, ED, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 12 Millbank Road, Forest Hill Village, Ont.

Lt.-Col. (A/Brig.) C. A. Campbell, OBE, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 37 Pembroke St., Kingston, Ont.

Lt.-Col. A. K. Jordan, ED, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 111 Williamson Road, Toronto, Ont.

Major G. C. A. Macartney, Canadian Infantry Corps, Toronto, Ont.

Distinguished Service Order—*Con.*

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

Major C. M. McDougall, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1601 Sherbrooke St., Montreal, P.Q.

Major C. A. McEwen, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Church Ave., Sussex, N.B.

Major D. H. McIndoe, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Vernon, B.C.

Major G. K. Wade, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Chilliwack, B.C.

Lt.-Col. F. L. Caron, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 7985 St. Dennis St., Montreal, P.Q.

Captain (A/Maj.) D. H. Evers, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 237 Second Ave., N.E., Calgary, Alta.

Major J. W. Powell, MC, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Glenthorne, Wem., Shropshire, England.

Captain (A/Maj.) D. M. Rodgers, Canadian Infantry Corps, 65 Tache Ave., Norwood Grove, Man.

Lt.-Col. R. M. Lendrum, Canadian Infantry Corps, Box 487, Duncan, B.C.

Lt.-Col. L. G. C. Lilley, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 280 Charlotte St., Fredericton, N.B.

Major D. W. McIntyre, Canadian Infantry Corps, 528 King St., West, Chatham, Ont.

Major D. D. Sweeting, Canadian Infantry Corps, Ste. 201, 1162 Fort St., Vancouver, B.C.

Major W. B. Nelson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 378 Stradbrooke St., Winnipeg, Man.

Captain (A/Maj.) W. O. Stockdale, Canadian Infantry Corps, Apt. 1, 797 Bathurst St., Toronto, Ont.

Major A. B. Conron, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 484 Dufferin Ave., London, Ont.

Captain (A/Maj.) D. McCarthy, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1411 Seventh St. West, Calgary, Alta.

Lt.-Col. R. C. Coleman, MC, Canadian Infantry Corps, Montreal, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. A. S. Gregory, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1451 King St., North Battleford, Sask.

Major (A/Lt.-Col.) A. D. MacPherson, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 233-2nd St., Medicine Hat, Alta.

Major J. W. Braden, Canadian Infantry Corps, Ontario St., Bowmanville, Ont.

Major J. P. Gautier, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 4014 Wilson Ave., N.D.G., Montreal, P.Q.

Major F. W. Johnson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Three Rivers, P.Q.

Major J. C. King, Canadian Infantry Corps, 158 Duchess Ave., London, Ont.

Major H. L. Main, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 130 Hawthorne Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Major L. V. McGurran, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2913 College Ave., Regina, Sask.

Major H. R. Turner, ED, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 357 Cambridge St., Winnipeg, Man.

Major L. C. Winhold, Canadian Infantry Corps,, Tavistock, Ont.

Major G. L. Cassidy, Canadian Infantry Corps, Bracebridge, Ont.

Major E. G. English, Canadian Infantry Corps, Chemainus, B.C.

Major L. B. Hill, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 171 St. Paul St. West, St. Catharines, Ont.

Major A. J. La Prairie, Canadian Infantry Corps, 17 Mountclair Ave., Toronto, Ont.

[Mr. Abbott.]

Major W. J. Neill, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3554-42nd Ave. West, Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. (A/Maj.) K. N. Webber, Canadian Infantry Corps, 26 Garden St., Halifax, N.S.

Lt.-Col. (A/Brig.) W. C. Leggat, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 3433 Stanley St., Montreal, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. M. W. Andrew, Canadian Infantry Corps, 67 Caroline St. South, Hamilton, Ont.

Lt.-Col. R. L. Ellis, Canadian Infantry Corps, High River, Alta.

Lt.-Col. N. M. Gemmell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 333 Burnham St., Peterborough, Ont.

Lt.-Col. R. B. D. Harris, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 72 Balmoral Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lt.-Col. R. E. Hogarth, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Ottawa, Ont.

Lt.-Col. J. M. McAvity, MBE, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 181 Lytton Blvd., Toronto 12, Ont.

Lt.-Col. A. Powis, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 389 Metcalfe Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. G. A. Rankin, The Royal Canadian Artillery, No. 40 Adm. Unit, C.W.A.C., Glebe Bks., Ottawa, Ont.

Lt.-Col. H. A. Smith, MC, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Dauphin, Man.

Major L. G. L. Bastin, Canadian Infantry Corps, Dalhousie, N.B.

Major D. G. Brown, Canadian Infantry Corps, Manor, Sask.

Major C. T. Gray, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Calgary, Alta.

Major E. W. Henselwood, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Manitou, Man.

Major R. M. Houston, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 7962 St. Denis St., Montreal, P.Q.

Major W. A. Joyce, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 16 Ruskin Row, Winnipeg, Man.

Major M. L. Lahaie, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 5600 Decelles Ave., Apt. 9, Montreal, P.Q.

Major S. J. McWhirter, ED, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 217 Margaret Ave., West Kildonan, Winnipeg, Man.

Major O. A. Nickson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Apt. 92, 1509 Sherbrooke St. West, Montreal, P.Q.

Major E. E. Westcott, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 27 Crescent Blvd., Simcoe, Ont.

Lt.-Col. K. D. Landell, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 974 St. Antoine St., Montreal, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. C. A. Richardson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 10126-122 St., Edmonton, Alta.

Lt.-Col. R. B. Somerville, Canadian Infantry Corps, 631 Carleton Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

Major H. R. S. Ellis, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Bridge St., Sackville, N.B.

Major O. H. Mace, Canadian Infantry Corps, Innisfail, Alta.

Bar to the Distinguished Service Order

Lt.-Col. W. D. Whitaker, DSO, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5 Montclair Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Brig. J. M. Rockingham, DSO, Canadian Army, 825 Foul Bay Road, Victoria, B.C.

Lt.-Col. H. P. Bell-Irving, DSO, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2810 S.W. Marine Dr., Vancouver, B.C.

Lt.-Col. J. A. Dextraze, DSO, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3745 Lacombe Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Brig. F. N. Cabeldu, DSO, ED, Canadian Infantry Corps, 622 Falkland Rd., Victoria, B.C.

The Military Cross (MC)

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

Capt. (A/Major) J. E. Cooke, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 1050 Jarvis St., Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) D. F. Rankine, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Manitou, Man.

Lieut. G. S. Worrell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 19 Sugar Loaf St., Campbellton, N.B.

Capt. (A/Major) C. V. Lilley, Canadian Infantry Corps, 11030-81st Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

Capt. M. L. Baker, Canadian Infantry Corps, 72 St. Albans St., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. J. E. Stothers, Canadian Infantry Corps, Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. A. P. Beavan, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 99 Dundas St., Kingston, Ont.

Lieut. H. K. Bird, Canadian Infantry Corps, Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. L. J. Heaps, Canadian Infantry Corps, 134-4th Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. (A/Major) D. W. McCullough, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 51 Fairview Ave., Sudbury, Ont.

Capt. J. S. Boyer, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Saint John, N.B.

H/Capt. D. P. Rowland, Canadian Chaplain Services, 1761 Prince Edward Ave., Niagara Falls, Ont.

Lieut. H. E. Cross, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2054 Metcalfe St., Apt. 4, Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. D. N. Gardiner, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 263 Aubrey St., Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. J. G. Pierce, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 492 Homewood Ave., Peterborough, Ont.

M15614 WO I (RSM) R. Bowen, Canadian Infantry Corps, 10228-107th St., Edmonton, Alta.

Lieut. J. A. Laurie, Canadian Infantry Corps, 184 Wellington St. E., Chatham, Ont.

Capt. (A/Major) D. F. Kennedy, Canadian Infantry Corps, 117 Lavinia St., New Glasgow, N.S.

Capt. (A/Major) R. T. Suckling, Canadian Infantry Corps, 465 Bay St., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. J. P. Archambault, General List, 4077 Northcliffe Ave., N.D.G., Montreal, P.Q.

H/Capt. J. R. Leng, Canadian Chaplain Services, 120 James St. E., Brockville, Ont.

Capt. P. C. Neil, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 2050 Metcalfe St., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. L. V. Perry, Canadian Infantry Corps, 138 Lewis St., Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) E. J. Billo, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 205 Erie Ave., Brantford, Ont.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) D. D. Edwards, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 89 Inglewood Drive, Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. J. E. Birmingham, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 1438 St. Urbain St., Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. S. L. Caseley, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Kensington, P.E.I.

Lieut. R. G. Elliot, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 662 Bay St., Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.

Lieut. J. L. Fontaine, Canadian Infantry Corps, 7844 Rue Drolet, Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. L. C. Hawkins, Canadian Infantry Corps, 516 Cottonwood St., Nelson, B.C.

Lieut. D. Heaps, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. C. H. Kydd, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Gray St., Windsor, N.S.

Lieut. J. H. Poole, Canadian Infantry Corps, 55 Ottawa St., Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. F. R. Rea, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Argyle Court, Calgary, Alta.

Lieut. J. J. J. Sunstrum, Canadian Infantry Corps, 40 Sixth Ave., North Bay, Ont.

Lieut. H. R. Tucker, Canadian Infantry Corps, 23 Chesterfield Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

M10712 WO II (CSM) H. O. Larson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Stettler, Alta.

Capt. (A/Major) G. C. Lewis, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Douglas Ave., Oakville, Ont.

Capt. P. A. Cropp, Canadian Infantry Corps, 631 Princess St., Woodstock, Ont.

Lieut. J. H. D. Oland, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 53 Ochterloney St., Dartmouth, N.S.

Capt. T. G. Gould, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 2457 Westhill Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. P. E. Gower, Canadian Infantry Corps, 508 Ominica St. E., Moose Jaw, Sask.

Lieut. A. B. McKinnon, Canadian Infantry Corps, Kincaid, Sask.

Capt. W. P. Hair, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 287 Forest Hill Road, Toronto, Ont.

Capt. R. L. Rochon, Canadian Infantry Corps, 72 Sweetland Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) W. Atkinson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 79 Manrose Ave., Quebec, P.Q.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) J. D. MacFarlane, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 317 Maplewood Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) L. G. Queen, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 2547 Bloor St. W., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. G. G. Aldous, Canadian Infantry Corps, Mount Pleasant Crt., Saint John, N.B.

Lieut. H. H. Badger, Canadian Infantry Corps, 151 Furby St., Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. T. W. Danby, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Unionville, Ont.

Lieut. D. G. C. Eggo, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 73 Pleasant Blvd., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. W. L. Keating, Canadian Infantry Corps, Lampman, Sask.

Lieut. A. B. McDonald, Canadian Infantry Corps, 134 Cottage Rd., Sydney, N.S.

Lieut. J. W. Neill, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 15 Armstrong Ave., Guelph, Ont.

Capt. (A/Major) J. C. Duncan, Canadian Infantry Corps, 970 Sherburn St., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. (A/Major) J. Hemelryk, Canadian Infantry Corps, Perth, Ont.

Capt. R. J. Gelston, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5632 15th Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. D. W. Mitchell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3 King St., Greenfield Park, P.Q.

Capt. K. P. Smibert, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Grenfell, Sask.

Lieut. R. J. Kennedy, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Dunrobin, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) L. Lacroix, Canadian Infantry Corps, 438½ St. Joseph St., Quebec, P.Q.

Capt. C. R. Baker, The Royal Canadian Artillery, St. Catharines, Ont.

Capt. S. A. Mooney, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 222 Harvard Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. J. A. Pollard, Canadian Infantry Corps, 34 Merritt St., St. Catharines, Ont.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) W. H. Q. Cameron, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) L. P. Martin, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 671 St. Louis St., Joliette, Que.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) L. E. Ross, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Richmond, P.Q.

Military Cross—*Con.*

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

Lieut. A. M. Burslem, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 549 Waterloo St., London, Ont.

Lieut. A. Clout, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 97 Cooksline St., East Angus, Que.

Lieut. E. P. Fisher, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1606 Belcher St., Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. C. D. Gatton, Canadian Infantry Corps, Kenora, Ont.

Lieut. R. K. Kerr, Canadian Infantry Corps, 24 Rupert St., Port Arthur, Ont.

Lieut. O. K. H. Kierans, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3502 Northcliffe Ave., Montreal, Que.

Lieut. B. Lafleur, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Joliette, P.Q.

Lieut. P. H. McCloskey, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 15 Kingsway Crescent, Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. L. C. McKay, Canadian Infantry Corps, 25 Turnbull St., Belleville, Ont.

Lieut. D. H. MacDougall, Canadian Infantry Corps, Main St., Antigonish, N.S.

Lieut. A. I. MacMillan, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 44 Bairn Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. J. N. MacKinnon, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 139 Toronto St., Barrie, Ont.

Lieut. A. H. L. Stephen, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1015 Ogilvy Ave., Montreal, Que.

Lieut. K. A. Wharton, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4 Paisley Ave., N., Hamilton, Ont.

Capt. (A/Major) D. J. Burke, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 437 3rd Ave., E., Swift Current, Sask.

Capt. F. W. Drewry, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 322-36 Ave. W., Calgary, Alta.

Capt. G. C. Mersereau, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Saint John, N.B.

H/Capt. A. Munro, Canadian Chaplain Services, Banff Apt., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. A. J. Scotti, The Canadian Provost Corps, 7353 Casgrain St., Montreal, Que.

Capt. L. Withers, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 122 St. Denis Ave., St. Lambert, Que.

Lieut. W. M. MacNutt, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 20 Brock St., Drummondville, P.Q.

Lieut. A. Saunders, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Kingston, Ont.

Lieut. G. G. Ward, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 172 Bergemont Ave., Quebec, P.Q.

Capt. (A/Major) R. F. MacKay, Canadian Infantry Corps, Main St., Trenton, N.S.

Capt. P. E. Labelle, Canadian Infantry Corps, Marierville, P.Q.

Lieut. I. M. MacDonald, Canadian Infantry Corps, 52 Duggan Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. W. R. Buchner, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 855 Wellington St., London, Ont.

Lieut. L. J. Bennett, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2375 W. 12th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. E. J. Berryman, Canadian Infantry Corps, 179-10th St., Quebec, P.Q.

Lieut. J. W. Macdonald, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 5545 Durbar St., Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. E. Nicholson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3270 Douglas St., Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. G. O. Tamblyn, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 98 Laurier Ave., Yorkton, Sask.

Lieut. J. A. York, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 4228 Wilson Ave., N.D.G., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. L. B. Fleet, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2 Brown Ave., Quebec, P.Q.

Capt. R. Poulin, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 114 Fourth St., Quebec, P.Q.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) M. C. Carter, Canadian Infantry Corps, 142 Garfield St., Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) J. E. Y. Theriault, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 564 St-Valier, Quebec, P.Q.

Capt. (A/Major) Hodges, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1205 Lincoln Rd., Windsor, Ont.

H/Capt. H. F. Appleyard, Canadian Chaplain Services, Meaford, Ont.

Capt. G. W. Beal, Canadian Infantry Corps, 297 Rosewell Ave., Toronto 12, Ont.

Capt. G. G. Blackburn, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Apt. 3, 416 Somerset St., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. H. E. Good, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, North Gower, Ont.

Capt. R. T. James, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1455 Tower Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. R. K. Swinton, Canadian Infantry Corps, 6622 Vine St., Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. R. J. W. Armstrong, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Cobalt, Ont.

Lieut. C. L. R. Black, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, McAdam, N.B.

Lieut. W. F. Brundrit, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Weston, Ont.

Lieut. H. P. Croome, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 311 Glen Road, Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. H. R. Everett, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Plaster Rock, N.B.

Lieut. A. R. Keiller, Canadian Infantry Corps, 199 St. Clarence Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. L. A. Mackenzie, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 42 Wicksteed, Ave., Mount Royal, P.Q.

Lieut. N. Mann, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 321 Monarch Park Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. J. O. Nesbitt, Canadian Infantry Corps, c/o Ritz Apts, Georgia St., Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. J. W. Ritchie, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 26 Ellsworth Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. R. A. Warriner, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 115 Walpole Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. J. P. Brennan, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 368 St. James St., Ville St. Pierre, Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) V. W. Jewkes, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 46 Notre Dame Street, St. John's, P.Q.

Lieut. L. A. Dum, MM, General List, 974 Roy St., E. Apt 9, Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. S. J. Van Flymen, Canadian Infantry Corps, 32 Glebemount Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. G. D. Goodwin, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 832 Charron St., Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. A. M. Spencer, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, R.R. No. 3, London, Ont.

Capt. J. A. Dure, Canadian Infantry Corps, Brighton, Ont.

Capt. R. I. Grant, Royal Canadian Artillery Chester, N. S.

Capt. R. N. Le Baron, Royal Canadian Artillery, North Hatley, P.Q.

Capt. V. C. Morrison, Royal Canadian Artillery, 1921-10A St. W., Calgary, Alta.

Capt. H. S. Roberts, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2207 Cameron St., Regina, Sask.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) H. L. Hamley, Canadian Infantry Corps, 302 Maitland Ave., Peterborough, Ont.

Military Cross—*Con.*

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

Lieut. (A/Capt.) D. A. Pearce, Canadian Infantry Corps, 10 Hughes St., St. Thomas, Ont.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) C. de L. Porteous, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 1374 Sherbrooke St., Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. W. R. Batten, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 5916 McKenzie St., Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut, J. P. Best, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 555 Grosvenor Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

Lieut, M. G. Farr, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 147 Leopold Cres., Regina, Sask.

Lieut. G. T. Haig, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 108 Lenore St., Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. G. Jean, Canadian Infantry Corps, Rimouski, P.Q.

Lieut. C. G. Jones, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 282 Bold St., Hamilton, Ont.

Lieut. G. O. MacDonald, Canadian Infantry Corps, 601-10th New Waterford, Cape Breton, N.S.

Lieut. D. C. MacKenzie, Canadian Infantry Corps, Springhill, N.S.

Lieut. W. J. McLeod, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 1219 Delaware Ave., Niagara Falls, Ont.

Lieut. W. A. Myers, Canadian Infantry Corps, 95 Elliot Row, St. John, N.B.

Lieut. R. W. Roscoe, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3 Bee Orches Terrace, Queen Rd., St. John's, Nfld.

Lieut. W. D. Rose, Canadian Armoured Corps, 35 Morley Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. L. J. Taschereau, General List, 4349 Chapleau St., Apt. 2, Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. (A/Maj.) E. S. Duffield, Canadian Infantry Corps, Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. (A/Maj.) W. S. Leggat, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1363 The Crescent, Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. (A/Maj.) W. H. Mitchell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 133 York Mills Rd., York Mills, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) J. I. Nicholson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 9 Richmond St., Charlottetown, P.E.I.

Capt. (A/Maj.) W. G. Whiteside, Canadian Infantry Corps, 90 Charleton St., Hamilton, Ont.

Capt. T. J. Bell, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 83 King St., Guelph, Ont.

Capt. W. D. Egan, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 341 Riverdale Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. E. M. Evans, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Toronto, Ont.

Capt. W. W. Niles, Canadian Infantry Corps, 64 Gorham St., Newmarket, Ont.

Capt. D. G. Pyper, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 34 Chatsworth Drive, Toronto, Ont.

Capt. W. T. Thompson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 25 Castle Frank Crescent, Toronto, Ont.

Capt. W. R. Tippett, The Royal Canadian Artillery, St. John, N.B.

Capt. J. C. Viets, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 841 Acadia Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. W. A. Walker, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Canora, Sask.

Capt. R. L. White, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 312 Third St. N., Kenora, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) S. L. Chambers, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3392 West 33rd Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Lt. (A/Capt.) J. D. Crowe, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Guelph, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) E. A. Dawson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 5-7th Ave., S., Kenora, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) P. F. McDonnell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3914 W. 30th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Lt. (A/Capt.) F. R. Sutton, Canadian Infantry Corps, 34 Amherst St., Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. G. H. Clawson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 30 Ridge Hill Drive, Toronto 10, Ont.

Lieut. P. J. Collins, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 5311 Balsam St., Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. C. H. Conquest, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Athabaska, Alta.

Lieut. W. D. Gerard, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 51 Lincoln Ave., Brantford, Ont.

Lieut. J. L. Hancock, Canadian Infantry Corps, 228 Ahrens St. West, Kitchener, Ont.

Lieut. I. J. Harper, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 204 Cumberland St., Charlottetown, P.E.I.

Lieut. A. D. Hellens, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Marlatic, Ont.

Lieut. B. G. Hurst, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 95 Parkside Drive, Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. C. N. Nicolay, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Oak Point, Man.

Lieut. N. W. D. Mann, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. J. A. M. Morin, Canadian Infantry Corps, Ste. Claire, P.Q.

Lieut. J. E. Oldfield, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3004 Waterloo Rd., Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. E. J. Reilly, Canadian Infantry Corps, Grandview, Man.

Lieut. A. M. Ross, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Embro, Ont.

Lieut. M. A. Ruiter, Canadian Infantry Corps, 307 Frederick Ave., Peterborough, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) J. G. Stevens, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2 Belvedere Rd., Westmount, P.Q.

Capt. J. C. Bond, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Chippawa, Ont.

Capt. K. A. Campbell, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1255 Devonshire Crescent, Vancouver, B.C.

H/Capt. J. Cardy, Canadian Chaplain Services, Port Credit, Ont.

H/Capt. T. R. Davies, Canadian Chaplain Services, Ponoka, Alta.

Lieut. J. Anderson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2341 Yonge St., Apt. 28, Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. J. D. Bie, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Belle Plaine, Sask.

Lieut. H. P. Wilson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 161 Winona Drive, Toronto, Ont.

A4005 W.O. I (R.S.M.) J. G. Austin, Canadian Infantry Corps, 91 Spring Garden Road, Halifax, N.S.

H31 W.O. II (B.S.M.) H. Holberton, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 244-4th St. N.W., Medicine Hat, Alta.

Capt. W. G. Godfrey, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 88 St. Leonards Ave., Toronto 12, Ont.

Bar to the Military Cross

Lieut. B. E. A. Caw, MC, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Virden, Man.

Capt. (A/Maj.) V. R. Schjelderup, DSO, MC, Canadian Infantry Corps, Courtney, B.C.

H/Capt. J. M. Anderson, MC, Canadian Chaplain Services, 30 Bruce St., London, Ont.

Lieut. G. V. Wright, MC, the Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Ancaster, Ont.

Distinguished Conduct Medal (DCM)

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

F64934 Sgt. S. MacDonald, Canadian Infantry Corps, Thorburn, N.S.

B55128 L/Cpl. W. R. Saunders, Canadian Infantry Corps, Maple Island, Ont.

C52868 Pte. J. A. Bray, Canadian Infantry Corps, 35B Lauber Ave., Cornwall, Ont.

A105661 Pte. H. G. Otis, Canadian Infantry Corps, Burgessville, Ont.

M104610 Tpr. A. G. Broadbent, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Iola, Alta.

K46862 Sgt. A. Gri. MM, Canadian Infantry Corps, Kelowna, B.C.

B54652 WO II (CSM) A. R. McPhee, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5511 Campden Place, Montreal, Que.

B126443 L/Sgt. A. G. Huffman, Canadian Infantry Corps, Delhi, Ont.

A22019 L/Sgt. A. H. Lewis, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 3317 Edison St., Windsor, Ont.

C58593 Cpl. J. Bingham, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Ballantrae, Ont.

H35279 L/Bdr. W. P. Bays, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Riding Mountain, Man.

B127987 L/Cpl. R. A. McMahon, Canadian Infantry Corps, Elk Lake, Ont.

B142193 L/Cpl. J. M. Snudden, Canadian Infantry Corps, 355 Louisa St., Oshawa, Ont.

D26479 Gdsm. R. B. Naylor, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 10 Sexton Ave., Greenfield Pk., P.Q.

K76724 Pte. (A/Cpl.) P. P. Katchanoski, Canadian Infantry Corps, Souris, Man.

K62419 WO II (CSM) J. Kemp, Canadian Infantry Corps, 276 Needham St., Nanaimo, B.C.

H45944 Pte. (A/Sgt.) C. H. Byce, MM, Canadian Infantry Corps, 56 Portland St., Saint John, N.B.

G23269 Sgt. (A/WO II (CSM) J. E. Bernard, Canadian Infantry Corps, Harper Road, Tignish, P.E.I.

B62282 Sgt. (A/WO II (CSM) G. W. Green, Canadian Infantry Corps, 16 Madison Ave., Creekskill, New Jersey, U.S.A.

K37988 Sgt. J. J. Harty, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Vancouver, B.C.

D57848 Cpl (A/Sgt.) M. Bosse, Canadian Infantry Corps, Lac Des Aigles, P.Q.

A44319 Pte. (A/Cpl.) D. H. Maidens, Canadian Infantry Corps, 6 Sunset Ave., London, Ont.

B19629 Sgt. A. R. MacLeod, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 519 Parkside Ave., Toronto, Ont.

D157871 Cpl. J. M. Beaulieu, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1599 Parc Lafontaine, Montreal, Que.

M41061 L/Cpl. W. L. Fairfield, Canadian Infanty Corps, 601-15 Ave. West, Calgary, Alta.

K15513 Sgt. D. Gomez, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Prince Rupert, B.C.

D26538 Sgt. F. MacVeigh, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Montreal, P.Q.

C58039 L/Cpl. R. W. Mackay, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Prescott, Ont.

C33169 Pte. C. L. Challice, Canadian Infantry Corps, Millbrook, Ont.

D106190 Pte. L. Major, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2325 Frontenac St., Montreal, P.Q.

L41106 Pte. M. L. McGilvery, Canadian Infantry Corps, Maidstone, Sask.

D156788 Sgt. G. Deschesne, Canadian Infantry Corps, Joliette, P.Q.

C70214 Sgt. F. Howarth, Canadian Infantry Corps, Niagara Falls, Ont.

L35252 Sgt. E. A. Knight, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Estevan, Sask.

F54680 Sgt. M. B. MacDonald, Canadian Infantry Corps, Iona, N.S.

M51023 Sgt. T. E. Milner, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 315-4th Ave., Calgary, Alta.

M107678 Cpl. R. J. Arndt, Canadian Infantry Corps, Thorsby, Alta.

B78719 Cpl. W. Aseltine, Canadian Infantry Corps, 74-4th St., New Toronto, Ont.

B70118 Cpl. H. D. Stitt, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 185 Prescott Ave., Toronto, Ont.

A118218 L/Cpl. S. L. Johns, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 3181 Turner Rd. Sub. 12, Windsor, Ont.

M105583 L/Cpl. F. O. Rourke, Canadian Infantry Corps, Lacombe, Alta.

A19124 Spr. W. W. Broome, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Wingham, Ont.

B65037 Pte. A. M. Steele, Canadian Infantry Corps, West Hill, Ont.

K62193 WO II (CSM) J. L. Nimmo, Canadian Infantry Corps, Westholme, B.C.

Military Medal (MM)

F41552 Sgt. V. C. Amberman, Canadian Infantry Corps, Granville Ferry, N.S.

B61316 Sgt. S. H. Harrison, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 17 Cruickshank Ave., Toronto, Ont.

G420 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) F. G. Baughan, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Aulac, N.B.

A11200 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) G. E. Grant, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5th Ledger St., Kitchener, Ont.

K1628 Cpl. C. H. Ehlers, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Salmon Arm, B.C.

G258 Cpl. J. D. McAskill, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 1624 Sherbrooke St. W.,

E104 Cpl. G. L. White, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 506-B 6th Ave., Medicine Hat, Alta.

B78779 L/Cpl. N. Blows, Canadian Infantry Corps, 528th Street, New Toronto, Ont.

B146719 L/Cpl. J. E. C. Shepherd, Canadian Infantry Corps, Zephyr, Ont.

K49711 Pte. J. Brown, Canadian Infantry Corps, Vernon, B.C.

L41094 Sgt. M. G. Durham, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Sturgis, Sask.

L74066 L/Sgt. R. L. Burrison, Canadian Infantry Corps, Marlboro, Alta.

L56669 L/Sgt. R. H. Dunkeld, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1316 Retallack St., Regina, Sask.

A107072 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) L. C. Stewart, Canadian Infantry Corps, Marie Hill, Maidstone, Sask.

K29025 Cpl. M. Duruisseau, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Penticton, B.C.

D41035 Cpl. L. Fortin, Canadian Infantry Corps, East Broughton, P.Q.

B142480 Cpl. J. M. N. McEachern, Canadian Infantry Corps, Raglan, Ont.

K15798 Pte. H. Edgar, Canadian Infantry Corps, Lake Buntzen, B.C.

B68591 Pte. J. W. L. Gunn, Canadian Infantry Corps, Long Branch, Ont.

H65505 Pte. W. Mandzuik, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Duck River, Man.

C121903 Pte. E. M. Miller, Canadian Infantry Corps, Main St., Almonte, Ont.

H60074 Pte. H. F. Paci, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 745 Wellington St., Winnipeg, Man.

H100303 Pte. M. Posthumus, The Royal Canadian Artillery, St. Germaine, Man.

C79408 Pte. E. D. Scott, Canadian Infantry Corps, Almonte, Ont.

Military Medal—*Con.*

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

L18050 WO II (RQMS) J. W. Diggle, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 3030 Montague St., Regina, Sask.

A2171 Sgt. W. F. Cramp, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 573 King West, Hamilton, Ont.

G15100 Sgt. G. B. Jonah, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 532 Queen St., Fredericton, N.B.

K70513 Sgt. R. L. Kelly, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 805 East-56 Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

F78690 Sgt. W. A. Perrin, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Upper Musquodoboit, N.S.

B60584 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) J. A. Lowry, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 132 Patricia Ave., Oshawa, Ont.

M9075 Cpl. J. Hayley, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Charlottetown Bonavist Bay, Newfoundland.

G49271 Cpl. G. O. Wilcox, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, St. George, N.B.

F88640 L/Cpl. C. J. Harte, Canadian Infantry Corps, Whitney Peir, N.S.

B31663 L/Cpl. N. Main, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 234 Fulton Ave., Toronto, Ont.

H54712 Gnr. A. J. Marchuk, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Sleeman, Ont.

D7117 Gnr. H. J. Snow, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 612 First Ave., Verdun, P.Q.

C5011 WO II (CSM) W. J. Foster, Canadian Infantry Corps, Belleville, Ont.

H19748 WO II (CSM) E. P. Miller, Canadian Infantry Corps, 250 Longside St., Winnipeg, Man.

K35477 Sgt. T. W. Brydon, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Kelowna, B.C.

M28840 Sgt. L. F. Freeman, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Camrose, Alta.

K52168 Sgt. E. J. Laloge, Canadian Infantry Corps, Vancouver, B.C.

B43550 Sgt. R. J. McLelland, Canadian Infantry Corps, 26 Gold St., Paris, Ont.

M56983 Sgt. R. W. Williams, Canadian Infantry Corps, Falun, Alta.

R25436 L/Sgt. C. S. Clarke, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Oakland, Ont.

A76142 L/Sgt. W. H. Moriarity, Canadian Infantry Corps, 56 Ball St., Paris, Ont.

D72347 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) G. A. Durocher, Canadian Infantry Corps, Shawville, Que.

L100143 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) D. E. Kent, Canadian Infantry Corps, Weyburn, Sask.

D160016 Cpl. M. J. F. Bedard, Canadian Infantry Corps, Rue St. Marie, Marieville, Que.

B43092 Cpl. A. J. Kelly, Canadian Infantry Corps, 182 Fourth Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

F30353 Cpl. O. F. Schnare, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Chester, N.S.

M105247 Pte. (A/Sgt.) C. E. Anderson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 7026-26th St. S.E., Calgary, Alta.

B143322 Pte. (A/Sgt.) S. S. Chandler, Canadian Infantry Corps, 519 Albert St., Oshawa, Ont.

M102056 Pte. (A/Sgt.) M. Melnychanko, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1314-5th Ave. S., Leithbridge, Alta.

M8988 Pte. R. E. Austin, Canadian Infantry Corps, Royalties, Alta.

B45330 Pte. H. E. Besso, Canadian Infantry Corps, 138 Bowning Ave., Toronto, Ont.

H.46006 Pte. G. S. Butcher, Canadian Infantry Corps, Gannon Rd. North, Sydney, N.S.

B83534 Pte. L. C. Dobberthien, Canadian Infantry Corps, Alma, Ont.

D71284 Pte. A. Fromstein, Canadian Infantry Corps, 117 Major St., Toronto, Ont.

F82469 Pte. L. P. Head, Canadian Infantry Corps, 199 Kent St., Charlottetown, P.E.I.

C2919 Pte. J. Lefebvre, Canadian Infantry Corps, 41 Charlevois St., Hull, P.Q.

G57623 Pte. L. Leger, Canadian Infantry Corps, Babineau, N.B.

F9285 Pte. A. MacDonald, Canadian Infantry Corps, Stewartdale, N.S.

M143 Gnr. C. W. Muirhead, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 488 Alberta St., Nanaimo, B.C.

D167248 Pte. D. Murphy, Canadian Infantry Corps, 702-3rd Ave., Verdun, P.Q.

B147507 Pte. E. Randall, Canadian Infantry Corps, 91 Baldwin St., Dundas, Ont.

B114806 Pte. A. E. Scarborough, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 52 St. Guentin Ave., Scarboro Bluffs, Ont.

B144828 Pte. L. Sloat, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Hagersville, Ont.

A22809 Pte. E. J. A. Vermette, Canadian Infantry Corps, Elm St., Tilbury, Ont.

M101873 Pte. (A/Cpl.) M. Hoerndl, Canadian Infantry Corps, 636 Bannantyne Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

C102304 Pte. N. Charlebois, Canadian Infantry Corps, 18 Main Street, Aylmer, Que.

M104009 Tpr. D. H. Williams, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Sylvester, Alta.

B76902 Sgt. H. G. Bird, Canadian Infantry Corps, 559 Greenwood Ave., Toronto, Ont.

A11835 Sgt. L. J. Campbell, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 537-8th St. East, Owen Sound, Ont.

M104311 Sgt. E. F. Sodeman, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, New Norway, Alta.

B63171 L/Sgt. D. G. Campbell, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Fleming, Sask.

L27418 L/Sgt. G. R. Langton, Canadian Infantry Corps, Mortlach, Sask.

C2954 Cpl. E. W. Baker, Canadian Infantry Corps, 44 Elm St., Brockville, Ont.

A37247 Cpl. S. W. Erison, Canadian Infantry Corps, 44 Haddington St., Galt, Ont.

B11915 Bdr. J. Ninness, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 42 Welland Ave. W., St. Catharines, Ont.

F26423 Cpl. E. A. Stanley, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 298 Fitzroy St., Charlottetown, P.E.I.

D136793 L/Cpl. E. Desjardins, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4119 Des Erables St., Montreal, P.Q.

B48896 L/Cpl. A. D. Elliott, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 83 Edmund St., Sudbury, Ont.

M44012 L/Bdr. R. D. Kerr, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Lousana, Alta.

M16383 L/Cpl. J. A. W. Woodford, Canadian Infantry Corps, Stewart, B.C.

B61974 Tpr. (A/Cpl.) J. C. Pritchard, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 72 Hillcrest Drive, Toronto, Ont.

G43160 Pte. W. M. Hazelwood, Canadian Infantry Corps, Hammond River, N.B.

K76346 Spr. R. F. Heathcote, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1600 Bay Street, Victoria, B.C.

B105051 Spr. A. McCallagh, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Port McNicholl, Ont.

B91058 Rfn. M. F. Milson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Angus, Ont.

Military Medal—*Con.*

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

F45667 Pte. R. G. Munroe, Canadian Infantry Corps, 674 Robie St., Halifax, N.S.

B52575 Rfn. C. Nahwegezhik, Canadian Infantry Corps, Sheguiandah, Ont.

H100150 Pte. D. H. Snyder, Canadian Infantry Corps, Hodgson, Man.

K46340 Pte. (A/Cpl.) R. A. Shepherd, Canadian Infantry Corps, 831 Linkleas Avenue, Victoria, B.C.

B46519 L/Sgt. C. J. Fisher, Canadian Infantry Corps, Little Current, Ont.

B63919 W.O. II (C.S.M.) C. C. Martin, DCM, Canadian Infantry Corps, 137 Benson Avenue, Toronto, Ont.

B54665 C.Q.M.S. C. M. White, Canadian Infantry Corps, New Liskeard, Ont.

H45752 Sgt. R. H. Appleton, Canadian Infantry Corps, 907 — Ave. North, Saskatoon, Sask.

G6037 Sgt. E. J. Corbett, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 54 Bayfield St., Charlottetown, P.E.I.

K42861 Sgt. L. A. Cummings, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1545-3rd Ave., Trail, B.C.

H41441 Sgt. N. J. Lowe, Canadian Infantry Corps, Roland, Man.

B36528 Sgt. L. A. Mace, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 129 Peter St., Hamilton, Ont.

L27883 Sgt. W. J. Shaw, Canadian Infantry Corps, Compass, Sask.

L27835 Sgt. E. S. Tenklei, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1450 Cornwall St., Regina, Sask.

C120631 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) C. A. Post, Canadian Infantry Corps, Carrying Place, Ont.

A99733 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) M. M. Shaw, Canadian Infantry Corps, 28 Seventh St., Chatham, Ont.

L13577 Cpl. M. E. Adolph, Canadian Infantry Corps, Gull Lake, Sask.

G7434 Cpl. D. E. Connors, Canadian Infantry Corps, Cork Station, N.S.

C65483 Cpl. M. L. Coulas, Canadian Infantry Corps, Barry's Bay, Ont.

L86884 Cpl. H. J. Gunville, Canadian Infantry Corps, Prince Albert, Sask.

B76137 Cpl. H. MacPherson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 139 Ellen St., Midland, Ont.

B122903 L/Cpl. W. C. Meyrick, Canadian Infantry Corps, 531 Lansdowne Ave., Toronto, Ont.

L86964 Pte. (A/Cpl.) J. Bukurak, Canadian Infantry Corps, Colonsay, Sask.

B126793 Pte. (A/Cpl.) M. D. Dragomatz, Canadian Infantry Corps, 116 Annis Street, Oshawa, Ont.

L74833 Pte. (A/Cpl.) J. Ellis, Canadian Infantry Corps, Elfras, Sask.

A37591 Pte. (A/Cpl.) F. R. Jull, Canadian Infantry Corps, Waterford, Ont.

L26281 Gnr. (A/Bdr.) J. R. Stromquist, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Prince Albert, Sask.

B137949 Pte. (A/Cpl.) I. H. Wright, Canadian Infantry Corps, Proton Station, Ont.

L101561 Pte. M. A. Beauliua, Canadian Infantry Corps, Melfort, Sask.

B144085 Pte. C. Bell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 268 Inglewood St., Winnipeg, Man.

L107092 Rfn. B. Cyr, Canadian Infantry Corps, Richard, Sask.

F45980 Tpr. J. F. Forbes, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Hopewell, N.S.

M51444 Gdsmn. J. R. Heighton, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Pashley, Alta.

B18610 Gnr. W. J. Maynes, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 904 Lea St., Pembroke, Ont.

B115341 Gnr. J. J. Robertson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 41 Gifford St., Toronto, Ont.

D7765 Gnr. B. Satten, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 10050-114th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

L8857 Tpr. V. P. Schuler, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Bodmin, Sask.

F86581 Gnr. F. M. Tufts, The Royal Canadian Artillery, West Caledonia, N.S.

E13067 Pte. V. F. Veilleux, Canadian Infantry Corps, St. Benoit, P.Q.

C26266 Rfm. J. M. Watson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Norland, Ont.

P1690 Sgt. B. E. Shaw, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Picton St., Niagara-on-the-Lake, Ont.

L20574 Cpl. L. W. Feig, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Fox Valley, Sask.

C101591 L/Bdr. R. D'Aoust, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Sarsfield, Ont.

A34922 Pte. (A/Cpl.) C. K. Bailey, The Canadian Provost Corps, 12 Major St., London, Ont.

D76757 Pte. A. Astrof, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1236 Fort St., Montreal, P.Q.

C39460 Gnr. J. S. Jackson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 419 Bronson Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

B101587 Pte. D. J. Saunders, Canadian Infantry Corps, 63 Winchester St., Toronto, Ont.

E23301 WO II (CSM) I. Roy, Canadian Infantry Corps, 44½ Cote de la Fabrique, Quebec, Que.

B60919 WO II (SSM) A. H. Russell, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 709 Woodbine Ave., Toronto, Ont.

G4025 Sgt. J. B. Bailey, The Royal Canadian Artillery, South Devon, N.B.

M54243 Sgt. D. G. McLaughlin, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Edmonton, Alta.

K98224 Sgt. H. A. Reambeault, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 2887 W. 21st Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

K35471 L/Sgt. H. W. M. Johnson, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Salt Spring Island, B.C.

H16776 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) L. Kreamer, Canadian Infantry Corps, Netly Lake, Man.

H3081 Bdr. G. A. Cameron, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Taro Hall, Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.

B31573 Cpl. A. R. Edwards, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Bala, Ont.

K15133 Cpl. J. R. Greene, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5489 Elm St., Vancouver, B.C.

D21556 Cpl. R. J. Kirkpatrick, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 3339 Lacombe Ave., Montreal, Que.

B114326 L/Cpl. M. G. Armstrong, Canadian Infantry Corps, 28 Celahie St., Toronto, Ont.

D9015 L/Bdr. D. H. Langtree, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Queen St. E., Toronto, Ont.

M3497 L/Bdr. R. M. Sieger, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Silver Heights, Alta.

H17055 Spr. J. A. Arthur, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 2246 St. Antoine St., Montreal, Que.

D110227 Spr. B. Beaton, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Lost River, P.Q.

M106776 Pte. J. F. Bennett, Canadian Infantry Corps, Bear Flat, B.C.

C10444 Gnr. J. D. Breeze, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Forester's Falls, Ont.

B88742 Gnr. G. W. Gunstone, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 8 Lark St., Toronto, Ont.

F77357 Gnr. L. J. Meurant, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Souris East, P.E.I.

Military Medal—*Con.*

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

G16085 Sgmn. B. C. Mills, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Baie Verte, N.B.

D9068 Gnr. J. Young, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 9715 Hochelaga St., Montreal, P.Q.

C2871 Sgt. A. Bray, Canadian Infantry Corps, 689 First St. East, Cornwall, Ont.

B68000 Sgt. R. A. T. Stafford, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 186 Heward Ave., Toronto, Ont.

K69872 L/Sgt. T. Hanberry, Canadian Infantry Corps, 144 E., 12th St., North Vancouver, B.C.

L19157 L/Sgt. J. M. Simpson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 2122 Broad St., Regina, Sask.

L7237 Cpl. P. Burton, Canadian Infantry Corps, Wilmar, Sask.

A62073 Cpl. W. J. Ferguson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Box 201, Port Sydney, Ont.

A3812 Cpl. R. Murdock, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 3190A Dundas St., W., Toronto, Ont.

K53551 Cpl. R. G. Woodward, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1308 Cariboo St., New Westminster, B.C.

B114101 Pte. J. B. E. Bissonnette, Canadian Infantry Corps, 246 D'Youville St., Sudbury, Ont.

F16755 Pte. G. E. Hudson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Upper Granville, Anna. Co., N.S.

G7194 Pte. J. O. Quigley, Canadian Infantry Corps, Petitcodiac, N.B.

H195373 Pte. R. E. Sykes, Canadian Infantry Corps, Vicker's Heights Fort William, Ont.

D128116 L/Bdr. A. Jacques, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Upton Co., Bagot, P.Q.

H60132 Gnr. W. Bulak, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Box 182, 212 Queen St., West Selkirk, Man.

B9794 Gnr. S. V. Femia, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 92 Dagner Ave., Toronto, Ont.

L53230 Sgt. A. J. Baynton, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 92 Lough Borough Park Brixton, London, S.W., England.

D56312 Sgt. P. E. Boyer, Canadian Infantry Corps, Ste. Philomene St., De Chateauguy, Que.

L54941 Sgt. L. J. Hessdorfer, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, St. Benedict, Sask.

B59110 Sgt. R. J. MacMurray, Canadian Infantry Corps, Little Current, Ont.

B37817 Sgt. A. Mercey, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Hanover, Ont.

E0120 Sgt. D. G. Miller, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Gaspe Peninsula, Gaspe, P.Q.

B112521 Sgt. R. H. Pearcey, Canadian Infantry Corps, 170 Gillard Ave., Toronto, Ont.

H63854 Sgt. A. Rigby, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Carberry, Man.

H204698 Sgt. J. Ruczak, Canadian Infantry Corps, East Hawk Lake, Ont.

A3220 Sgt. J. K. Stover, Canadian Infantry Corps, 141 Alice St., Brantford, Ont.

D138937 L/Sgt. A. M. Tremblay, Canadian Infantry Corps, St. Gerard Village Wolfe Co., P.Q.

B135839 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) H. L. O'Rourke, Canadian Infantry Corps, Midland Post Office, Ont.

K66196 Cpl. P. D. Ewart, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, R.R. No. 1, Penticton, B.C.

L53284 Cpl. B. J. McGillion, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 18 Charlton West, Hamilton, Ont.

B160906 L/Cpl. W. J. King, Canadian Infantry Corps, 333 Bathrust St., Toronto, Ont.

B65599 Pte. (A/Cpl.) C. G. Barrett, Canadian Infantry Corps, Bowmanville, Ont.

M41334 Spr. (A/Cpl.) P. Bayley, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Spurfield, Ont.

B134852 Pte. (A/Cpl.) T. A. Davidson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5 Leyton Ave., Scarboro, Ont.

L10515 Pte. (A/Cpl.) J. Rieberger, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Lintlaw, Sask.

B159847 Pte. (A/Cpl.) R. E. Stacey, Canadian Infantry Corps, 104 Avondale Ave., Hamilton, Ont.

B130223 Spr. G. A. Blackburn, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Hunta, Ont.

D132843 Tpr. V. A. J. Cunningham, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 166 Hillcrest, Montreal W., P.Q.

H18309 Pte. M. Dowhy, Canadian Infantry Corps, Caliente, Man.

H14021 Tpr. C. H. Georgeson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Ideal, Man.

C58311 Pte. M. M. Lavallee, Canadian Infantry Corps, Whitney, Ont.

L106038 Pte. R. F. Morrow, Canadian Infantry Corps, 323 19th St. East., Prince Albert, Sask.

B112892 L/Sgt. A. T. P. Connell, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 52 Kingston Road, Toronto, Ont.

A457 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) J. R. Camley, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 168 Ross St., Welland, Ont.

H26298 Cpl. J. A. Byers, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 539 Castle St., Winnipeg, Man.

H57955 Cpl. G. S. Carswell, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Manitou, Man.

D46904 L/Cpl. M. D. Davis, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Bishopton, P.Q.

G22232 Pte. (A/Cpl.) J. H. W. Senecal, Canadian Infantry Corps, Campbellton, N.B.

F59800 WO II (CSM) H. J. Bishop, Canadian Infantry Corps, Summerside, P.E.I.

H77389 Sgt. W. W. Abbott, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 672 Spruce St., Winnipeg, Man.

P1673 Sgt. R. F. Davidson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 24 East Rd., Bircholiffe, Toronto 8, Ont.

H46526 Sgt. C. K. Faulkner, Canadian Infantry Corps, 29 Shuniah Rd., Port Arthur, Ont.

A103019 Sgt. J. F. Flannery, Canadian Infantry Corps, Seaforth, Ont.

G22220 Sgt. J. L. Hennigar, Canadian Infantry Corps, Dawsonville, Restigouche, N.B.

M52030 Sgt. J. E. Lambert, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 2633-15th Ave. West., Calgary, Alta.

A57497 Sgt. L. A. Slumkofske, Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Belle River, Ont.

F60341 Sgt. G. Stewart, Canadian Infantry Corps, Woods Island, P.E.I.

P1702 Sgt. R. J. Westwood, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 46 Aylmer Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

F29715 Sgt. E. C. Wheeler, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 251 Brunswick St., Halifax, N.S.

D3970 Sgt. C. G. Whittall, Royal Canadian Amoured Corps, Isle Bizaro, P.Q.

C53260 L/Sgt. A. C. Dolan, Canadian Infantry Corps, 492 Dickson St., Peterborough, Ont.

B19955 L/Sgt. G. Harris, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 27 Frankdale Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Military Medal—*Con.*

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

L54710 L/Sgt. G. M. Jordan, Canadian Infantry Corps, Star City, Sask.

B29735 L/Sgt. G. A. Lang, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Webbwood, Ont.

A105265 L/Sgt. C. J. Riedel, Canadian Infantry Corps, 194 Queen St. N., Kitchener, Ont.

C122657 Cpl. (A/Sgt) M. S. Baxter, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3 First St., Kingston, Ont.

B55632 Cpl. (A/Sgt) G. L. Caya, Canadian Infantry Corps, 8 Angel Place, St. John's, Nfld.

B114458 Cpl. (A/Sgt) E. Crain, Canadian Infantry Corps, 343 New St. Jean St., Orillia, Ont.

B132009 Cpl. (A/Sgt) F. J. Jarman, Canadian Infantry Corps, 39 Brunette St., Oakville, Ont.

H45799 Cpl. (A/Sgt) A. L. Laprade, Canadian Infantry Corps, Cumberland St., Port Arthur, Ont.

K57875 Cpl. (A/Sgt) A. R. Minnis, Canadian Infantry Corps, Langley Prairie, B.C.

C122280 Cpl. H. C. Atchison, Canadian Infantry Corps, 33 Gulf St., Cornwall, Ont.

D3397 Cpl. K. A. Chapman, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 2193 Belgrave Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

D1548 Cpl. L. J. Conway, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Vankleek Hill, Ont.

A49990 Cpl. C. J. Handley, Canadian Infantry Corps, 265 Wellington St., London, Ont.

B81161 Cpl. J. J. A. Nicholson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Sundridge, Ont.

M20561 Cpl. S. A. Wurster, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Lathom, Alta.

B134808 L/Cpl. P. P. Fraser, Canadian Infantry Corps, 296 Euler Rd., Churchill, N.Y., USA.

K67752 L/Cpl. A. J. Kellerman, Canadian Infantry Corps, Bristol, Ind., USA.

H14407 L/Cpl. N. Kruska, Canadian Infantry Corps, Emerson, Man.

G733 L/Cpl. C. A. McMullin, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Fredericton, N.B.

H103369 Rfn. (A/L/Cpl) F. L. Hole, Canadian Infantry Corps, Winnipeg, Man.

L106725 Rfn. J. D. Innes, Canadian Infantry Corps, Paynton, Sask.

D59425 Pte. H. Lefebvre, Canadian Infantry Corps, Coteau Stn., Soulanges Co., P.Q.

B60678 Tpr. E. M. Nichols, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 534 Parliament St., Toronto 5, Ont.

B142026 Pte. G. F. Scott, Canadian Infantry Corps, 337 Bessie St., Sudbury, Ont.

C120647 Pte. D. I. Shanks, Canadian Infantry Corps, Ashton, Ont.

C42438 Pte. F. F. Thompson, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Kingston, Ont.

G23287 Pte. E. F. Watling, Canadian Infantry Corps, Loggieville, Northumberland, N.B.

M51195 Rfn. G. H. Webster, Canadian Infantry Corps, Manyberries, Alta.

C122275 Pte. J. A. W. Whiteacre, Canadian Infantry Corps, 21 Belmont Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

K72949 Spr. F. Ray, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Prince George, B.C.

A107474 Spr. L. MacHardy, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 19 Bruce St., Goderich, Ont.

B67971 Sgt. L. D. Young, Canadian Infantry Corps, 71 Windsor Ave., Timmins, Ont.

A31023 WO I (RSM) J. S. Gee, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Listowell, Ont.

B78522 WO II (CSM) G. Keyes, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2878 McRoberts Ave., Toronto, Ont.

H20266 Sgt. A/WO II (CSM) E. L. Ovens, Canadian Infantry Corps, 351 Victor St., Winnipeg, Man.

B53517 Sgt. J. S. Cameron, Canadian Infantry Corps, 105 Wells Hill Ave., Toronto, Ont.

K37801 Sgt. W. J. Gilchrist, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 1024-6th Ave., New Westminster, B.C.

B76891 Sgt. L. W. Hinds, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1019 Queen St., E., Toronto, Ont.

P1669 Sgt. E. S. Johnson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Milliken, Ont.

D76511 Sgt. R. W. Leatherbarrow, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 625 Birch Ave., St. Lambert, Que.

D82483 Sgt. A. M. Nelson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Montreal, Que.

L36173 Sgt. G. C. Quarry, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Maple Creek, Sask.

H41435 Sgt. F. J. Ryan, Canadian Infantry Corps, Flin Flon, Man.

L36298 Sgt. V. A. Salisbury, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 12914-65th St., N., Edmonton, Alta.

L41569 Sgt. T. C. Smith, Canadian Infantry Corps, 831-8th Ave., N., Saskatoon, Sask.

A11100 Sgt. J. R. Spencer, Canadian Infantry Corps, Queen St., E., Hespeler, Ont.

H35249 Sgt. J. E. Stooke, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 487 Riverton Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

A103206 L/Sgt. H. H. Schell, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 113 Bright St., Sarnia, Ont.

L1480 Cpl. (A/Sgt) W. E. G. Coburn, Canadian Infantry Corps, West Hazel, Sask.

B75631 Cpl. (A/Sgt) H. F. Motton, Canadian Infantry Corps, 95 Delaware Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B77412 Cpl. W. H. Cotter, Canadian Infantry Corps, 552 Manning Ave., Toronto, Ont.

F75984 Cpl. F. A. Hannigan, Canadian Infantry Corps, New Waterford, N.S.

K57151 Cpl. W. Knowles, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1385 Vista Heights, Victoria, B.C.

H29131 Cpl. G. T. Lowe, Canadian Infantry Corps, 753-13th St., Brandon, Man.

H26499 Cpl. M. McEachnie, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 187 River Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

L86928 Cpl. O. Nelson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Prince Albert, Sask.

M8982 L/Cpl. W. B. Carstairs, Canadian Infantry Corps, Cherhill, Alta.

B18820 L/Cpl. R. A. Davis, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 169 Hunter St., E., Hamilton, Ont.

C50538 L/Bdr. R. W. Hammond, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2 George St., Ajax, Ont.

G211 L/Cpl. H. L. Jonah, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Surrey, N.B.

G6214 L/Cpl. T. H. Kirkpatrick, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 268 Regent St., Fredericton, N.B.

L105081 L/Cpl. L. A. LeGrand, Canadian Infantry Corps, Jordan River, Sask.

D7711 L/Bdr. J. R. Millar, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 7271 Durocher St., Montreal, Que.

L92960 L/Cpl. A. C. Smith, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Verwood, Sask.

L103928 L/Cpl. D. A. Spence, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Moosomin, Sask.

B157835 Pte. (A/Cpl.) R. J. Levert, Canadian Infantry Corps, North Lancaster, Ont.

Military Medal—*Con.*

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

E46952 Gnr. R. Bouchard, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Des Aulnaies, Que.

H93416 Spr. H. I. Bredeson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Winnipeg, Man.

C5928 Pte. G. R. Campbell, Canadian Infantry Corps, Coe Hill, Ont.

H8130 Rfn. W. Chapman, Canadian Infantry Corps, Fuller St., Manitou, Man.

A22743 Pte. G. F. Cote, Canadian Infantry Corps, Windsor, Ont.

L26395 Gnr. D. Fehr, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1325-6th Ave., N., Saskatoon, Sask.

H22225 Rfn. J. B. Gingras, Canadian Infantry Corps, Pinewood, Ont.

L103282 Spr. W. K. Grieve, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Powell River, B.C.

K66356 Tpr. R. P. Janes, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 563 Bruce Ave., Nanaimo, B.C.

D167096 Pte. L. E. Lehman, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5648 Charlemagne St., Montreal, Que.

B111548 Pte. W. L. Lemmon, Canadian Infantry Corps, Redbridge, Ont.

C54116 Pte. P. A. MacLean, Canadian Infantry Corps, Maxville, Ont.

G19915 Pte. H. Martin, Canadian Infantry Corps, 54 George St., Moncton, N.B.

F58305 Pte. C. R. Matthews, Canadian Infantry Corps, Debert, N.S.

C120835 Tpr. R. E. Meldrum, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Bellamy, Ont.

C48723 Pte. R. B. Packer, Canadian Infantry Corps, 668 Stewart St., Peterborough, Ont.

G6151 Tpr. B. Parker, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Blackville, N.B.

B142305 Pte. F. W. Ridler, Canadian Infantry Corps, 64 MacLean Blvd., East York, Toronto, Ont.

G3037 Bdr. C. H. Robinson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1021 Kingston Rd., Toronto, Ont.

D136030 Pte. J. B. Roux, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1 Roux St., Ste. Therese de Blainville, Que.

H9015 Pte. J. A. Shields, Canadian Infantry Corps, 55 Matheson Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

A20705 Spr. F. R. Squires, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Dresden, Ot.

H38548 Sigmn. G. E. Thomas, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Winnipeg, Man.

H18832 Pte. T. Watkin, Canadian Infantry Corps, 862-1st St., Brandon, Man.

C39576 WO II (BSM) D. M. Ault, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Aultsville, Ont.

B69834 WO II (Sqdn. SM) W. C. Clarkson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 29 Fitzgerald St., St. Catharines, Ont.

B54942 WO II (CSM) J. E. Hamm, Canadian Infantry Corps, 95 Church St., Kitchener, Ont.

G22452 Sgt. H. J. Boulay, Canadian Infantry Corps, Belledune, N.B.

C26213 S/Sgt. L. T. Brown, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 7 Colborne St., Lindsay, Ont.

F30575 Sgt. V. R. Bowers, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, De Willers P.O., N.S.

K16027 Sgt. H. J. Brummitt, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 212 Vernon Drive, Vancouver, B.C.

A55041 Sgt. F. W. Casselman, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 325 Earl St., Kingston, Ont.

H26063 Sgt. W. Chauk, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Pleasant Home, Man.

M54206 Sgt. J. Fullen The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 9701-100A St., Edmonton, Alta.

B17107 Sgt. R. L. Goodall, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Thessalon, Ont.

B77237 Sgt. T. N. Harris, Canadian Infantry Corps, 72 Ardmour Rd., Scarboro Bluffs, Ont.

B19590 Sgt. G. E. Jasper, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 63 Roslin Ave., Toronto, Ont.

M10863 Sgt. J. E. Kroesing, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Coleman, Alta.

C36045 Sgt. W. H. McPherson, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Cloyne, Ont.

K37084 Sgt. S. A. Neilsen, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Carmagny, Alta.

H38728 Sgt. A. Pateman, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 702 Minto St., Winnipeg, Man.

L18381 Sgt. J. W. Preston, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Edmonton, Alta.

K48441 Sgt. F. R. Renwick, Canadian Infantry Corps, 354-12th St., Brandon, Man.

H64678 Sgt. M. C. Roulston, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Fort Frances, Ont.

H29101 Sgt. J. E. Wright, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Alexander, Man.

L17062 L/Sgt. R. D. Buswell, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Wapella, Sask.

D116154 L/Sgt. W. Gordon, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 96 Prince Edward Ave., Valois, P.Q.

H36480 L/Sgt. A. S. Leathwood, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Molson, Man.

F81409 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) P. V. R. Ciceri, Canadian Infantry Corps, 377 Clairemount Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

D82784 Cpl (A/Sgt) D. J. Murphy, Canadian Infantry Corps, 708 Farm St., Point St. Charles, Montreal, P.Q.

B17777 Bdr. E. Hodgkinson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 252 Woburn Ave., Toronto, Ont.

H38803 Cpl. S. H. Rampling, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signal, 622-15th St., Brandon, Man.

A2351 Cpl. J. Tomlinson, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Woodham, Ont.

L12647 L/Cpl O. T. Camphaug, The Canadian Provost Corps, Pennant, Sask.

C53239 L/Cpl. R. D. Clissold, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 148 William St., Brockville, Ont.

D160019 Pte. (A/Cpl.) M. Dagenais, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2359 Rue Anita, Montreal, P.Q.

C1659 Gnr. W. C. Ace, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Iroquois, Ont.

B44081 Gnr. J. H. Brooks, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Glanford Station, Ont.

K66741 Gnr. D. G. Havard, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2251 Cadboro Bay Rd., Victoria, B.C.

M26573 Gnr. R. D. Margach, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 211-15th Ave., N.E., Calgary, Alta.

G17928 C.Q.M.S. R. F. Hawkins, Canadian Infantry Corps, Woodstock, N.B.

F39840 Sgt. W. J. Graham, Canadian Infantry Corps, 6 Plunkett St., Windsor, N.S.

K2445 Sgt. W. C. McCutcheon, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Summerland, B.C.

M57873 Cpl. J. H. Munroe, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Suite 8, Glenburn Apts., Winnipeg, Man.

D21413 Sgmn. W. T. Gray, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Montreal, P.Q.

H76021 Gnr. G. M. Humby, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Fort William, Ont.

A3213 Sgt. E. F. Carron, Canadian Infantry Corps, Paincourt, Ont.

1st Bar to Military Medal

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

H11137 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) G. Clarke, MM, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Lony-Lac, Ont.

B74606 WO II (CSM) E. C. Knott, MM, Canadian Infantry Corps, 174 Elm St. N., Timmins, Ont.

B91058 Rfn. M. F. Milson, MM, Canadian Infantry Corps, Angus, Ont.

M54243 Sgt. D. G. McLaughlin, MM, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 13045-123rd St., Edmonton, Alta.

F88640 Pte. C. J. Harte, MM, Canadian Infantry Corps, McKay's Corner, Glace Bay, N.S.

L10187 Sgt. E. M. Evoy, MM, Canadian Infantry Corps, Carleton Place, Ont.

2nd Bar to Military Medal

A21209 WO II (CSM) F. L. Dixon, MM, Canadian Infantry Corps, Old Barnes, N.S.

British Empire Medal

D9095 L/Sgt. R. A. Horan, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 5403-4th Ave., Rosemont, P.Q.

F97267 Pte. A. Smith, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 532 George St., Sydney, N.S.

D81851 L/Cpl. D. R. Sudds, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2967 Haig Ave., Longue Pointe, Montreal, P.Q.

A19424 L/Sgt. D. W. Conner, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 111 Marley Place, London, Ont.

H37717 Sgt. A. H. Francis, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 207 King Edward St., St. James, Man.

D77105 Tpr. J. B. Hancock, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 2515 Quesnel St., Montreal, P.Q.

Mentions in Dispatches

General H. D. G Crerar, CH, CB, DSO, Canadian Army, Roxborough Apts., Ottawa, Ont.

Brig. O. Kitching, DSO, Canadian Army, Montreal, P.Q.

Major (A/Lt.-Col.) T. C. MacWilliam, Canadian Infantry Corps, 27 Bromley Ave., Moncton, N.B.

Major J. M. Secter, Canadian Infantry Corps, 435 Ash St., Winnipeg, Man.

Captain W. B. Perry, Canadian Infantry Corps, 12 Woodville Rd., West Saint John, N.B.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) C. V. Lilley, Canadian Infantry Corps, 11030-81st Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

Lieut. F. L. J. Arnett, Canadian Infantry Corps, 225 Kent St., Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. R. G. Marsh, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2143 Yukon St., Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. P. Mercier, Canadian Infantry Corps, 6177 rue Durocher, Outremont, P.Q.

Lieut. C. M. Patch, Canadian Infantry Corps, 118 Aberdeen Ave., Westmound, P.Q.

Lieut. J. W. Pennington, Canadian Infantry Corps, 19 Victoria St., Dundas, Ont.

Lieut. L. A. Stilling, Canadian Infantry Corps, 246 Howe St., Victoria, B.C.

Lieut. A. J. Street, Canadian Infantry Corps, Kentville, N.S.

K53659 S/Sgt. D. J. McLachlan, Canadian Infantry Corps, 626-24th Ave. W., Calgary, Alta.

M17303 Sgt. (A/S/Sgt.) G. O. Godin, Canadian Infantry Corps, 10350-104 St., Edmonton, Alta.

B61753 Sgt. J. Bodner, Shandro P.O., Alta.

H17510 Sgt. G. A. Campbell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 312-7th St. S., Kenora, Ont.

H2322 Sgt. F. C. Hansen, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 575 South West, Marine Dr., Vancouver, B.C.

B33150 Sgt. W. D. Homes, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 1066 Ellis Lane, Niagara Falls, Ont.

B33136 Cpl. E. J. Attridge, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Highgate, Ont.

H95757 L/Cpl. H. H. Cox, The Royal Canadians Corps of Signals, 356 Centennial St., Winnipeg, Man.

H100435 Pte. (A/Sgt.) J. H. Laughren, Canadian Infantry Corps, 750 Hodder Ave., Port Arthur, Ont.

B127695 Pte. N. E. Brown, Canadian Infantry Corps, Oshawa, Ont.

F43879 Pte. J. D. Schofield, Canadian Infantry Corps, Cambridge, N.S.

B65035 Gnr. R. T. Stableford, The Royal Canadian Artillery, West Hill, Ont.

Lieut. V. C. Moore, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3249 Quadra St., Victoria, B.C.

K46862 Sgt. A. Gri, Canadian Infantry Corps, Kelowna, B.C.

Brig. (A/Maj.-Gen.) B. M. Hoffmeister, CBE, DSO, ED, Canadian Army, 4749 Belmount Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Brig. J. F. A. Lister, OBE, Canadian Army, 2149 Granite St., Victoria, B.C.

Brig. W. C. Murphy, DSO, ED, Canadian Army, 4326 Cartier St., Vancouver, B.C.

Brig. E. A. McCusker, CBE, MC, ED, Canadian Army, Regina, Sask.

Brig. C. S. McKee, ED, Canadian Army, 27 Riverview Drive, Toronto, 12, Ont.

Brig. J. D. B. Smith, CBE, DSO, Canadian Army, 652 Talbot St., London, Ont.

Brig. C. Vokes, CBE, DSO, Canadian Army, 433 Besserer St., Ottawa, Ont.

Colonel C. F. Hubbs, 11 Dora Road, Wimbledon S.W. 19, London, England.

Colonel M. V. McQueen, HQ 1 Canadian Corps, 296 Queens Ave., London, Ont.

Lt.-Col. (A/Brig.) C. A. Campbell, OBE, HQ 1 Canadian Corps, 37 Pembrook St., Kingston, Ont.

Lt.-Col. (A/Brig.) W. P. Gilbride, DSO, OBE, Canadian Army, 7 Brock Ave., N., Montreal, West, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. (A/Col.) F. B. Matthews, OBE, Canadian Infantry Corps, 123 Richview Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lt.-Col. G. W. Robinson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 277 Regent St., London, Ont.

Lt.-Col. F. A. Vokes, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 315 Academy Rd., Winnipeg, Man.

Major (A/Lt.-Col.) A. K. Jordan, ED, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 111 Williamson Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Major R. J. R. Donabie, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 88 Hillcroft Ave., Oshawa, Ont.

Major H. G. Kierstead, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 80 Princess St., Saint John, N.B.

Major R. W. Leitch, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 534 Marlow Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

Major D. H. McIndoe, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Vernon, B.C.

Major P. Templeton, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Bondville, P.Q.

Major G. J. H. Wattsford, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Kingston, Ont.

Major G. R. Whiston, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 5094 Victoria Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. (A/Major) B. G. King, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 74 Roseberry Place, St. Thomas, Ont.

Captain C. F. Baker, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 9 Castle Frank Drive, Toronto, Ont.

Captain M. F. Barnes, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Vernon, B.C.

Captain J. C. Letcher, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Fernie, B.C.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) A. E. M. Inwood, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 9 Homewood Drive, Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) J. L. Jones, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 1283 Lincoln Rd., Windsor, Ont.

Lieut. R. A. Cawsey, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 605-16th Street, N.W., Calgary, Alta.

Lieut. A. F. Johnston, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 496 St. James St., London, Ont.

Lieut. J. B. McBride, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 60 Maple Ave., Barrie, Ont.

K1631 WO1 (RSM) R. W. Hodgson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Vernon, B.C.

D26 WO2 (CSM) (A/WO1) (RSM) R. G. MacGillivray, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Centre St., Bowmanville, Ont.

M27147 WO2 (RQMS) J. D. Buckley, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Elnora, Alta.

K92186 WO2 (RQMS) P. F. Hilborn, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Kelowna, B.C.

G9 Sgt. J. Coates, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Westmorland Co., N.B.

B60765 Sgt. J. Gibson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Holland Landing, Ont.

B79538 Sgt. R. Jack, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Newton, Ont.

K60989 Sgt. H. A. Lamoreaux, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 47 Langley Ave., Toronto, 6, Ont.

H95 Sgt. D. W. Lovelock, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 95 W. 17th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

B69831 L/Sgt. R. H. Buchanan, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 546 Victoria Pk. Ave., Toronto, Ont.

D27039 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) G. T. Jones, MM, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Montreal, P.Q.

B217 Cpl. D. G. Bristo, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Willow Cove, Ont.

A55041 Cpl. F. W. Casselman, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Chesterville, Ont.

A44574 Cpl. L. Davies, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 433 Talbot St., St. Thomas, Ont.

D76591 Cpl. B. M. McKeage, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Rock Island, Que., Can.

A3812 Cpl. R. Murdock, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps 3190A Dundas Street West, Toronto, Ont.

B60852 Cpl. L. J. Toye, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Englehart, Ont.

G486 L/Cpl. F. E. Boudreau, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Beresford, N.B.

B58217 L/Cpl. S. A. Uppington, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Woodbridge, Ont.

A42350 Tpr. A. F. Bagnall, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 81 Bond St., W., Hamilton, Ont.

H100516 Tpr. J. H. M. Clarkson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Bilbert Plains, Man.

H46371 Tpr. A. Daniar, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Dryden, Ont.

C120000 Tpr. J. W. Gray, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Woodstock, Ont.

B60979 Tpr. R. D. Haynes, MM, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 1156 Queen Street East, Kingston, Ont.

D36484 Tpr. W. J. Kay, MM, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Verdun, P.Q.

K72946 Tpr. E. Kobarynka, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Arbarg, Man.

A55035 Tpr. J. A. Majors, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 1094 Wyandotte St., W., Windsor, Ont.

B364 Tpr. A. E. Sayer, Delhi, Ont.

M60705 Tpr. I. R. Seymour, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 811 Centre St. S., Calgary, Alta.

L101755 Tpr. F. Spratt, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 53 Hendricks Ave., Toronto, Ont.

M26945 Tpr. W. M. Wells, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Penhold, Alta.

Lt-Col. W. D. Kirk, ED, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 5551 Queen Mary Rd., Montreal, P.Q.

Major (A/Lt.-Col.) P. H. Tedman, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 67 Farnham Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Major A. J. B. Bailey, MBE, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Crofton, Vancouver Island, B.C.

Major W. P. Doohan, 167½ Lochiel St., Sarnia, Ont.

Major G. C. Howitt, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Napanee, Ont.

Major P. J. Keller, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Canora, Sask.

Major P. D. Kingsmill, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Toronto, Ont.

Major C. S. McKay, 10 Temple Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Major A. Powis, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 389 Metcalfe Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

Major W. L. Shortreed, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Toronto, Ont.

Capt (A/Major) A. W. Goodman, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 4775 Sherbrooke St., Westmount, P. Q.

Capt. (A/Major) J. D. Hall, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 57 Weller St., Peterborough, Ont.

Captain D. J. Black, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Montreal, P.Q.

Captain R. W. Chard, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Edmonton, Alta.

Captain, R. G. McHarg, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Ayer's Cliff, P.Q.

Captain K. B. Rowe, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 35 King St., Guelph, Ont.

Captain G. E. Shewell, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Ottawa, Ont.

Captain W. S. Tyndale, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 115 Sunnyside Ave, Westmount, P.Q.

Captain G. L. Vincent, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 4164 West 11th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) D. J. Teek, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2919 W. 29th St., Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut G. R. Fowler, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Baldur, Man.

Lieut. L. T. Hodgson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 574 Minto St., Winnipeg, Man.

Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

Lieut. J. B. O'Neill, The Royal Canadian Artillery, St. George, N.B.

Lieut. G. E. Weidmark, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 57 Winnifred St., Smith Falls, Ont.

Lieut. R. Wilson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 8318 87th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

N.4025 WO II (BSM) D. S. Bruce, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 10165 114th St., Edmonton, Alta.

H.60342 WO II (BSM) R. L. Lavreau, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 714 River St. Kenora, Ont.

P.6650 WO II (BSM) W. H. Hardon, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Kingston, Ont.

B.17640 WO II (BSM) E. A. Hook, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 36 Bartlett Ave., Toronto, Ont.

K.15004 WO II (BSM) F. Woodhouse, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1321 Graverley St., Vancouver, B.C.

L.119 S/Sgt. F. H. Brazier, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 54 Hight St. W., Moose Jaw, Sask.

D.7170 Sgt. J. Bechard, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Montreal, Que.

B.15184 Sgt. J. J. Brotherton, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 33 Duke St., Woodstok, Ont

H.76048 Sgt. L. E. Davis, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 3rd Ave. South, Geraldton, Ont.

E.0071 Sgt. J. W. Eden, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Wakeham, Gaspé, P.Q.

D.10850 Sgt. R. A. Goddard, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 437 Broadview Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B.7154 Sgt. D. McMullen, BEM, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Postal Station "O", Toronto, Ont.

A.28136 Sgt. R. N. Russell, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2 Wilmot Ave., Galt, Ont.

L.22523 Sgt. H. J. Simmons, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1235 Retallack St., Regina, Sask.

P.6672 Sgt. F. L. Thrasher, The Royal Canadian Artillery, General Delivery, Pembroke, Ont.

M.50113 L/Sgt. J. M. Murland, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 9608 81st Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

A.28134 L/Sgt. J. H. McIver, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 848 Queen St., Preston, Ont.

L.174 L/Sgt. A. M. Watt, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Moosomin, Sask.

L35084 Bdr. M. J. Boyle, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Shaunavon, Sask.

C10357 Bdr. E. R. R. Cardiff, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Franktown, Ont.

G7183 Bdr. H. R. Cole, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Sussex, N.B.

E0135 Bdr. J. A. R. Farrell, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Matapedia, Que.

A28085 Bdr. R. Hamilton, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 33 Waterloo St. E., Guelph, Ont.

K25813 Bdr. A. K. Johnston, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Duncan, B.C.

A46019 Bdr. J. R. McAllister, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Kincardine, Ont.

U1878 Bdr. C. W. Newhall, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 247 St. Julian St., Oshawa, Ont.

C63803 Bdr. H. W. Reid, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 37 Benjamin St., Belleville, Ont.

G7117 L/Bdr. R. A. Garland, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Sunny Brae, N.B.

N3322 L/Bdr. R. C. Shields, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Dawson Creek, B.C.

B43749 L/Bdr. F. W. Turner, MM, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 37 Balsam Ave., Toronto, Ont.

L64034 Gnr. L. Amundson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Swift Current, Sask.

F14291 Gnr. L. J. Brennick, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Montague, P.E.I.

F91745 Gnr. F. A. Christie, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Barrington Passage, Shelburne, N.S.

D9025 Gnr. L. O. Crossan, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 287 Willibrord Ave., Verdun, Que.

G7376 E. M. Dore, The Royal Canadian Artillery Lower Southampton, N.B.

G4316 Gnr. J. C. Estey, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Traceyville, N.B.

H103798 Gnr. J. L. Habinski, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Cooks Creek, Man.

B25244 Gnr. G. W. Hanna, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Toronto, Ont.

K16050 Gnr. J. H. James, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Fort McMurray, Alta.

B44445 Gnr. C. H. Kingshott, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Bent River, Ont.

C63960 Gnr. C. A. Kippen, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Apple Hill, Ont.

B17586 Gnr. N. W. Kirkpatrick, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Bracebridge, Ont.

D118823 Gnr. H. W. Lamb, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Eversfield, Newark, Nottinghamshire, Eng.

F6180 Gnr. J. E. Lockwood, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Tecumseh, Ont.

F86121 Gnr. K. W. Longmire, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Milford, N.S.

K46815 Gnr. J. T. Moran, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1041-11th Ave., Prince Rupert, B.C.

B21687 Gnr. C. L. Morland, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Toronto, Ont.

B21586 Gnr. D. I. Newell, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 99 Maitland St., Toronto, Ont.

H59613 Gnr. W. Peresky, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 721 Scotland Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

B83470 Gnr. T. P. Richardson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Hespeler, Ont.

B111221 Gnr. R. C. Rowat, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 422 Douglas St., Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.

L10254 Gnr. H. S. Shore, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1175 Queen St., Regina, Sask.

G6145 Gnr. J. H. Weymer, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 76 Coran Ave., Shelton, Conn., U.S.A.

D9068 Gnr. J. Young, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 9715 Hochelaga St., Montreal, Que.

Major W. J. Bright, DSO, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 52 Elmwood, London, Ont.

Major J. E. Brown, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1427-7th St. N.W., Calgary, Alta.

Lieut. A. T. Anderson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 4238 Angus Drive, Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. J. W. Bailey, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 10089 Jasper Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

Lieut. A. M. Cormie, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 136 Claremont Ave., Norwood, Man.

Lieut. J. B. Donald, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. H. F. Horwood, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 806 Island Park Dr., Ottawa, Ont.

Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

K73923 S/Sgt. J. W. Ballentine, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 2332 Burns St., Vancouver, B.C.

D16001 Sgt. R. Atherton, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 3810 Draper Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

L19017 Sgt. T. Barton, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Estevan, Sask.

H13255 Sgt. E. B. Clark, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, River Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

M54233 Sgt. D. C. Eckhardt, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Kinuso, Alta.

B26369 Sgt. F. M. Gronert, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 391 Armour Rd., Peterboro, Ont.

M7048 Sgt. O. P. Keith, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Havelock, N.B.

B40470 L/Sgt. T. J. Reid, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Noranda, P.Q.

M5294 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) S. M. Armstrong, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Elnora, Alta.

B92946 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) G. F. Baker, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 20 Sproat Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B92754 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) L. Hudson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 42 Napier St., Dundas, Ont.

B17049 Cpl. M. E. Jenkins, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Magnetawan, Ont.

B28836 Cpl. J. A. W. Lavigne, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Luskville, P.Q.

C2535 Cpl. D. MacIver, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Sudbury, Ont.

B83213 L/Cpl. G. S. Britton, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Toronto, Ont.

B39545 L/Cpl. T. Poppleton, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, South Porcupine, Ont.

K75088 L/Cpl. G. H. Price, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1836-E-13th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

L51126 Spr. P. C. Barie, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Gravelbourg, Sask

B28075 Spr. S. J. Hardings, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 937 Bay St., Toronto, Ont.

K31609 Spr. G. M. Haskins, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Okla, Sask.

B28838 D. G. Maracle, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Rouyn, Que.

H36312 Spr. J. J. Morrison, The Corps of the Royal Canadian Engineers, 1245 Dominion St., Winnipeg, Man.

H36232 Spr. J. Orr, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Cloverdale, B.C.

C2413 Spr. L. W. Robertson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 72 Hopewell Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

P10181 Spr. L. J. Soutar, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 344 Flora St., Ottawa, Ont.

M41791 Spr. W. H. F. Standish, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Lethbridge, Alta.

B25657 Spr. T. E. J. Sullivan, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 3 McMurchy Ave., Brampton, Ont.

A35054 Spr. A. E. Watt, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Southampton, Ont.

Lt.-Col. A. E. Wrinch, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 349 Somerset St., Ottawa, Ont.

Captain J. A. August, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 53 Eccles St., Barrie, Ont.

Captain L. R. Douglas, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 192 Hunter St., Peterborough, Ont.

Captain H. E. Good, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, North Gower, Ont.

Lieut. J. E. Morgan, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 5566 Decelles Ave., Montreal, 26, P.Q.

Lieut. D. A. McInnis, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Tyvan, Sask.

H3906 WO II (S/QMS) W. N. Grace, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 388 Talbot Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

P39943 C.Q.M.S. W. S. McTaggart, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 163 Marmora St., Trenton, Ont.

B88356 Sgt. E. E. Baird, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 115 Clendenan Ave., Toronto, Ont.

A2098 Sgt. W. L. Harvey, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 28 Wharncliffe Rd. N., London, Ont.

C3001 Sgt. W. J. Little, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 95 Hinton Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

D21577 Sgt. W. F. Merchant, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 6 Lepage Ave., Dorval, P.Q.

A2161 Sgt. C. F. Ogden, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 18 Delaware St., Woodstock, Ont.

D21156 Sgt. D. J. Robertson, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 3562 Lorne Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

B31835 L/Sgt. R. H. Easby, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 419 Leloraine Ave., Toronto, Ont.

E29779 Cpl. P. A. Simard, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 207 St. Dominique, Jonquieres, P.Q.

A57979 Cpl. D. I. Steinhauer, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 496 Euclid Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B33108 Cpl. S. W. Wolf, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Palmerston, Ont.

G16068 L/Cpl. J. D. Cabel, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Chatham, N.B.

G49410 L/Cpl. L. G. Richards, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 103 Archibald St., Moncton, N.B.

H34003 Sgmn. N. Campbell, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 44 Hargrave St., Winnipeg, Man.

P9375 Sgmn. F. S. Clarabut, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 370½ Princess St., Kingston, Ont.

C3034 Sgmn. S. Deavy, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 254 Arlington Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

E34923 Sgmn. E. Foran, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Grand Cascapedia, P.Q.

H38821 Sgmn. M. E. Gilbert, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Port Dover, Ont.

C29569 Sgmn. W. M. Guthrie, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 9 Birch Ave., Kingston, Ont.

K70614 Sgmn. E. C. Herod, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 8208 French St., Vancouver, B.C.

C31449 Sgmn. H. E. Rathwell, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 21 Arthur St., Perth Ont.

Lt.-Col. W. W. Mathers, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1073 Richmond St. N., London, Ont.

Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

Major J. R. Black, Canadian Infantry Corps, 22 Palmer Ave., Oakville, Ont.

Major T. de Faye, MBE, Canadian Infantry Corps, Saskatoon, Sask.

Major I. F. Douglas, Canadian Infantry Corps, 550 Campbell Ave., New Westminster, B.C.

Major G. D. Johnston, Canadian Infantry Corps, 504 Clarence Ave. N., Saskatoon, Sask.

Major A. J. P. LePrairie, Canadian Infantry Corps, 17 Mountclair Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Major G. E. B. Renison, Canadian Infantry Corps, Iroquois Falls, Ont.

Major W. G. M. Robinson, OBE, Canadian Infantry Corps, 100 Highland Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Major A. W. Rogers, Canadian Infantry Corps, 78 Upper Prince St., Charlottetown, P.E.I.

Major G. A. Ross, DSO, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1190 Kenilworth Rd., Town of Mount Royal, P.Q.

Major P. H. Stehelin, Canadian Infantry Corps, Yarmouth, N.S.

Capt. (A/Major) T. L. Davies, Canadian Infantry Corps, 467 Oriole Parkway, Toronto, Ont.

Capt. (A/Major) J. L. G. Poulin, Canadian Infantry Corps, Quebec, P.Q.

Capt. H. J. Bishop, Canadian Infantry Corps, 10804-125th St., Edmonton, Alta.

Capt. F. T. Forgrave, Canadian Infantry Corps, 13 Frontenac St., St. Johns, P.Q.

Capt. V. Ignatieff, Canadian Infantry Corps, Toronto, Ont.

Capt. F. F. McEachren, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1 Whitney Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. W. J. Palmer, Canadian Infantry Corps, 213 Dunvegan Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. R. W. Pilot, MBE, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1517 Pine Ave. W., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. W. D. Reid, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1334 Mitchell St., Victoria, B.C.

Capt. W. M. W. Shaw, Canadian Infantry Corps, 243 Eugene St., Norwood, Man.

Capt. J. B. Smith, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1005 Maitland St., London, Ont.

Capt. L. G. Smith, Canadian Infantry Corps, Renfrew, Ont.

Capt. W. G. Winters, Canadian Infantry Corps, Prince Albert, Sask.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) T. L. Allen, Canadian Infantry Corps, 31 South St., Halifax, N.S.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) W. L. C. Delaney, Canadian Infantry Corps, Grand Falls, N.B.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) R. R. Douglas, Canadian Infantry Corps, 550 Campbell Ave., New Westminister, B.C.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) J. A. Johnston, Canadian Infantry Corps, 603 Queens Ave., London, Ont.

Lieut. D. M. Dickie, Canadian Infantry Corps, 70 Castle Frank Cres., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. G. F. Henderson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 126 Brock St., Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. W. C. Hider, Canadian Infantry Corps, 151 Douglas St., Stratford, Ont.

Lieut. C. I. Kennedy, Canadian Infantry Corps, 344 Piccadilly St., London, Ont.

Lieut. D. H. Kennedy, Canadian Infantry Corps, 8501A Foucher St., Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. R. N. Knowles, Canadian Infantry Corps, Windsor, N.S.

Lieut. H. N. McLeod, Canadian Infantry Corps, 110 Orange St., Saint John, N.B.

Lieut. D. S. Snively, Canadian Infantry Corps, Aurora, Ont.

Lieut. G. J. Wood, Canadian Infantry Corps, 33 Holley Ave., Weston, Ont.

Lieut. R. Yelle, Canadian Infantry Corps, Shawinigan Bay, P.Q.

M15711 WO I (RSM) J. T. P. Ferguson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 11146 127th St., Edmonton, Alta.

E4001 WO II (RQMS) (A/WO I, RSM) P. Hache, Canadian Infantry Corps, 24 13th Rue. St. Francois D'Assise, Quebec, P.Q.

P22087 WO II (RQMS) P. A. Scrutton, Canadian Infantry Corps, 119 Jones Ave., Toronto, Ont.

A11185 WO II (CSM) D. R. Bruce, Canadian Infantry Corps, 432 Woolwich St., Guelph, Ont.

L1126 CQMS T. W. Lytle, Canadian Infantry Corps, 609 3rd Ave., Saskatoon, Sask.

E11135 Sgt. (A/WO II, CSM) L. Couturier, Notre Dame des Anges, P.Q.

M15825 Sgt. L. H. Burghardt, Canadian Infantry Corps, 11408 81st St., Edmonton, Alta.

B73440 Sgt. D. K. Caswell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 849 Broadview Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B130585 Sgt. N. Corken, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1264 Elsmere Ave., Windsor, Ont.

C70537 Sgt. W. G. Coughlin, Canadian Infantry Corps, Ottawa, Ont.

M179 Sgt. M. Couillard, Canadian Infantry Corps, Coaldale, Alta.

B46320 Sgt. A. Mitchell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 226 Livingstone Ave., Toronto, Ont.

K57858 Sgt. E. W. Pedersen, Canadian Infantry Corps, Victoria, B.C.

M16216 Sgt. R. Pulkrabek, Canadian Infantry Corps, St. Paul, Alta.

K85296 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) F. L. Bentham, Canadian Infantry Corps, 265 Cadillac Ave., Victoria, B.C.

F49965 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) J. A. Brown, Canadian Infantry Corps, Springhill, N.S.

F39661 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) H. A. MacLeod, Canadian Infantry Corps, Bridgewater, N.S.

C5695 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) C. J. Shier, Canadian Infantry Corps, Gooderham, Ont.

F54641 Cpl. C. A. Fleet, Canadian Infantry Corps, Stephenville Crossing, Newfoundland.

F78819 Cpl. J. S. Francis, Canadian Infantry Corps, Milton, N.S.

B51666 Cpl. J. R. F. Gambell, Canadian Infantry Corps, Beaver St., Glen Williams, Ont.

H17551 Cpl. W. Harachka, Canadian Infantry Corps, Glen Cairn, Man.

L1622 Cpl. D. P. Hay, Canadian Infantry Corps, Chilliwack, B.C.

K53310 Cpl. G. McGregor, Canadian Infantry Corps, North Kamloops, B.C.

K52470 L/Cpl. L. L. Greig, Canadian Infantry Corps, Vancouver, B.C.

K53580 L/Cpl. T. T. Guest, Canadian Infantry Corps, 448 Ross Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

F88640 L/Cpl. C. J. Harte, Canadian Infantry Corps, McKay's Corner, Glace Bay, N.S.

B137510 L/Cpl. D. A. MacPhail, Canadian Infantry Corps, 70 9th St., New Toronto, Ont.

C75673 L/Cpl. J. J. P. A. Mercier, Canadian Infantry Corps, 198 Montreal Rd., Cornwall, Ont.

K50530 Pte. (A/Cpl.) K. J. Gustafson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Princeton, B.C.

F44757 Pte. (A/Cpl.) P. W. Jordan, Canadian Infantry Corps, Pictou, N.S.

H103423 Pte. (A/Cpl.) I. Sangster, Canadian Infantry Corps, Deepdale, Man.

F39858 Pte. (A/Cpl.) D. L. G. Sproule, Canadian Infantry Corps, 44 Waddell St., Truro, N.S.

Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

F60091 Pte. A. A. Arsenault, Canadian Infantry Corps, Miscouche, P.E.I.

A4194 Pte. M. E. Bailey, Canadian Infantry Corps, 234 S. Queen St., Sarnia, Ont.

A71047 Pte. R. I. Bean, Canadian Infantry Corps, Listowel, Ont.

G23009 Pte. J. A. Bernard, Canadian Infantry Corps, Bathurst, N.B.

F86801 Pte. M. J. Bernstein, Canadian Infantry Corps, 566 Robie St., Halifax, N.S.

C5980 Pte. M. F. Broadworth, Canadian Infantry Corps, Frankford, Ont.

H16736 Pte. S. J. Cousins, Canadian Infantry Corps, Bagot, Man.

A12013 Pte. J. W. Foreman, Canadian Infantry Corps, Galt, Ont.

A50574 Pte. V. E. Gooding, Canadian Infantry Corps, Listowel, Ont.

B72942 Pte. E. G. Harrison, Canadian Infantry Corps, 204 Kingston Rd., Toronto, Ont.

F35245 Fus. W. J. LeLievre, Canadian Infantry Corps, Halifax, N.S.

C6185 Pte. W. A. Maracle, Canadian Infantry Corps, Shannonville, Ont.

F97160 Pte. M. Melnick, Canadian Infantry Corps, 18 Park St., Glace Bay, N.S.

M16418 Pte. C. J. Morgan, Canadian Infantry Corps, Edmonton, Alta.

D137147 Pte. J. P. D. McGowan, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5698 Jeanne Mance St., Montreal, P.Q.

F88293 Pte. A. I. Neary, Canadian Infantry Corps, 144-11th St., New Aberdeen, N.S.

K100181 Pte. K. H. Perkins, Canadian Infantry Corps, Bristol, N.B.

H9718 Pte. L. M. Steele, Canadian Infantry Corps, Winnipeg, Man.

C65642 Pte. H. D. Stoodley, Canadian Infantry Corps, 388 Murray St., Pembroke, Ont.

M102910 Pte. R. H. Storch, Canadian Infantry Corps, Scapa, Alta.

P21300 Pte. J. A. Sugden, Canadian Infantry Corps, 922 North Park St., Victoria, B.C.

B61462 Pte. N. Taylor, Canadian Infantry Corps, 7 Merrill Ave., Toronto, Ont.

H/Lt.-Col. J. Logan-Vencta, Canadian Chaplain Services, 146 Carling Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

H/Major J. M. Colling, Canadian Chaplain Services, 41 Trevithan St., London, Ont.

H/Capt. (A/H/Major) W. J. Phillips, Canadian Chaplain Services, 122 Spring Park Rd., Charlottetown, P.E.I.

H/Capt. C. D. Daniel, Canadian Chaplain Services, 139 Wonham, Ingersoll, Ont.

H/Capt. J. L. Le Sage, Canadian Chaplain Services, 586 Lisgar St., Ottawa, Ont.

H/Capt. G. A. Meiklejohn, Canadian Chaplain Services, Campbellford, Ont.

H/Capt. J. A. Munro, Canadian Chaplain Services, Banff Apt., Vancouver, B.C.

Major J. D. Cheatley, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 356 Campbell St., Winnipeg, Man.

Major G. Gibb, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Vancouver, B.C.

Major J. B. MacAulay, ED, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 103 Dolbeau St., Quebec, P.Q.

Major M. E. Meers, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1423-4th St., N.W., Calgary, Alta.

Major W. A. McArthur, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 35 Laws Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. A. M. Abernethy, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 266 Roselawn Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. T. L. Berridge, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 80 Cedar Ave., Pointe Claire, P.Q.

Capt. M. B. Bricker, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. H. J. Delaney, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Sydney St., Saint John, N.B.

Capt. K. V. D. Gardner, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 220 Strathearn Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. A. T. MacKenzie, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 228 Frank St., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. J. A. MacKenzie, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 112 Roxboro Rd., Calgary, Alta.

Capt. S. H. Mislap, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 495 Prince Arthur Ave., W., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. D. S. Nicholson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 484 Pitt St., Cornwall, Ont.

Capt. J. M. Snowball, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 250 Ranleigh Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. R. K. Thomson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1775 Blanca St., Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) J. W. Gambles, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 56 Fairview Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. E. A. Smart, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Armadale, N.S.

H51710 WO I (MSM) P. H. Sturton, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 123 Smith St., Winnipeg, Man.

D91314 WO II (CSM) T. McKellar, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Domville St., St. Lambert Annex, P.Q.

M20694 Sgt. C. Gibson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 633-17th Ave. N.W., Calgary, Alta.

F92799 Sgt. T. H. Hilchie, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Marriott's Cove, N.S.

C70709 Sgt. L. C. Muir, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Riceville, Ont.

M20946 Sgt. N. McNeil, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Edmonton, Alta.

B84423 Cpl. G. Hollingworth, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Toronto, Ont.

K6033 Cpl. E. Howcroft, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Kimberley, B.C.

B37444 Cpl. G. Mavor, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 317 Main St., E., Hamilton, Ont.

F45291 Cpl. A. V. Munroe, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Little Dover, N.S.

D91447 Cpl. L. McCorkill, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Montreal, P.Q.

B93258 Cpl. J. Walker, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 796 Carlaw Ave., Toronto, Ont.

C11549 L/Cpl. S. J. Haggarty, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 413 Queen St., Ottawa, Ont.

F87605 L/Cpl. J. F. King, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Pugwash, N.S.

H51795 L/Cpl. C. E. Lewin, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Kenilworth Court, Winnipeg, Man.

H87414 L/Cpl R. O. McDonald, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Dawson Creek, B.C.

K70639 Pte. H. Anderson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 4484 W. 10th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

C53123 Pte. J. E. Blodgett, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 183 Reid Street, Peterborough, Ont.

Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

M50885 Pte. J. A. Boe, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Drumheller, Alta.

F76223 Pte. I. D. Broome, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, New Ross, N.S.

H101121 Pte. C. T. Claeys, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Fort Garry, Man.

M54429 Pte. F. Cooperman, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1503-22nd Ave., Calgary, Alta.

M36324 Pte. N. G. Ellingson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 730 Janette St., Windsor, Ont.

A42087 Pte. W. W. Fulsom, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Princeton, Ont.

M60354 Pte. R. J. Garrett, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Bellevue, Alta.

B89562 Pte. E. F. Goodwin, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Bracebridge, Ont.

H57908 Pte. J. J. Graham, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Wasega, Sask.

M42048 Pte. J. Hetherington, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Drumheller, Alta.

D115425 Pte. A. Jugand, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 2164 Amherst St., Montreal, P.Q.

M58816 Pte. A. Kennedy, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Fort Saskatchewan, Alta.

L110160 Pte. W. A. Kennedy, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Wierdale, Sask.

F32308 Pte. R. Miles, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 61 South St., Glace Bay, N.S.

C11382 Pte. E. B. McElroy, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 376 MacLaren St., Ottawa, Ont.

M63046 Pte. J. McGee, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 10519-68th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

C30028 Pte. R. Saumur, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Cumberland, Ont.

D126668 Pte. J. M. Sevigny, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Sutton, P.Q.

L100635 Pte. F. G. Walker, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 333 Metcalfe St., Ottawa, Ont.

Lt.-Col. M. R. Elliott, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 35 Jackman Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lt.-Col. E. C. Janes, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, London, Ont.

Major E. H. Anderson, DSO, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Digby, N.S.

Major R. W. Boyden, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 30 Laurence Ave. E., Toronto, Ont.

Major J. U. Coleman, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Duncan, B.C.

Major J. A. Langille, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Oxford, N.S.

Major A. St. C. Rumball, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Brandon, Man.

Capt. (A/Major) G. Latour, The Royal Canadian Medical Corps, 46 St. Geneviene Ave., Quebec, P.Q.

Captain E. Aiello, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Fernie, B.C.

Captain R. J. Fassina, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 161 Ontario St., Port Arthur, Ont.

Captain W. L. Menzies, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1860 Greatford Place, Victoria, B.C.

Captain J. Mitchell, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 443 Burrows Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Captain H. L. Nutik, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 4908 Sherbrooke St. W., Montreal, P.Q.

Captain J. P. Pearce, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 154 Foster Ave., Belleville, Ont.

Captain H. M. Ross, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 17 Barbara Ave., Guelph, Ont.

Captain T. H. Smellie, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Prescott, Ont.

Lt. (N/S) R. K. Ackhurst, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 29 Vernon Street, Halifax, N.S.

Lt. (N/S) L. E. Bibby, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1330-16th Ave. West, Calgary, Alta.

Lt. (N/S) M. F. Cascaden. The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 343-21st Street, Brandon, Man.

Lt. (N/S) A. Halabuza, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Willowbrook, Sask.

Lt. (N/S) M. M. MacDonald, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 8719-99th St., Edmonton, Alta.

Lt. (N/S) M. S. Taylor, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 777 St. Catherine St. W., Montreal, P.Q.

A27083 W.O. I (R.S.M.) E. Bond, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 212 Liverpool St., Guelph, Ont.

B93554 W.O. II (Q.M.S.) G. H. Cox, 67 Gloucester St., Toronto 5, Ont.

L17281 Sgt. C. R. Barry, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Kuroki, Sask.

D109328 Sgt. H. Bond, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 5109-9th Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

B87965 Sgt. J. R. Patrick, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 232 Roxborough Ave., Hamilton, Ont.

C27278 L/Sgt. R. A. Barrett, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Eganville, Ont.

L17254 Cpl. A. Fages, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Regina, Sask.

M24011 Cpl. G. G. Gifford, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 919-7th Ave. West, Calgary, Alta.

H11172 Cpl. P. F. Renaud, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Baird, Ont.

B110126 L/Cpl. A. Whittingstall, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 132 Bilbert Ave., Toronto, Ont.

D94169 Pte. L. P. Cloutier, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Normetal, P.Q.

D95822 Pte. R. H. Guyan, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 830-5th Avenue, Verdun, P.Q.

H94410 Pte. N. J. Lebel, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 192 North Cumberland St., Port Arthur, Ont.

M25902 Pte. R. E. Lory, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Stony Plain, Alta.

B89864 Pte. G. A. Scargall, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 42 Napier St. South, Dundas, Ont.

Captain N. W. Bunnin, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Ponoka, Alta.

Captain G. J. Mash, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 43 Union St., Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. H. V. Kneen, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 461 Highcroft Ave., Westboro, Ont.

B2020 Sgt. (A/S/Sgt.) C. H. Johnston, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 794 Carlaw Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

A50077 Sgt. J. F. Hallam, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 975 Eleas St., London, Ont.

B57487 Sgt. S. H. Young, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 451 Catherine St. N., Hamilton, Ont.

M11321 Cpl. R. W. Ritchie, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 509-3rd Ave. W., Calgary, Alta.

L9122 L/Cpl. E. E. Mowles, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Heward, Sask.

B130522 Pte. R. J. Clapham, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Waterdown, Ont.

M56302 Pte. J. H. Freeman, Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Enilda, Alta.

Major W. S. Hunt, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 4810 Queen Mary Road, Montreal, P.Q.

Captain R. E. Hallam, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Weyburn, Sask.

Captain L. Martin, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 4751 Coolbrook Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Captain C. J. Rankin, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 759 St. Catherine St. W., Montreal, P.Q.

Captain R. G. Waite, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 49 Hartley Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. W. S. R. Stevenson, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 251 Park Road, Rockcliffe, Ont.

U1563 W.O. II (S.Q.M.S.) H. Gallier, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 519 Seven Oaks Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

P35357 W.O. II (A.Q.M.S.) E. MacMillan, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Kingston, Ont.

M62358 S/Sgt. C. Tose, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Caroline, Alta.

M60243 Cpl. D. K. Anderson, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Sibbald, Alta.

B94556 Cpl. A. R. Green, Royal Canadian Electrical & Mechanical Engineers, 14 Division St., Lindsay, Ont.

B56856 Cpl. W. N. Keating, Royal Canadian Electrical & Mechanical Engineers, 17 Wellington St. W., Brampton, Ont.

A29207 Cpl. J. C. Wray, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 428 Quebec St., London, Ont.

A86157 L/Cpl. W. D. Campbell, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 364 Talbot St., London, Ont.

B87955 L/Cpl. J. A. Mancuso, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 255 Welland Ave., St. Catharines, Ont.

A19432 L/Cpl. W. J. Mitchell, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 492 Highburg St., London, Ont.

B57351 Cfn. W. Coull, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 144 Catherine St. N., Hamilton, Ont.

C5611 Cfn. J. L. Daniels, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 3111 Dundas St. W., Toronto, Ont.

D109741 Cfn. S. N. Duncan, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 1891 St. James St. W., Montreal, P.Q.

H63621 Cfn. G. Jamieson, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Cordona, Man.

A58621 Cfn. A. A. Meecham, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Fergus, Ont.

K46446 Cfn. R. W. Stickler, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 2446 W. 4th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Lt.-Col. F. N. Cowley, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, 519 Camden Pl., Winnipeg, Man.

Major J. G. G. Couture, ED, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, 4th Ave. Blvd. St. Louis, Three Rivers, Que.

Major S. E. Goodwin, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, 11 Ruper St., Amherst, N.S.

L25505 WO II (SQMS) F. A. Chapman, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, 960 Garnet St., Regina, Sask.

Major (A/Lt.-Col.) W. L. Finlay, Canadian Dental Corps, 311 Fairmont Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Major L. H. Smith, Canadian Dental Corps, Simcoe, Ont.

Captain G. W. Holden, Canadian Dental Corps, Pine Grove Via, Woodbridge, Ont.

Captain M. R. McNeill, Canadian Dental Corps, Goderich, Ont.

H37259 Cpl. R. G. Seller, Canadian Dental Corps, 20 Blenheem Ave., St. Vital, Man.

B84061 Pte. R. Walker, Canadian Dental Corps, Toronto, Ont.

H64670 WO II (QMS) M. Silver, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 258 Manitoba Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

L25617 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) L. Hood, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 1330 Cameron St., Regina, Sask.

B36756 Cpl. P. R. Pugsley, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 1311 Cannon St. E., Hamilton, Ont.

C97849 Pte. (A/Cpl.) W. A. Brands, The Canadian Postal Corps, Portage La Prairie, Man.

Captain A. J. Scotti, The Canadian Provost Corps, 7353 Casgrain St., Montreal, Que.

C42019 Sgt. (A/WO I) (RSM) J. E. McCardle, The Canadian Provost Corps, Kendra, Ont.

C42010 Sgt. D. R. Henzie, The Canadian Provost Corps, 1939 Garnet St., Regina, Sask.

D110005 Sgt. G. Meldrum, The Canadian Provost Corps, 528 Regina St., Verdun, Que.

H4011 Sgt. W. J. Nicol, The Canadian Provost Corps, Otterburne, Man.

B.95591 Sgt. G. F. Parker, The Canadian Provost Corps, Islington, Ont.

A56010 Cpl. W. L. Yule, The Canadian Provost Corps, Fullerton, Ont.

C33525 L/Cpl. B. Boyes, The Canadian Provost Corps, Kingston St., Goderich, Ont.

U2072 L/Cpl. H. C. Stenning, The Canadian Provost Corps, West Malling, Kent, England.

W10126 Pte. (A/Cpl.) E. M. Cossar, Canadian Women's Army Corps, 664 Walker Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Captain H. A. Hunter, Canadian Intelligence Corps, Russell, Man.

Captain D. J. O. H. M. McQueen, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 55 Gwynn Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Major (A/Lt.-Col.) D. D. Carrick, General List, 329 Lytton Blvd., Toronto, Ont.

Major W. T. Chambers, General List, 184 Cartier St., Ottawa, Ont.

Major L. F. Dawes, General List, 2337 Gray Ave., New Westminster, B.C.

Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

Major J. W. B. Johnston, General List, Cookshire, P.Q.

Major C. P. Lailey, General List, 392 Davenport Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Captain E. G. Madore, General List, Coronation, Alta.

Captain W. A. Moss, General List, 119 Strathcona Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Captain A. W. L. Watson, General List, Winnipeg, Man.

Supr. H. J. Houghton, Auxiliary Services, 315-26th St. West, Saskatoon, Sask.

Supr. R. P. Willison, Auxiliary Services, 80 Delaware Ave., Toronto, Ont.

General H. D. G. Crerar, CB, DSO, Canadian Army, Roxborough Apts., Ottawa, Ontario.

Maj.-Gen. G. G. Simonds, CB, CBE, DSO, Canadian Army, Wardlaw Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Brig. J. A. W. Bennett, CBE, Canadian Army, Halifax, N.S.

Brig. G. S. N. Gostling, ED, Canadian Army, 161 Vaughan St., Winnipeg, Man.

Brig. J. N. Lane, DSO, Canadian Army Halifax, N.S.

Brig. R. W. Moncel, OBE, Canadian Army, 88 Young Ave., Halifax, N.S.

Brig. G. Walsh, CBE, DSO, Canadian Army, Oakville, Ont.

Lt.-Col. T. C. Lewis, DSO, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 52 Academy Rd., Westmount, P.Q.

Maj. (A/Lt.-Col.) F. E. Wigle, OBE, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 88 Glenfern Ave., Hamilton, Ont.

Major F. H. Baldwin, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 79 Queen St., Sherbrooke, P.Q.

Capt. (A/Major) R. F. Green, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Boharm, Sask.

Capt. J. C. Bond, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Chippawa, Ont.

Capt. J. J. Burke, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Bracebridge, Ont.

Capt. R. F. Garrow, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 98 Pembroke St. W., Pembroke, Ont.

Lieut. C. L. Black, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, McAdam, N.B.

Lieut. R. N. Caswell, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 863 University Drive, Saskatoon, Sask.

Lieut. H. P. Wilson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 161 Winona Drive, Toronto, Ont.

M45704 WO II (CSM) E. F. Bundy, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Calgary, Alta.

D36196 WO II (MQMS) J. Desy, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Shawinigan Falls, P.Q.

D3047 WO II (RQMS) F. I. English, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 432 Willibrod Ave., Verdun, P.Q.

P1585 WO II (SSM) H. R. G. Figg, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 145 Lakeshore Rd., Toronto, Ont.

C58493 WO II (MQMS) R. A. Moore, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 408 Slater St., Ottawa, Ont.

H26071 WO II (SSM) W. Tough, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 552 Portage Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

A430 Sgt. J. C. Allen, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 418 Richmond St., London, Ont.

A42230 Sgt. H. F. Burnley, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 196 Norwick Ave., Woodstock, Ont.

H26271 Sgt. J. R. Goodman, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Fraser Block, Calgary, Alta.

D3062 Sgt. L. C. Henderson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 383 Gertrude St., Verdun, P.Q.

D26538 Sgt. F. MacVeigh, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Montreal, P.Q.

K37294 Sgt. H. M. Rekert, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Oliver, B.C.

H26319 Sgt. J. O. H. Shineton, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Norgate, Man.

L53592 Sgt. G. H. Smith, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, MacDowall, Sask.

D81800 Sgt. L. C. Vincent, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 939 Beaumont Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

D3319 L/Sgt. E. R. Holloway, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 504 William David St., Montreal, P.Q.

B83619 L/Sgt J. F. Larkin, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 103 Logan Ave., Toronto, Ont.

A44623 Cpl. (A/WO II, SSM) H. L. Benoit, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Ruscomb, Ont.

H77624 Cpl. R. A. Madill, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Teulon, Man.

H77943 Cpl. R. D. McCormick, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 211 1st St. East, Fort Frances, Ont.

L36760 Cpl. A. G. Pringle, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Endeavour, Sask.

M45059 Cpl. S. T. Rose, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Redcliff, Alta.

K57672 Cpl. J. Stella, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Blairmore, Alta.

A4437 Cpl. W. J. Talbot, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 31 Adams Ave., Toronto, Ont.

F79760 Cpl. J. A. White, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 23 Poplar St., Amherst, N.S.

G48902 L/Cpl. R. C. Baker, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 83 Cedar St., Halifax, N.S.

F30924 Gdsm. (A/Cpl.) E. A. Moody, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Ecum Secum, N.S.

F30395 Tpr. H. G. Hinkley, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Pleasant Bay, Cape Breton, N.S.

C40108 Gdsm. J. M. Levasseur, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 386½ St. Patrick St., Ottawa, Ont.

K71251 Tpr. M. E. Magrath, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Wellington Court, Moose Jaw, Sask.

B11113 Tpr. J. Mathes, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Cayuga, Ont.

K71262 Tpr. T. V. Simpson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Kelowna, B.C.

Capt. D. M. Dunlap, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 31 Forest Hill Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. F. E. T. Gill, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 20 Range Road, Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. J. F. Grandy, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 68 St. Mary St., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. R. M. McGibbon, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 605 Queen St., Fredericton, N.B.

Capt. J. E. Seybold, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 331 Lansdowne Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

Capt. R. C. M. Wyld, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Macleod, Alta.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) R. E. Barnes, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Goderich, Ont.

Lieut. D. J. Godkin, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 101 Beverly St., Kingston, Ont.

Lieut. W. E. D. Gray, The Royal Canadian Artillery, La Malbaie, P.Q.

Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

Lieut. R. E. LeSueur The Royal Canadian Artillery, 240 North Vidal St., Sarnia, Ont.

Lieut. K. J. T. Nussey, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Hudson Heights, P.Q.

Lieut. J. G. Scheuer, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Begras Island, P.Q.

Lieut. H. H. Slack, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 5 Maple Ave., Toronto, Ont.

C18607 WO II (BSM) E. H. Blodgett, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Norwood, Ont.

D11011 WO II (BSM) L. A. Clements, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Waterloo, Ont.

B11199 WO II (BSM) A. A. McFarland, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 52 Market St., Brantford, Ont.

A17102 WO II (BSM) P. Oleniuk, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 555 South Russell St., Sarnia, Ont.

A35195 WO II (RQMS) D. S. Young, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 30 Yorkshore St., S., Guelph, Ont.

B7019 S/Sgt. (A/WOI, SM) A. D. Montgomery, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 55 Belsize Drive, Toronto, Ont.

C72757 S/Sgt. J. A. McIntosh, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Fenelon Falls, Ont.

B48012 BQMS J. E. Taylor, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Port Dover, Ont.

C50001 BQMS J. Victor, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 597 Gilchrist St., Peterborough, Ont.

H66926 Sgt. W. Hallem, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 572 Prospect St., St. Boniface, Man.

L61794 Sgt. A. H. La Rocque, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 116 Furby St., Winnipeg, Man.

E21888 Sgt. K. R. Nash, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 6 St. Foye Rd., Quebec, P.Q.

A50177 Sgt. W. G. Purbrick, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Cottam, Ont.

D16071 Sgt. F. M. Shearer, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Morin Heights, P.Q.

K9112 Sgt. J. N. B. Wheeler, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Beaverlodge, Alta.

M55978 L/Sgt. H. A. Honey, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Dewberry, Alta.

D12041 Bdr. W. H. Goode, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 115 Eighth Ave., Sherbrooke, P.Q.

K76555 Bdr. G. K. Goundrey, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Mission City, B.C.

H6659 Bdr. C. Lindstrom, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 624 Victor St., Winnipeg, Man.

D118553 Bdr. H. T. Mitchell, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 12436 Notre Dame St. E., Pointe-aux-Trembles, P.Q.

K17061 Bdr. J. L. Parker, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 761 20th St. Hollyburn, West Vancouver, B.C.

G4061 Bdr. H. P. Villers, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Nashwaaksis, N.B.

A32217 L/Bdr. R. A. Fleming, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 321 Bell St., Ingersoll, Ont.

L28274 L/Bdr. G. W. Neovard, The Royal Canadian Artillery, South Battleford, Sask.

F16808 L/Bdr. G. H. Trott, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Barrington Head, N.S.

H102392 Gnr. (A/Sgt.) P. Isaac, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Steinback, Man.

L6296 Gnr. (A/Sgt.) R. J. Kyle, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Nottingham, Sask.

H102003 Gnr. H. Buhr, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Gretna, Man.

D12047 Gnr. R. Cardinal, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 3612 Laval Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

M53283 Gnr. R. I. Cross, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 506 9th St., N.E., Calgary, Alta.

H59769 J. R. Dixon, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1111 West 7th Ave, Vancouver, B.C.

B9794 Gnr. S. V. Femia, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 92 Dagmar Ave., Toronto, Ont.

D132031 Gnr. G. C. Garceau, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2450 Mariette St. NDG, Montreal, P.Q.

F25573 Gnr. P. B. Hennessy, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Windsor, N.S.

E46982 Gnr. P. E. Leclerc, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Chandler, P.Q.

N103696 Gnr. R. A. Ledge, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1033 8th St., N., Lethbridge, Alta.

C1378 Gnr. R. H. McClary, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Mallorytown, Ont.

C34961 Gnr. D. E. Obre, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Wapella, Sask.

D11613 Gnr. A. Poirier, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 145 London St., Sherbrooke, P.Q.

D12511 Gnr. A. Stewart, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 19 Toffie St., Shawinigan Falls, P.Q.

A64793 Gnr. S. Stratychuk, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 188 Cedar St., S., Kitchener, Ont.

M60377 Gnr. C. E. Trotter, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Nanton, Alta.

B6863 Gnr. A. R. Tuck, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 75 Ontario St., Burlington, Ont.

C26268 Gnr. J. Weaver, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 197 Brock St., Peterboro, Ont.

C26264 Gnr. B. G. Weir, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Omemee, Ont.

Lt.-Col. J. R. B. Jones, OBE, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 10044-147th St., Edmonton, Alta.

Major H. D. Bowyer, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 14 Page Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Major C. C. Hunter, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 233 N. Forsyth St., Sarnia, Ont.

Major G. L. MacDonald, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 63 Chesnut Ave., Brantford, Ont.

Major L. G. S. Trorey, MBE, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 4527 West 15th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Major E. H. Wright, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 10114 123rd St., Edmonton, Alta.

Capt. (A/Major) W. S. Leggat, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1363 The Crescent, Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. D. J. McIntyre, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 528 King St., W., Chatham, Ont.

Capt. W. J. G. Wadsworth, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 34 Ardagh St., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. H. A. S. West, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 412 Sparks St., Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) S. F. Dadson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 291 First Ave, Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) W. J. Rupert, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 519 MacKay St., Pembroke, Ont.

Lieut. G. A. Allen, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, High River, Alta.

Lieut. W. R. Hetherington, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Success, Sask.

Lieut. J. R. Smith, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1000 Waterloo St., London, Ont.

Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

F22301 WO I (RSM) A. Dunlop, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 45 Commercial St., Glace Bay, N.S.

B29057 WO I (RSM) R. M. Grant, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Cochrane, Ont.

D16361 WO I (SM) J. F. J. Keddell, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 480 Victoria Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

M7258 WO II (CSM) R. Allan, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Westlock, Alta.

L33086, WO II (MQMS) M. A. Loken, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Viceroy, Sask.

B29607 WO II (QMS) P. Straiton, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 133 Winchester St., Toronto, Ont.

M5135 S/Sgt. R. F. Fretwell, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Clive, Alta.

L33035 Sgt. C. L. Cowger, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Richlea, Sask.

B27911 Sgt. V. Morley, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Sudbury, Ont.

C34711 Sgt. R. A. Page, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 41 Catherine St., Eastview, Ont.

B29148 L/Sgt. H. G. Bryant, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 212 Indian Rd., Toronto, Ont.

B25404 L/Sgt. J. L. Glynn, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 307 Westmoreland Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B26115 L/Sgt. H. C. Guthrie, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Acton, Ont.

B3112 Cpl. N. Hopkins, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 55 Waverley Rd., Toronto, Ont.

B28522 Cpl. T. D. Starr, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 42A Poplar Ave., Kirkland Lake, Ont.

A20418 L/Cpl. J. F. Hannon, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 443 Park St., Kitchener, Ont.

L92913 L/Cpl. L. A. Mack, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Hamilton St., Regina, Sask.

A19481 Spr. (A/Cpl.) E. Christensen, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Fullerton, Ont.

M59195 Spr. O. Blanes, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Teepee Creek, Alta.

B23468 Spr. A. H. Collins, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Trout Creek, Ont.

C25748 Spr. H. F. Given, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 29 Robert St., Ottawa, Ont.

D18009 Spr. H. Jackson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 4291 Western Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

B23373 Spr. E. L. Judd, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Charlton, Ont.

A18258 Spr. A. J. Marleau, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1217 Hickory Rd., Windsor, Ont.

D59338 Spr. M. Renaud, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 2030 Rue Letourneux, Montreal, P.Q.

M35980 Spr. P. Ring, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Pilot Butte, Sask.

D15549 Spr. R. Savard, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Ste. Scholastique, Deux Montagnes, P.Q.

B29922 Spr. R. W. Scott, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Maynooth, Ont.

M41470 Spr. F. V. Stanley, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 2313-5th Ave., N.W., Calgary, Alta.

D16381 Spr. P. St. Thomas, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Frand Falls, N.B.

H82321 Spr. J. M. Whyte, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Kenton, Man.

Major W. H. Jardine, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 1311-6A St., N.W., Calgary, Alta.

Major K. M. Johnston, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 153 Prince St., Charlottetown, P.E.I.

Major E. H. Kerr, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 1124 Summit Ave., Victoria, B.C.

Capt. G. L. Atyeo, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 324 Charles St., Belleville, Ont.

Capt. J. A. Parker, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 169 Henderson Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. A. M. Tedford, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Coldstream, N.B.

M63925 Sgt. G. A. Kerstens, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Midnapore, Alta.

B31953 Sgt. F. J. Ritchie, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 1961 Quebec Street, Regina, Sask.

D24115 L/Sgt. G. Berlinguette, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 4282 St. Antoine St., Montreal, P.Q.

B32315 L/Sgt. J. L. Fraser, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 1146-3rd Ave., W., Owen Sound, Ont.

L22460 L/Sgt. H. A. Huntington, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 133 Fairfort St., Moose Jaw, Sask.

D21335 L/Sgt. E. C. Webber, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Boy's Farm, Shawbridge, P.Q.

M44582 Cpl. J. W. Moore, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 1927 32nd Ave., Calgary, Alta.

G3561 Cpl. G. C. Robertson, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Tide Head, N.B.

D116372 Cpl. J. W. Roy, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 10790 St. Charles St., Montreal, P.Q.

M27269 Cpl. T. E. Wall, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Veteran, Alta.

B112664 L/Cpl. H. W. Bowser, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Nestorville, Ont.

H38837 L/Cpl. K. D. Caney, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 620 Ingersoll St., Winnipeg, Man.

G18298 L/Cpl. G. M. Porter, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Meductic, N.B.

L101084 Sigmn. G. W. Adair, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Shackleton, Sask.

B31236 Sigmn. J. Barr, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 177 Sammon Ave., Toronto, Ont.

M57104 Sigmn. A. B. Bounds, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 11212-75th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

F79829 Sigmn. A. D. Brown, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 26 Edward St., Halifax, N.S.

B31149 Sigmn. G. A. Glover, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 46 Bertmount Ave., Toronto, Ont.

K70608 Sigmn. R. G. Holloway, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 3553 W. 26th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

H38763 Sigmn. T. H. Houston, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Kenton, Man.

Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

B84652 Sigmn. S. E. Lowe, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 1669 Gerard Street, Toronto, Ont.

G53475 Sigmn. H. Mack, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Marchbank, N.B.

B113834 Sigmn. E. W. Marnoch, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 169 Chambers Ave., Toronto, Ont.

D24078 Sigmn. E. J. Racette, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 6723 Chambord St., Montreal, P.Q.

C101202 Sigmn. N. H. Stewart, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Almonte, Ont.

B32621 Sigmn. R. W. Swainson, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Rosseau, Ont.

C64536 Sigmn. A. E. Thompson, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 165 Munro St., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut.-Col. T. P. Gilday, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3295 Cedar Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

Lieut.-Col. R. D. King, DSO, ED, Canadian Infantry Corps, 24 Summer St., Halifax, N.S.

Lieut.-Col. G. H. Logie, Canadian Infantry Corps, Breeside Farm, Gould, P.Q.

Major D. G. Brown, Canadian Infantry Corps, Manor, Sask.

Major J. C. Duncan, Canadian Infantry Corps, 970 Sherburn St., Winnipeg, Man.

Major J. Hemelryk, Canadian Infantry Corps, Brantford, Ont.

Major R. E. C. Hunt, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4215 Western Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

Major F. Lee, Canadian Infantry Corps, 717-7th Ave., N., Saskatoon, Sask.

Major W. S. MacKenzie, ED, Canadian Infantry Corps, 255 First Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Major T. Mackie, Canadian Infantry Corps, 100 Oriole Parkway, Toronto, Ont.

Major D. W. McIntyre, Canadian Infantry Corps, 528 King St., W., Chatham, Ont.

Major J. A. Northey, Canadian Infantry Corps, 14 Dundas St., Toronto, Ont.

Major V. G. H. Phillips, Canadian Infantry Corps, Shelburne, Ont.

Major W. S. Watt, Canadian Infantry Corps, 531 Furby St., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. (A/Major) H. Campbell, MC, MM, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2521 Chapleau St., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. (A/Major) I. C. Campbell, Canadian Infantry Corps, Kingston, Ont.

Capt. (A/Major) J. L. Stewart, Canadian Infantry Corps, 10 Shorncliff Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. (A/Major) J. E. Stothers, MC, Canadian Infantry Corps, Toronto, Ont.

Capt. R. Boulanger, Canadian Infantry Corps, Ste. Come, P.Q.

Capt. L. J. J. Bourassa, Canadian Infantry Corps, Shawinigan Falls, P.Q.

Capt. R. B. C. Cawsey, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1280-3rd Ave., N.E., Moose Jaw, Sask.

Capt. H. R. Downie, Canadian Infantry Corps, Toronto, Ont.

Capt. J. L. Duchastel de Montrouge, Canadian Infantry Corps, 68 Elmwood Ave., Outremont, P.Q.

Capt. A. H. Holman, Canadian Infantry Corps, Summerside, P.E.I.

Capt. K. N. Kingston, Canadian Infantry Corps, 21 Manning Ave., Peterborough, Ont.

Capt. R. G. Marsh, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2143 Yukon St., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. J. M. Robertson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 115-18th Ave., N.E., Calgary, Alta.

Capt. J. A. Robitaille, Canadian Infantry Corps, 184 St. Joseph Blvd. E., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. B. G. Shellon, Canadian Infantry Corps, 8 Hudson Bay Ave., Kirkland Lake, Ont.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) R. R. Davey, Canadian Infantry Corps, 780-17th St., Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. W. J. Armstrong, Canadian Infantry Corps, 39 Kernahan St., St. Catharines, Ont.

Lieut. W. J. C. Ayers, Canadian Infantry Corps, 778 Ingersoll St., Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. J. L. Davies, Canadian Infantry Corps, 314-5th Ave., N.E., Calgary, Alta.

Lieut. M. G. G. De Merlis, Canadian Infantry Corps, 12 St. Michel St., Quebec, P.Q.

Lieut. G. A. Embury, Canadian Infantry Corps, Corydon Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. G. E. Fleury, Canadian Infantry Corps, 70 Pearl St. N., Hamilton, Ont.

Lieut. C. W. Fullerton, Canadian Infantry Corps, Kingsbridge Rd., St. John's, Nfld.

Lieut. H. L. Hamley, Canadian Infantry Corps, 215 Dublin St., Peterborough, Ont.

Lieut. G. J. Pennock, Canadian Infantry Corps, 148 McIntyre St. W., North Bay, Ont.

Lieut. G. W. Pollard, Canadian Infantry Corps, 758 Vine St., Preston, Ont.

Lieut. F. E. Propp, Canadian Infantry Corps, Togo, Sask.

Lieut. J. D. Riddell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 97 Berkshire Ave., Toronto, Ont.

A4005 WO I (RSM) J. G. Austin, Canadian Infantry Corps, 91 Spring Garden Rd., Halifax, N.S.

D76000 WO I (RSM) J. A. Mitchell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 7076 St. Urbain St., Montreal, P.Q.

H19826 WO II (CSM) J. Forbes, Canadian Infantry Corps, Keewatin, Ont.

C5011 WO II (CSM) W. J. Foster, Canadian Infantry Corps, Belleville, Ont.

B51906 WO II (CSM) F. A. Hodder, Canadian Infantry Corps, 44 William St., Paris, Ont.

E42638 WO II (CSM) G. Hynes, Canadian Infantry Corps, 781 Brewester St., Montreal, P.Q.

M10712 WO II (CSM) H. O. Larson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 220-21st Ave. N.E., Calgary, Alta.

B36615 WO II (CSM) R. Morgan, Canadian Infantry Corps, 33 Forest Ave., Hamilton, Ont.

L27110 WO II (CSM) J. A. Nelson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 312 East 9th Ave., Prince Albert, Sask.

D82922 WO II (CSM) A. F. Turnbull, Canadian Infantry Corps, 986 Dovaar Ave., Outremont, P.Q.

H46145 WO II (CSM) H. W. Usher, Canadian Infantry Corps, Dryden, Ont.

A21120 WO II (CSM) E. J. Wilson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1024 Goyeau St., Windsor, Ont.

L27054 CQMS J. S. Jean, Canadian Infantry Corps, 737 Champagneur Ave., Outremont, P.Q.

B96928 CQMS J. Marshall, Canadian Infantry Corps, 242 Blackthorn Ave., Toronto, Ont.

F44832 Sgt. (A/WO II, CSM) D. Wilson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Victoria St., Westville, N.S.

M11724 Sgt. G. R. Belcher, Canadian Infantry Corps, Bow Island, Alta.

A71032 Sgt. G. F. Collings, Canadian Infantry Corps, 19 Beacher St., London, Ont.

D86197 Sgt. G. F. Dallas, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4648 Wellington St., Verdun, P.Q.

G22650 Sgt. V. Dutcher, Canadian Infantry Corps, Newcastle, N.B.

B146080 Sgt. R. D. Gowland, Canadian Infantry Corps, Main St., Milton West, Ont.

Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

C20799 Sgt. R. A. Henderson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 167 Florence St., Ottawa, Ont.

C11659 Sgt. M. Heriteau, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1260 Bernard Blvd. W., Outremont, P.Q.

B34559 Sgt. W. B. Jackson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 91 Marion St., Toronto, Ont.

B76245 Sgt. N. L. Kemp, Canadian Infantry Corps, Oakville, Ont.

B63979 Sgt. W. A. Lennox, Canadian Infantry Corps, 36 Soulter St., Toronto, Ont.

K57497 Sgt. C. Morgan, Canadian Infantry Corps, 350 Sylvia St., Victoria, B.C.

B76227 Sgt. A. E. Nicholson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 660 Milverton Blvd., Toronto, Ont.

B75945 Sgt. T. W. Noble, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3 Birch Ave., Mt. Dennis, Ont.

G22550 Sgt. W. J. Quigley, Canadian Infantry Corps, Grand Falls, N.B.

H41406 Sgt. A. F. Richardson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Atikokan, Ont.

H19149 Sgt. W. Sheridan, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3807 Victory St., Burnaby, B.C.

K57276 Sgt. M. H. Tetlock, Canadian Infantry Corps, Field, B.C.

B37428 Sgt. L. B. Wilson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Dundas, Ont.

B45945 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) V. J. Mann, Canadian Infantry Corps, 126½ Alfred St., Brantford, Ont.

D137980 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) J. A. Sauve, Canadian Infantry Corps, Vankleek Hill, Ont.

C54273 Cpl. L. J. Coyne, Canadian Infantry Corps, 21 Smith Ave., Cornwall, Ont.

B76784 Cpl. C. A. Ferguson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Aylmer, Ont.

L27465 Cpl. R. L. Fortner, Canadian Infantry Corps, Yellow Grass, Sask.

B74713 Cpl. W. W. Hughes, Canadian Infantry Corps, Bronte, Ont.

F66372 Cpl. I. V. Robart, Canadian Infantry Corps, Fore St., Liverpool, N.S.

K62130 Cpl. A. H. Vose, Canadian Infantry Corps, Alberni, B.C.

C79108 L/Cpl. H. A. Barr, Canadian Infantry Corps, Renfrew, Ont.

B87787 L/Cpl. H. E. Chapman, Canadian Infantry Corps, 232 Ashdale Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B145922 L/Cpl. L. N. Gilchrist, Canadian Infantry Corps, Parry Sound, Ont.

G32766 L/Cpl. R. A. MacNeil, Canadian Infantry Corps, 292 Millidge Ave., Saint John, N.B.

D72275 L/Cpl. G. J. McCabe, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4887 Hutchison St., Montreal, P.Q.

M67704 L/Cpl. C. A. Pearson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Hayter, Alta.

B52246 L/Cpl. H. H. Robinson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Ituma, Sask.

B115285 Pte. (A/Cpl.) D. H. Howard, Canadian Infantry Corps, 211½ Queen St., E., Toronto, Ont.

L103196 Rfn. (A/Cpl.) P. Osachuk, Canadian Infantry Corps, Foam Lake, Sask.

M12059 Pte. (A/Cpl.) R. G. Thomson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Alameda, Sask.

C10041 Pte. F. Banes, Canadian Infantry Corps, Perth Road, Ont.

M16817 Pte. J. Burndred, Canadian Infantry Corps, Calgary, Alta.

D57179 Pte. M. Charron, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4297 Parthenais St., Montreal, P.Q.

C103494 Pte. H. Cousineau, Canadian Infantry Corps, 156½ Leduc St., Hull, P.Q.

D83150 Pte. T. Edgar, Canadian Infantry Corps, 681 Bourgeois St., Montreal, P.Q.

E106727 Pte. L. Glode, Canadian Infantry Corps, 11½ Sagard St., Quebec, P.Q.

E10151 Pte. H. Godin, Canadian Infantry Corps, Laplante Petit Rocher Nord, N.B.

B137895 Pte. E. P. Haley, Canadian Infantry Corps, Matheson, Ont.

B55786 Pte. C. C. D. Harvey, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1 Cabot Road, Grand Falls, Nfld.

M31028 Pte. F. Kublick, Canadian Infantry Corps, 8849 - 94th St., Edmonton, Alta.

C54226 Pte. J. H. MacDonald, Canadian Infantry Corps, Glen Robertson, Ont.

B116737 Pte. H. D. Martin, Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.

F50330 Pte. J. A. McDonald, Canadian Infantry Corps, Clifton, N.S.

B103240 Pte. E. Peer, Canadian Infantry Corps, Caledon, Ont.

A49653 Pte. C. F. Peltier, Canadian Infantry Corps, Wallaceburg, Ont.

B79532 Pte. A. G. Penfold, Canadian Infantry Corps, Colborne, Ont.

H42111 Pte. R. Prince, Canadian Infantry Corps, Matlock, Man.

P40832 Pte. E. J. Ross, Canadian Infantry Corps, Cheverie, N.S.

C20583 Pte. R. P. R. Shea, Canadian Infantry Corps, 571 Wellington St., Ottawa, Ont.

H/Major W. C. McCarney, Canadian Chaplain Services, 420 London St., Peterboro, Ont.

H/Captain J. Cardy, Canadian Chaplain Services, 83 College St., Epson Surrey, Eng.

H/Captain W. E. Harrison, Canadian Chaplain Services, 1077 Dorchester Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

H/Captain J. R. Lang, Canadian Chaplain Services, 120 James St. E., Brockville, Ont.

Lt.-Col. H. E. Hacking, ED, Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 4262 Cypress St., Vancouver, B.C.

Lt.-Col. A. H. Jarvis, OBE, ED, Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 220 Broughdale Ave., London, Ont.

Major (A/Lt.-Col.) L. K. Ash, MBE, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Baden, Ont.

Major R. A. Walker, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Hamilton, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) H. B. Gow, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Calgary, Alta.

Capt. (A/Maj.) E. R. Heuchan, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 267 St. Clements Ave., Toronto 12, Ont.

Capt. J. D. H. Campbell, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, McBride St., Crescent, B.C.

Capt. R. A. Labelle, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Outremont, P.Q.

Capt. J. R. MacKenzie, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Stettler, Alta.

Capt. J. H. MacLaren, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 16 Louisa St., Barrie, Ont.

Capt. H. E. Patrick, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. R. J. Sweezey, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 132 St. James Street, Montreal, P.Q.

Lt. (A/Capt.) J. H. Graham, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 4131 St. Catherine St. W., Montreal, P.Q.

Lt. (A/Capt.) R. S. Ingram, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 4600 Christophe Colomb St., Montreal, P.Q.

Lt. (A/Capt.) J. G. Scott, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 86 Manderley Drive, Toronto 13, Ont.

Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

Lieut. E. A. Baxter, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 302 Nelson St., Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. J. G. Steen, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 62 Marjery Ave., Toronto, Ont.

K79234 W.O. I (M.S.M.) H. L. Davies, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Westview, Powell River, B.C.

U1501 W.O. II (Q.M.S.) A. W. Barnes, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 86 Hatcham Park Road, London S.E. 14, England.

C11831 D. F. Boreham, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 172 Kent St., Ottawa, Ont.

M24100 W.O. II (C.S.M.) J. A. Hext, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 223 Third Ave. West, Calgary, Alta.

B82627 W.O. II (C.S.M.) H. D. Hillier, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 246 Woodmount Ave., Toronto, Ont.

K78856 W.O. II (C.S.M.) W. T. Pearson, M.B.E., The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1915 St. Ann St., Victoria, B.C.

D106607 Mech. S/Sgt. (A/W.O. I) (M.S.M.) N. Brock, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Mansonville, P.Q.

L7307 H. Baller, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Regina, Sask.

M63014 Mech. S/Sgt. W. D. Carruthers, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Creemore, Ont.

G52475 C.Q.M.S. E. R. Libby, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, St. Stephen, N.B.

B98680 Mech. S/Sgt. A. E. Seymour, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Gravenhurst Sanatorium, Gravenhurst, Ont.

B82626 Sgt. W. G. Couch, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 262 Glebemount Ave., Toronto, Ont.

C11459 Sgt. J. Goderre, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 250 Parkdale Avenue, Ottawa, Ont.

C27774 Sgt. R. J. Lindsay, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 16 Union Street, Portsmouth, Ont.

C12655 Sgt. R. MacDonald, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 20 Pearson Avenue, Toronto, Ont.

B81577 Sgt. J. D. Mansell, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Hamiota, Man.

D126530 Sgt. A. S. Mason, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 3805 Verdun Ave., Verdun, P.Q.

M50017 Sgt. W. W. Nutt, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1913 Bowness Rd., Calgary, Alta.

H37891 Sgt. M. E. Ridley, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Beausejour, Man.

K79066 Sgt. E. S. Thompson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1085 East 49th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

A57766 Sgt. W. A. Wigle, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 77 Talbot Street, Leamington, Ont.

H70455 Sgt. D. A. Wilkie, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Douglas, Man.

B83021 L/Sgt. S. Allen, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Joseph St., Port Credit, Ont.

B84520 L/Sgt. H. R. Snyder, The Royal Canadian Army Service. Corps, 1272 St. Clair Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B87661 Cpl. W. G. Barchard, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Newcastle, Ont.

B54245 Cpl. C. T. Burke, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Port Colborne, Ont.

B89216 Cpl. A. Jagger, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 41 Burnfield Ave., Toronto, Ont.

M61637 Cpl. C. Kast, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 343-19th St. N., Lethbridge, Alta.

B80273 Cpl. W. T. Lamb, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 25 Glencairn Ave., Toronto, Ont.

H40754 Cpl. W. R. F. MacIsaac, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 925 St. Mary's Rd., St. Vital, Man.

K92127 Cpl. D. G. McRae, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Coldstream Hotel, Vernon, B.C.

H37782 Cpl. E. F. Noble, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Boissevain, Man.

K73485 Cpl. I. Smith, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Kamloops, B.C.

H37882 L/Cpl. E. Dolke, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Morris, Man.

D131653 L/Cpl. M. B. Keith, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 120 Holbrook Rd., Quincy, Mass, U.S.A.

H65010 L/Cpl. E. Meyers, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 432 Galloway St., Winnipeg, Man.

H57960 L/Cpl. A. J. Stewart, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 108 Balmoral St., Winnipeg, Man.

B55858 L/Cpl H. D. Stewart, Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 23 Lappin Avenue, Toronto, Ont.

C1470 L/Cpl. W. M. Thompson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Dorset, Ont.

L101108 Pte. (A/Cpl.) H. R. Ewen, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Porcupine Plain, Sask.

B89400 Pte. (A/Cpl.) D. W. Jamieson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 25 Glencairn Ave., Toronto, Ont.

D91691 Pte. C. E. Barrett, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 123 11th Ave., Lachine, Que.

F67793 Pte. J. H. Batten, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Kingston, Ont.

K74324 Pte. L. Cervo, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Vancouver, B.C.

C12494 Pte. A. R. Collins, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 49 Lake Ave., Carlton Place, Ont.

B110740 Pte. H. C. Cooper, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Redbridge, Ont.

F64893 Pte. E. L. Decoste, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Antigonish, N.S.

U2089 Pte. H. R. Dixon, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 3 Southey St., Keswick, Eng.

H65650 Pte. H. Espeland, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Sprague, Man.

H87850 Pte. W. R. Hudson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Dugald, Man.

D91871 Pte. M. T. King, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 56 Rivard S., Montreal, Que.

L51225 Pte. K. L. E. Nesseth, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Speers, Sask.

C32089 Pte. E. Sidney, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Raglan St., Renfrew, Ont.

C34752 Pte. C. J. Smith, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 543 Hilson Ave., Laurentian View, Ont.

F76263 Pte. W. A. Spencer, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Waverly, N.S.

Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

B138896 Pte. F. J. Sullivan, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 478 Brock Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lt.-Col. G. C. Ferguson, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 372 Arthur St., Port Arthur, Ont.

Lt.-Col. R. Blais, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 3 de l'Eglise, Quebec, P.Q.

Major H. I. Palmer, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 17 Church St., Brantford, Ont.

Major A. E. Thoms, MBE, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 724 Johnson St., Kingston, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) F. S. Brien, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 806 Ouellette Ave., Windsor, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) C. C. Misener, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 20 Fenwick, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) C. L. Pearson, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 11009-82 Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

Captain P. Bernstein, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Beachburg, Ont.

Captain T. A. Laidlaw, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Sackville, N.B.

Captain N. N. Levinne, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 112 Braemore Gardens, Toronto 10, Ont.

Captain H. A. Roberts, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Winnipeg, Man.

Captain R. G. Winram, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 931 College Ave., Regina, Sask.

Lieut. N. A. Riley, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1410 Parker St., Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. (N/S) S. Eede, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Harrow, Ont.

Lieut. (N/S) E. W. Ewart, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Petrolia, Ont.

Lieut. (N/S) A. J. Goodwin, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1269 Wolseley Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. (N/S) H. E. MacLaine, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 234 Sydney St., Charlottetown, P.E.I.

Lieut. (N/S) G. E. Wallbridge, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1557-West-89th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

F67610 WO I (R.S.M.) L. G. Tremaman, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 255 Barrington St., Halifax, N.S.

H35851 WO II (Q.M.S.), (A/WO 1) (R.S.M.), R. G. Foster, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 21 Lipton St., Winnipeg, Man.

B35046 WO II (Q.M.S.) J. R. Eustace, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 10 Queen St., E., Newmarket, Ont.

F527 WO II (R.Q.M.S.) H. R. MacLachlan, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Great Village, N.S.

E25911 S/Sgt. H. Grenier, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 12 Rue d'Aiguillon, Quebec, P.Q.

A17056 Sgt. F. L. Holloway, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Acton, Ont.

L17082 Sgt. H. E. Kew, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1058 5th Ave., N.E., Moose Jaw, Sask.

A62121 Cpl. R. J. Dunning, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Woodstock, Ont.

D94516 Cpl. A. Spiers, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 4714 Wellington St., Verdun, P.Q.

B107542 Pte. (A/Sgt.) D. D. Watson, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 2340 Lundy's Lane, Niagara Falls, Ont.

L65704 Pte. R. E. K. Balkwill, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Arcola, Sask.

H50632 Pte. E. H. Gladish, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 518 Proper St., St. Boniface, Man.

C29058 Pte. D. H. Holmes, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 673 Quinpool Rd., Halifax, N.S.

H95176 Pte. M. J. Mitchell, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 349-12th St., Brandon, Man.

B9648 Pte. O. I. Niskanen, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Reesor, Ont.

B98733 Pte. C. A. Stirling, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 212 Hatt St., Dundas, Ont.

Major W. E. Bawden, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 21 Quebec Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Captain W. A. Armstrong, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 195 Drew Ave., Oshawa, Ont.

Captain G. C. Douglas, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 1354 Matthews St., Vancouver, B.C.

Captain A. S. Findlater, BEM, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 727-12th Ave., W., Calgary, Alta.

Lieut. F. W. Magee, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 577 William St., London, Ont.

C16661 WO I (Condr.) F. G. Webb, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 215 Bayfield St., Barrie, Ont.

P35292 WO II (SQMS), (A/WO I (S/Condr.)) E. Richards, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 101 Pearson St., Toronto, Ont.

B95349 WO II (RQMS) B. K. Ashley, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 40 Beaconsfield Ave., Toronto, Ont.

C32394 H. J. Doyle, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 82 Russell St., Smiths Falls, Ont.

B58293 S/Sgt. G. T. Fairbrother, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Beamsville, Ont.

D121024 Sgt. S. O. Gifford, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 80½ Perth St., Brockville, Ont.

M40894 Sgt. W. H. Gray, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 1512 26th Ave. St., W., Calgary, Alta.

L12315 Sgt. G. S. Sinclair, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 1603 10th Ave. E., Vancouver, B.C.

L9539 Cpl. J. R. Dean, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 2108 Reynolds St., Regina, Sask.

A29574 Cpl. J. A. Graham, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Cooksville, Ont.

A103088 Cpl. G. F. Miller, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 735 Kings St., London, Ont.

F65805 L/Cpl. L. A. Burke, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 18 Acadia St., Amherst, N.S.

A34612 L/Cpl. W. L. G. Francis, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Granton, Ont.

H65497 L/Cpl. D. C. Skerritt, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 184 Arnold Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

M7414 Pte. (A/Cpl.) W. F. J. Cornwell, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 339-22nd St. E., Prince Albert, Sask.

C73688 Pte. R. J. Christian, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 218 University Ave., Kingston, Ont.

Lt.-Col. C. R. Boehm, MBE, The Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 46 Hewitt Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Major L. P. Baker, The Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 341 Windermere Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Major H. L. K. Mason, The Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 328 South Archibald St., Fort William, Ont.

Major J. R. McLarnon, The Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 332 Emery St., London, Ont.

Major E. A. Perry, The Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 437 Assiniboine Ave, Winnipeg, Man.

Captain R. W. Anderson, The Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Acton, Ont.

Captain W. L. Bland, The Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 51 Hilton Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Captain J. W. Ferguson, The Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 106 Alcina Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Captain N. M. Kogan, The Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 5187 Esplanade Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Captain P. C. Neil, The Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 2050 Metcalfe St., Montreal, Que.

Captain A. B. Otto, The Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Broadway St., Paris, Ont.

Captain H. A. Rice, The Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 665 Government Rd., Chaput-Hughes, Ont.

A029146 WO I (Armt.S/M) G. G. Matthews, The Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 865 Charlotte Rd., Windsor, Ont.

B94170 WO II (QMS) F. G. Allen, The Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Arnprior, Ont.

B3853 WO II (CSM) B. J. Bye, The Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 290 Chisholm St., Toronto, Ont.

B94527 WO II (QMS) P. A. Farmer, The Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 116 Danforth Ave., Toronto, Ont.

L2157 S/Sgt. W. T. Duckett, The Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 921 7th Ave., N., Saskatoon, Sask.

K73061 Armt. S/Sgt. F. J. Huish, The Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Whonack, B.C.

L7506 Sgt. (A/S/Sgt.) C. G. Hallam, The Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Weyburn, Sask.

K70160 Sgt. W. E. Dale, the Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 3836 17th Ave., W., Vancouver, B.C.

A20499 Sgt. C. E. Fox, The Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Brunner Ave., Amherstburg, Ont.

A68191 Sgt. D. M. Hill, The Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Markdale, Ont.

H99097 Sgt. F. A. Thomson, The Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 126 Cordona St., Winnipeg, Man.

G18697 Cpl. (A/Armt.S/Sgt.) H. B. Stewart, The Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Florenceville, N.B.

B58738 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) G. Glenn, The Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 371 Queen St., Midland, Ont.

D98506 Cpl. S. Bullock, The Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 1225 University St., Montreal, P.Q.

H99248 Cpl. W. G. Harrison, The Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 1013 Ashburn St., Winnipeg, Man.

A64165 Cpl. G. W. Jones, The Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Belgrave, Ont.

G49084 Cpl. J. I. Murray, The Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Main St., Moncton, N.B.

G32727 Cfn. C. R. Jones, The Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Grangeville N.B.

C32781 Cfn. P. Macki, The Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 35 Main St., Ottawa, E., Ont.

D117222 Cfn. C. Menzie, The Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 18 Rosewarns Ave., St. Vital, Man.

Major H. E. Simmons, Canadian Dental Corps, 5512 Olympic St., Vancouver, B.C.

Captain F. M. Roulston, Canadian Dental Corps, 50 Cedar St., Sudbury, Ont.

L8005 S/Sgt. M. F. Whetter, Canadian Dental Corps, Daphne, Sask.

H53004 Sgt. J. D. Connors, Canadian Dental Corps, 249 Albany St., St. James, Man.

B5277 Sgt. A. J. Tait, Canadian Dental Corps, Rockwell Ave., Toronto, Ont.

M42087 Pte. G. O. Bogstie, Canadian Dental Corps, Arrowwood, Alta.

Captain N. Anton, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 124 Keefer St., Ottawa, Ont.

M20505 WO II (QMS) H. C. Bowman, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 2417-14th St., W., Calgary, Alta.

P38259 WO II (QMS) J. C. Erving, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 21 Quinn St., Halifax, N.S.

G45157 S/Sgt. D. C. Smith, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 23 High St., Saint John, N.B.

A3246 Sgt. F. S. Doig, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, Guelph, Ont.

K91670 Sgt. W. A. West, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 3300 Harriet Rd., Victoria, B.C.

B81475 Cpl. H. P. Baylis, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 305 Tweedsmuir, Ave., Toronto, Ont.

H17030 Cpl. A. J. Bozyk, Canadian Postal Corps, Durban, Man.

Capt. (A/Major) C. O. Rochon, The Canadian Provost Corps, 4043 Hampton Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

G48715 Sgt. M. Hunter, The Canadian Provost Corps, 1452 Bishop St., Montreal, P.Q.

C5091 Sgt. C. Newman, The Canadian Provost Corps, Pictou, Ont.

B31091 Sgt. W. Seggie, The Canadian Provost Corps, 82 Harvie St., Toronto, Ont.

C421 Cpl. E. H. Perfect, The Canadian Provost Corps, Bowmanville, Ont.

B116252 L/Cpl. R. E. Gold, The Canadian Provost Corps, 791B Lakeshore Rd., New Toronto, Ont.

Major P. W. Belson, Canadian Forestry Corps, 990 Terrace Ave., Victoria, B.C.

Major F. J. L. Molyneux, Canadian Forestry Corps, 42 Beauce Rd., Beauharnois, P.Q.

Captain J. E. Gracie, Canadian Forestry Corps, Caraquet, N.B.

Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

C63147 Sgt. D. C. Card, Canadian Forestry Corps, Hybla, Ont.

M61893 Sgt. L. E. Eggleston, Canadian Forestry Corps, Edmonton, Alta.

Major A. E. Holden, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, 3 Airdrie Rd., Toronto, Ont.

D77165 Sgt. W. J. Quirk, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, 5317 St. Denis St., Montreal, Que.

Captain M. C. Sheilds, Canadian Women's Army Corps, 24 High St., Saint John, N.B.

W3055 Pte. E. M. Bautz, Canadian Women's Army Corps, 53 Landrigan St., Arnprior, Ont.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) J. Certain de Beaujeu, Canadian Intelligence Corps, Domaine d'Esterel, Lac Masson, P.Q.

Lieut. D. W. Taylor, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 97 Avenue Rd., Toronto, Ont.

H46297 WO II (CSM) J. A. Rahn, Canadian Intelligence Corps, Black Hawk, Ont.

K89337 Cpl. W. Rempel, Canadian Intelligence Corps, Swalwell, Alta.

L36616 Cpl. E. O. Rohac, Canadian Intelligence Corps, Loon River, Sask.

Lt.-Col. R. A. Harris, General List, Young & Bloor Sts., Toronto, Ont.

Lt.-Col. J. W. Proctor, OBE, General List, Jasper Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

Major R. H. Funnel, General List, 294 Woodlawn St., St. James, Man.

Major W. B. Martin, MC, General List, 928 Riverdale Ave., Calgary, Alta.

Capt. (A/Major) A. L. S. Ireton, General List, 103 Matchedash St., W., Orillia, Ont.

Capt. (A/Major) J. O. A. Letellier, General List, 256 Wilbrod St., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. (A/Major) T. J. E. McClelland, General List, 204 Percival Ave., Montreal, West, P.Q.

Capt. W. L. Archer, General List, 871 Dundas St., London, Ont.

Capt. T. T. M. Ferris, General List, 29 Balmoral Ave., London, Ont.

Capt. V. H. Hart, General List, Unity, Sask.

Supr. H. A. Brown, Auxiliary Services, 442 Hillsdale Ave. East, Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. S. W. Nichols, MC, Canadian Infantry Corps, Red Deer, Alta.

Lieut. W. H. Pope, Canadian Infantry Corps, 369 Daly Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

G18514 Pte. C. A. Orser, Canadian Infantry Corps, Hartland, N.B.

A21183 Pte. D. E. Shepherd, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3552 Sandwich St, W., Windsor, Ont.

Maj. (A/Lt.-Col.) F. M. Payne, General List, 274 Lytton Blvd., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. J. G. Coote, ED, Royal Canadian Artillery, 28 St. Amable St., Quebec, P.Q.

Maj. E. D. Magnus, MBE, Canadian Intelligence Corps, Montreal, P.Q.

Maj. L. W. Taylor, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 53 Lakeshore Drive, Toronto, Ont.

Maj. J. A. Willoughby, Canadian Intelligence Corps, London, Ont.

Maj. J. A. Wright, Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1742 W. 40th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. (A/Maj.) J. M. Magwood, General List, 21 Lewes Crescent, Toronto, Ont.

Capt. A. E. Andrews, General List, 74 Sunnyside Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. F. A. Barnes, Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 49 Roselawn Ave., Toronto, Ont.

[Mr. Abbott.]

Capt. J. R. Gauthier, Canadian Provost Corps, 15 Quinn Terrace, Longueuil, P.Q.

Capt. J. A. Gray, Canadian Intelligence Corps, Stellarton, N.S.

Capt. G. K. M. Johnston, ED, Canadian Infantry Corps, 42 Robertson Ave., Chatham, Ont.

Capt. E. W. MacDonald, Royal Canadian Artillery, Cupar, Sask.

Capt. T. W. Platt, Royal Canadian Artillery, Wingham, Ont.

Lieut. R. Barre, Canadian Provost Corps, 368 Besserer St., Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. L. J. Durocher, Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 209 York St., Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. R. E. Robichaud, Canadian Infantry Corps, 105 Rideau Terrace, Ottawa, Ont.

K53452 Sgt. J. Faucher, Canadian Provost Corps, Duck Lake, Sask.

K8138 Cpl. T. Fraser, Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Brandon, Man.

G18534 L/Cpl. A. L. Bulmer, Canadian Infantry Corps, 113 High Field St., Moncton, N.B.

K2126 Pte. L. K. Dunne, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1137 Retallack St., Regina, Sask.

H1089 Pte. M. M. Petrow, Canadian Infantry Corps, 519 Giroux St., St. Boniface, Man.

M103108 J. M. Stoley, Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Heart River, Alta.

Maj. W. H. Caven, Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 129 Iona St., Ottawa, Ont.

Maj. E. L. Littleford, Canadian Infantry Corps, 656 Elias St., London, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) J. I. Matas, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 121 Euclid Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. J. H. M. Dehler, MM, General List, 323 Besserer St., Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. J. E. Fournier, General List, Petit Rocher, N.B.

Maj. R. C. Gibb, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1231 Beach Drive, Victoria, B.C.

B78761 Pte. E. Reeves, Canadian Infantry Corps, 204 Lumsden Ave., Toronto, Ont.

L10374 Spr. H. E. Perrin, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Megan, Sask.

B115977 Pte. L. E. Harper, Canadian Infantry Corps, 11 Winslow Ave., Etobicoke, Ont.

L104110 Tpr. W. R. Bishop, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Mervin, Sask.

C20821 Sgt. K. B. O'Hara, Canadian Infantry Corps, 176 First Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

M41481 Sgt. D. M. MacQuarrie, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Balgonie, Sask.

Lieut. H. S. J. Upham, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 20 DeMonts Street, West Saint John, N.B.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) F. R. Caron, Canadian Infantry Corps, 10 Kirby Ave., Timmins, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) H. B. Boates, Canadian Infantry Corps, Pictou, Pictou Co., N.S.

Major D. J. McCordic, Canadian Infantry Corps, 27 Wrenson Rd., Toronto, Ont.

F22448 L/Cpl. D. W. Ryan, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Pomd St., Sidney Mines, N.S.

Captain L. P. Chesney, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 634 Murray Hill, Westmount, P.Q.

B93611 Sgt. M. J. McAlinden, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 27 Steiner St. E., Toronto, Ont.

H37796 Cpl. E. E. Larkin, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Marquette, Man.

M12024 Pte. E. Stokke, Canadian Infantry Corps, Lougheed, Alta.

Lt.-Gen. C. Foulkes, CBE, DSO, Canadian Army, Eltham Foul Bay Rd., Victoria, B.C.

Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

Brigadier E. A. McCusker, CBE, MC, ED, Canadian Army, Ste. 1, Madrid Apts., Regina, Sask.

Brigadier W. C. Murphy, DSO, ED, Canadian Army, 4350 Marguerita Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Colonel M. S. Dunn, OBE, ED, Canadian Army, 419 Fourth St. E., Cornwall, Ont.

Colonel E. B. Wilson, OBE, ED, Canadian Army, 11121-90 Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

Lt.-Col. (A/Brig.) J. S. H. Lind, DSO, Canadian Army, St. Mary's, Ont.

Major D. A. Fitzgerald, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Old Yonge St., York Mills, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) M. W. Rawlinson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 189 Highbourne Rd., Toronto 12, Ont.

Capt. J. A. Cole, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 85A Oxford St., Guelph, Ont.

Capt. J. M. Harold, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 17 Jane St., Paris, Ont.

Capt. J. C. Letcher, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Fernie, B.C.

Capt. A. Walton, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 3181 Travers Ave., West Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. N. F. Wilkins, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Apt. 6-82 Delatre St., Woodstock, Ont.

Lieut. G. W. Dauphinee, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 35 John St., Halifax, N.S.

Capt. A. F. Johnston, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 496 St. James St., London, Ont.

Lieut. J. C. Pallett, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, R.R. No. 1, Port Credit, Ont.

Lieut. E. S. Stokes, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 294 Wellington St., Sarnia, Ont.

Lieut. H. D. Watson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 6830 Hinds Ave., N. Hollywood, Calif.

K1631 WO I (RSM) R. W. Hodgson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Vernon, B.C.

G143 WO II (MQMS) W. S. Coutts, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, St. George, N.B.

P1579 WO II (SSM) R. W. Deeming, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Apt. 5, 31 Melbourne Ave., Toronto, Ont.

K92186 WO II (RQMS) P. F. Hilborn, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Kelowna, B.C.

D-36525 WO II (RQMS) C. P. Moliere, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 760 N. Miro St., New Orleans, U.S.A.

D71113 SQMS E. R. J. Fraser, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 1172 MacKay St., Montreal, P.Q.

P1602 SQMS A. H. Gough, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 235 Vaughan Road, Toronto, Ont.

P35270 S/Sgt. F. A. Quimet, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 443 Nepean St., Ottawa, Ont.

M26932 SQMS L. D. Williams, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Erskine, Alta.

H237 Sgt. D. F. Eveleigh, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Virden, Man.

M170404 Sgt. W. J. Frost, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 11546-84th St., Edmonton, Alta.

A44030 Sgt. W. D. Garraway, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 9 Henry St., St. Thomas, Ont.

L2520 Sgt. W. James, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 96 Edinboro Rd., Guelph, Ont.

P1669 Sgt. E. S. Johnson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Hagermans Corners, Milliken, Ont.

D36691 Sgt. L. Kemp, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Alexandria, Ont.

B61012 Sgt. W. A. Nelson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Warkworth, Ont.

M27116 Sgt. D. M. R. Patterson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 204-15th St. N.W., Calgary, Alta.

L54812 Sgt. N. A. Severson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Edam, Sask.

D36596 Sgt. R. H. Sparks, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 971 Regent Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

B69674 Sgt. C. G. Tompson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 522 Delaware Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B131 Sgt. J. A. Tracy, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Dunchurch, Ont.

A42068 L/Sgt. H. J. Funnell, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 135 Canterbury St., Ingersoll, Ont.

G474 Cpl. A. A. Chaters, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 168 Pine St., South Devon, N.B.

G210 Cpl. A. H. Englehart, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Lakeburn, West Co., N.B.

B60542 Cpl. J. R. Groat, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 257 Albert St., Oshawa, Ont.

H406 Cpl. M. H. Koffman, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Dauphin, Man.

B69897 Cpl. N. MacDonald, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 132 Ivy Ave., Toronto, Ont.

G190 Cpl. W. J. Preston, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 3 Rivers St., Saint John, N.B.

M27162 L/Cpl. D. R. McCoy, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Carstairs, Alta.

C70439 Tpr. (A/Sgt.) R. J. Barbier, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 18 Balsam St., Ottawa, Ont.

B149047 Tpr. (A/Cpl.) R. A. Gray, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Newcastle, Ont.

F30443 Tpr. T. Allen, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 7 Park Ave., Amherst, N.S.

A42350 Tpr. A. F. Bagnall, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 81 Bond St., North Hamilton, Ont.

L18502 Tpr. A. W. Harris, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Antler, Sask.

B67940 Tpr. W. C. Harris, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Thessalon, Ont.

D122928 Tpr. J. Neuspiel, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 140-30 Ash Ave., Long Island, N.Y.

M63803 Tpr. A. T. Race, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 10223-107th St., Edmonton, Alta.

A3850 Tpr. S. H. Schnarr, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 73½ Frederick St., Kitchener, Ont.

D233 Tpr. R. Viscusi, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 4092 Cartier St., Montreal, Que.

B7127 Tpr. C. D. Westover, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 30 Duplex Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. E. L. de Pencier, Royal Canadian Artillery, 56 Curzon St., London, Ont.

Maj. F. E. Goulding, Royal Canadian Artillery, Simcoe, Ont.

Maj. C. S. McKay, Royal Canadian Artillery, 2183 Bloor St. W., Toronto, Ont.

Major R. M. Quigley, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 65 West 63rd Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Major R. S. Wallace, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 237 May St., Fort William, Ont.

Major G. T. White, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 301 Stewart St., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. (A/Major) F. B. Rolph, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Prince William St., Saint John, N.B.

Capt. E. A. Coolen, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 116 Quinpool Rd., Halifax, N.S.

Capt. H. G. Crocker, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Newcastle, N.B.

Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

Capt. L. H. Dunsdon, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 185 Sydenham St., Brantford, Ont.

Capt. J. E. Eyres, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 717 Campbell Ave., Windsor, Ont.

Capt. J. B. Francis, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Indian Head, Sask.

Capt. T. D. Groves, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Quolicum Beach, Vancouver Island, B.C.

Capt. T. B. Harrison, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Harrow, Ont.

Capt. T. W. MacDonald, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Indian Head, Sask.

Capt. G. R. Pulkinghorn, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 241 Stuart St., Peterboro, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) J. R. Brick, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 161 Howard Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) J. M. Church, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Cranbrook, B.C.

Lt. (A/Capt.) H. W. Hilder, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 129 Niagara St., Welland, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) W. J. Hume, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 459 Lillooet St. W., Moose Jaw, Sask.

Lt. (A/Capt.) L. W. O'Banion, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 454 Second Ave., Niagara Falls, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) D. M. Scott, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1320 Dallas Rd., Victoria, B.C.

Lt. W. G. Barker, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 142 Huron St., Stratford, Ont.

Lieut. J. E. Derry, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Craigmyle, Alta.

Lieut. S. F. Farrow, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Red Deer, Alta.

Lieut. J. M. Lanouette, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Coal Valley, Alta.

Lieut. R. M. Whicher, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Wiarton, Ont.

P7137 WOI (RSM) J. L. Younker, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Winnipeg, Man.

D9029 WOII (BSM) W. Brown, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 5664 Sherbrooke St. W., Montreal, Que.

K8041 WOII (QMS) A. H. H. Donald, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Nelson, B.C.

P6650 WOII (BSM) W. H. Hardon, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 5 Ossington Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

D6502 WOII (BSM) F. W. Neale, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 29-4th Ave., Verdun, Que.

B6305 WOII (BSM) A. R. Nicol, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 32 Montrose Ave., Toronto, Ont.

H24101 WOII (BSM) E. C. Stones, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 938 Banning St., Winnipeg, Man.

L18060 WOII (BSM) T. Walton, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1656 Venables St., Vancouver, B.C.

D10612 S/Sgt. J. J. McDermott, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 6663 Delormier St., Montreal, Que.

G5084 Sgt. W. H. Bell, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 267 Charlotte St., Fredericton, N.B.

D10967 Sgt. F. J. Bendle, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 9922-111 St., Edmonton, Alta.

H35301 Sgt R. J. Byers, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Roland, Man.

G7176 Sgt. A. A. Cudmore, The Roal Canadian Artillery, Georgetown, Moncton, N.B.

C10420 Sgt. C. Doherty, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 125½ Pretoria Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

B13152 Sgt. H. F. Ireland, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 350 St. Pauls Ave., Brantford, Ont.

D10518 Sgt. W. F. Johnson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 3 Huron St. East, Newmarket, Ont.

E34806 Sgt. W. LeLacheur, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Rosebridge, Que.

E21946 Sgt. S. O. McKinley, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 240 St. John St., Quebec, Que.

G5099 Sgt. J. C. Sansom, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Napadogan, N.B.

D10632 Sgt. G. W. Sexton, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 745 Champangneur Ave., Outremont, Que.

P9483 Sgt. S. M. Smith, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Eganville, Ont.

B10166 D. Stockwell, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 80 Lowell Ave., St. Catharines, Ont.

F82040 Sgt. G. T. Tanner, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Wolfville, N.S.

B7074 Sgt. H. Taylor, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 11½ Aberdeen Ave., Toronto, 5, Ont.

D9131 Sgt. C. Thoms, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 111 Willibrord Ave., Verdun, Que.

B21166 Sgt. M. D. Weir, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 124 Braemar Ave., Toronto, Ont.

L18111 L/Sgt. C. Fitzgerald, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Regina, Sask.

B28861 L/Sgt. F. J. Gifford, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Romford, Ont.

B93756 L/Sgt. V. M. Kipp, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 23 Bernard Ave., Toronto, Ont.

D9515 L/Sgt. G. C. Philip, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 5211 Byron Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

H60004 L/Sgt. A. V. Rampton, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Dauphin, Man.

C9383 L/Sgt. F. B. Roach, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 102 Charles St., Kingston, Ont.

D10821 L/Sgt. S. R. Solway, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 383 Lake Promenade, Long Branch, Ont.

B17639 L/Sgt. W. H. Willis, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 45 Brownlaw Ave., Toronto, Ont.

D10805 Bdr. (A/Sgt.) G. B. Carter, The Royal Canadian Artillery, St. John's, Newfoundland.

H59583 Bdr. W. Chilton, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1603 Franklin St., Vancouver, B.C.

K25441 Bdr. A. H. Currie, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Hazenmore, Sask.

D9058 Bdr. F. Donlan, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 774-1st Ave., Verdun, Que.

C63543 Bdr. A. C. Elliott, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Brighton, Ont.

L35026 Bdr. A. S. Fleming, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Indian Head, Sask.

C1818 Bdr. R. B. Hutchison, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Bourlamaque, Que.

H76130 Bdr. E. R. Little, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Dryden, Man.

D12123 Bdr. J. D. MacLean, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 4528 Lafontaine St., Montreal, P.Q.

B17641 Bdr. F. A. McDonell, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 473 Marsueretta St., Toronto, Ont.

B28715 Bdr. G. W. Merritt, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Kings St., Ridgetown, Ont.

D11017 Bdr. D. S. Neil, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 146 Denison Ave., Granby, P.Q.

D6583 Bdr. L. Taylor, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 5905 Beaulieu Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

D6728 Bdr. D. A. Williams, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1327 Conway St., Montreal, P.Q.

H60229 L/Bdr. E. Leader, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Morden, Man.

Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

A28589 L/Bdr. P. J. MacEachern, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Holstein, Ont.

B7061 L/Bdr. G. H. Webster, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 656 Parliament St., Toronto, Ont.

H66417 Gnr. (A/Bdr.) J. W. Kornyk, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Rossburn, Man.

F16727 Gnr. C. G. Atkinson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Round Hill, N.S.

K46785 Gnr. R. V. Bennett, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 912 Broughton St., Vancouver, B.C.

B44721 Gnr. J. E. Blanchfield, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 871 Maple St., Niagara Falls, Ont.

F14172 Gnr. G. E. Bonnell, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 62 Great George St., Charlottetown, P.E.I.

B44013 Gnr. R. Burman, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 295 Park Ave., Brantford, Ont.

B11424 Gnr. R. R. Cameron, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 276 Westmoreland Ave., Toronto, Ont.

G5093 Gnr. D. A. Cròll, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Nashwaak, N.B.

B110949 Gnr. W. G. Danyer, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 267 Westmount Ave., Toronto, Ont.

D14547 Gnr. O. Doyon, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Sherbrooke, P.Q.

D10755 Gnr. H. O. L. Duggan, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Knowlton, P.Q.

K15029 Gnr. R. E. Dunning, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1832-W., 7th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

B21764 Gnr. C. A. Eisenbach, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Ayton, Ont.

B111949 Gnr. J. T. Forsyth, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 99 Laughton Ave., Toronto, Ont.

C63857 Gnr. E. E. Helm, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 290½ Front St., Belleville, Ont.

H76131 Gnr. E. Kristjanson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Geraldton, Ont.

H95378 Gnr. J. J. LaFontaine, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Sioux Lookout, Ont.

F78893 Gnr. J. E. MacDonald, The Royal Canadian Artillery, St. Charles, P.E.I.

B6876 Gnr. J. Manuel, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Vanessa, Ont.

B98154 Gnr. R. J. Marier, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 402 King St., Sudbury, Ont.

L103072 Gnr. N. G. Marshall, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Scrip, Sask.

B85216 Gnr. D. A. Miller, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Freeman, Ont.

B43721 Gnr. A. J. A. Neller, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 45 Sutherland Ave., Toronto, Ont.

L416 Gnr. A. J. Patterson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Duncan, Vancouver Isl., B.C.

B6908 Gnr. D. F. Potter, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 44 Welland Ave., St. Catharines, Ont.

K7045 Gnr. A. E. Powell, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 890 Bell Place, Trail, B.C.

K25138 Gnr. W. G. Prior, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Hope Bay, Pender Island, B.C.

D10157 Gnr. N. T. Pyke, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1014 Gilford St., Montreal, P.Q.

L35011 Gnr. D. A. Robertson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Indian Head, Sask.

F87502 Gnr. A. L. Roulston, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Elmsdale, N.S.

B44603 Gnr. O. A. Samarillo, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2378 Gerrard St. East, Toronto, Ont.

M50193 Gnr. M. Storey, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 430 12th St. N.W., Calgary, Alta.

C63818 Gnr. L. Vollum, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Ameliasburg, Ont.

G5005 Gnr. G. E. Wade, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 65 Enterprise St., Moncton, N.B.

B64683 Gnr. R. Wadeson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 69 Timmins St., North Bay, Ont.

K92490 Gnr. G. Watson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Rossland, B.C.

L35067 Gnr. A. J. Wright, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Aneroid, Sask.

Lieut. E. W. Dowd, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 159 First Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. W. J. Milhausen, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Morden, Man.

A18122 WO II (CSM) E. L. Cole, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 180 Victoria Ave. S., Hamilton, Ont.

H25121 WO II (Mech. (QMS)) J. M. Hotson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 344 Union Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

F91604 CQMS H. G. Preeper, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 12 Bloomfield St., Halifax, N.S.

L19017 Sgt. T. Barton, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Estevan, Sask.

H25016 Sgt. G. W. Elrick, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 650 Beverly St., Winnipeg, Man.

B28489 Sgt. R. K. Gauvreau, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 36 Wineva Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B28506 Sgt. W. M. Hastie, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 95 Third Street, Kirkland Lake, Ont.

C2006 Sgt. A. F. Westerby, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 589 Wellington St., Ottawa, Ont.

L19325 L/Sgt. E. L. Bellows, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Beechy, Sask.

B94840 L/Sgt. A. Brown, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 223 Jones Ave., Toronto, 8, Ont.

H13120 L/Sgt. G. C. Finch, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 558 Arlington St., Winnipeg, Man.

B5818 L/Sgt. D. McChesney, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 24 Wilson Ave., Timmins, Ont.

C30186 L/Sgt. A. Meron, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 64A Lois St., Hull, P.Q.

H25080 Cpl. H. E. Brown, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 182 Colony St., Winnipeg, Man.

H13109 Cpl. C. Kowalsky, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Main & Bannatyne, Winnipeg, Man.

M65556 Cpl. A. A. Lawrence, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Clandonald, Alta.

M65903 Cpl. R. H. Lynes, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Jarvis, Alta.

M54465 Cpl. R. M. MacDonald, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Cecil Lake, B.C.

B39529 Cpl. J. C. McCabe, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 66 Silver St., Cobalt, Ont.

H2936 Cpl. K. McKay, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, LaRiviere, Man.

H25299 Cpl. C. W. Milan, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1105 Ashburn St., Winnipeg, Man.

C2125 Cpl. J. A. Ouellette The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 147 York St., Ottawa, Ont.

Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

H36384 Cpl. R. M. Pedlar, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 652 Nassau St., Winnipeg, Man.

L19123 Cpl. J. S. Spokes, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1180 Cameron St., Regina, Sask.

M59188 Cpl. C. T. Thon, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Gull Lake, Sask.

M104011 Cpl. V. Westergaard, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 9675 99th St., Edmonton, Alta.

F22369 L/Cpl. J. W. Barlow, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Emerald St., New Waterford, N.S.

M103569 L/Cpl. E. E. Brinson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Olds, Alta.

L74676 L/Cpl. H. H. Caldwell, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Tisdale, Sask.

B28833 L/Cpl. E. N. Irvin, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Mount Forest, Ont.

D15200 L/Cpl. J. R. Johnson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Eastman, Que.

D16276 L/Cpl. H. O. McLellan, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 730-2nd Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

B5824 L/Cpl. J. M. Pletch, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Stratford, Ont.

H13191 L/Cpl. E. G. Tessman, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 701 Sherbrook St., Winnipeg, Man.

B100676 Spr. K. H. Bishop, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 82 Poulette St., Hamilton, Ont.

M65671 Spr. S. Fucsko, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Irma, Alta.

H57875 Spr. L. A. Griffith, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 616 Balmoral St., Winnipeg, Man.

D16526 Spr. V. A. Hogan, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 2575 Holt St., Montreal, P.Q.

M105145 Spr. P. S. Mathison, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 194 Bridge Ave., Windsor, Ont.

H2103 Spr. H. Pinder, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1499 Ross Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

B29202 Spr. W. B. Plummer, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Feversham, Ont.

C12689 Spr. D. F. Scharf, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 21 Armstrong St., Ottawa, Ont.

B92968 Spr. W. S. Scott, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 3 New Court, Pennsylvania, U.S.A.

D16707 Spr. K. E. Suttner, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Tupper Creek, B.C.

K31581 Spr. H. C. Tower, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1329 Harwood St., Vancouver, B.C.

H2104 Spr. T. Treller, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1459 Bannatyne Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

H103346 Spr. R. B. Williams, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Musquodoboit Harbour, N.S.

D15840 Spr. C. M. Worden, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, St. Therese de Blainville, P.Q.

Capt. H. E. Good, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, North Gower, Ont.

Capt. G. R. Kell, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 27 William St., Allendale, Ont.

Capt. E. A. Phillips, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Buckingham, P.Q.

Lieut. D. R. Burrill, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 32 Pitt St., St. John, N.B.

Lieut. W. W. Finlay, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Napanee, Ont.

Lieut. J. A. Shivas, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 137 Nile St., Stratford, Ont.

A2051 WO I (RSM) R. L. Lackie, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 24 Kensington St., London, Ont.

B33200 WO II (CSM) A. K. Geddes, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 1163-4th Ave., East, Owen Sound, Ont.

B33058 WO II (RQMS) W. F. McGowan, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 32 Prust Ave., Toronto, 8, Ont.

B31024 CQMS E. G. Clark, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 67 Allen Ave., Toronto, Ont.

A2193 Sgt. A. MacPherson, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 58 Hemlock St., St. Thomas, Ont.

D21303 Sgt. G. R. McKenzie, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 4997 Adam St., Montreal, Que.

K34969 Cpl (A/Sgt.) G. H. Clark, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Barriere, P.O., B.C

B31670 Cpl. S. L. Button, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 40 North Park St., Belleville, Ont.

F26337 Cpl. H. E. Carmichael, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 198 Cumberland St., Charlottetown, P.E.I.

B111267 Cpl. R. A. Hill, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 27 Hiawatha Rd., Toronto, Ont.

B34522 Cpl. J. F. McCann, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 321 King St., Dundas, Ont.

L22496 Cpl. J. H. Selman, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 700 Cambie St., Vancouver, B.C.

A2197 Cpl. J. A. Sherlock, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 372 Eva St., London, Ont.

B31700 Cpl. O. S. Thibideau, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 272 Albert St., Stratford, Ont.

D21574 Cpl. E. L. Treagus, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 1028 Brault Ave., Verdun, Que.

L20044 L/Cpl. G. W. Adams, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, White Rock, B.C.

B31604 L/Cpl. G. Bowers, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 95 Gowan Ave., Toronto, 6, Ont.

K35713 L/Cpl. S. T. Brooks, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Cloverdale, B.C.

P40290 L/Cpl. J. G. Edwards, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Glenavon, Sask.

F29032 L/Cpl. R. A. Freeman, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 34 Ryland Ave., Truro, N.S.

C3050 L/Cpl. W. W. McDougall, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 62 Elm St., Ottawa, Ont.

B38917 L/Cpl. T. S. Tolland, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Gore's Landing, Ont.

M36359 L/Cpl. W. Westmoreland, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Falun, Alta.

H38975 L/Cpl. A. G. Wiseman, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 478 Maryland St., Winnipeg, Man.

Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

B38900 Sigmn. R. G. Barber, The Royal Canadian Corp of Signals, Church St., Orangeville, Ont.

D21426 Sigmn. F. Biggs, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 5500-13th St., Montreal, Que.

B31625 Sigmn. J. E. Broughton, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 198 Symington Ave., Toronto, Ont.

M9016 Sigmn. P. Chapman, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 1404 Bowness Rd., Calgary, Alta.

M101834 Sigmn. C. L. Clarke, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 204-18th Ave., N.W., Calgary, Alta.

D20157 Sigmn. J. H. Ferguson, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 442 Egan Ave., Verdun, Que.

D116116 Sigmn. W. J. Fishley, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 198 Browning St., Haileybury, Ont.

F2954 Sigmn. M. MacDonald, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 368 Brookside St., Glace Bay, N.S.

G28637 Sigmn. B. H. McAloney, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 303 Rockland Rd., Saint John, N.B.

B32861 Sigmn. E. T. Mitchell, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Gorham St., Newmarket, Ont.

A2429 Sigmn. O. S. Seip, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 13 Menno St., Waterloo, Ont.

Lt.-Col. D. Cameron, DSO, Canadian Infantry Corps, 308 Pitt St., Cornwall, Ont.

Lt.-Col. G. C. Corbould, DSO, Canadian Infantry Corps, 503-6th Ave., New Westminster, B.C.

Lt.-Col. R. C. Merrick, MC, ED, Canadian Infantry Corps, 49 St. Clair Ave. W., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. (A/Lt.-Col.) J. R. Stone, Canadian Infantry Corps, Blueberry Mountain, Alta.

Major A. T. Brown, Canadian Infantry Corps, 16 Blenheim Rd., Galt, Ont.

Major J. H. Gowan, Canadian Infantry Corps, 46 St. George's Cres., Edmonton, Alta.

Major W. G. Longhurst, Canadian Infantry Corps, 10531-85th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

Major O. H. Mace, Canadian Infantry Corps, Innisfail, Alta.

Major F. G. McLaren, Canadian Infantry Corps, 9 Meredith Crescent, Toronto, Ont.

Major I. S. Wallace, Canadian Infantry Corps, 59 Poplar Plains Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) R. H. Hilborn, Canadian Infantry Corps, 406 King St., Preston, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) L. A. Watling, Canadian Infantry Corps, Chatham, Northumberland, N.B.

Capt. E. B. Bradish, Canadian Infantry Corps, Chilliwack, B.C.

Capt. H. T. Frizzell, Canadian Infantry Corps, Kentville, N.S.

Capt. G. S. Horgan, Canadian Infantry Corps, 221 St. George St., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. H. S. Robinson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Franklin Apts., Regina, Sask.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) G. M. Davies, Canadian Infantry Corps, 355 Chalmers Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) J. H. M. Eagar, Canadian Infantry Corps, Wolfville, N.S.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) A. B. Edgar, Canadian Infantry Corps, Hampton, N.B.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) W. W. Leach, Canadian Infantry Corps, Orangeville, Ont.

Lieut. A. L. R. DesRosiers, Canadian Infantry Corps, 430 Willowdale Ave., Outremont, P.Q.

Lieut. A. D. Egan, Canadian Infantry Corps, 153 Quebec St., Sherbrooke, P.Q.

Lieut. G. F. Halliwell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 475 Windsor St., Halifax, N.S.

Lieut. P .P. E. LaRochelle, Canadian Infantry Corps, 228 McDonald St., Peterborough, Ont.

Lieut. W. E. Matheson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Queen St., Westville, N.S.

Lieut. D. M. Smith, Canadian Infantry Corps, 23 Huss Ave., Brantford, Ont.

Lieut. R. Yelle, Canadian Infantry Corps, Baie Shawinigan, Que.

F29839 WO I (RSM) W. R. Callaghan, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4 Ma. St., Halifax, N.S.

B24120 WO I (RSM) G. A. McKelvey, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1368 Danforth Ave., Toronto, Ont.

C20006 WO II (QMS) J. R. Armstrong, Canadian Infantry Corps, Milltown, N.B.

P15467 WO II (CSM) I. A. MacDonald, Canadian Infantry Corps, 118 August Ave., Toronto, Ont.

C4006 WO II (RQMS) C. G. R. McCalpin, Canadian Infantry Corps, Picton, Ont.

B78669 WO II (RQMS) J. Stewart, Canadian Infantry Corps, 8 Kingston Rd., Toronto, Ont.

F39939 WO II (CSM) G. E. Zwicker, Canadian Infantry Corps, Eagle Head, N.S.

E41094 Sgt. (A/WO II (CSM)) J. P. Lepage, Canadian Infantry Corps, 21 Montmartre St., Quebec, P.Q.

A3792 Sgt. (A/WO II (CSM)) R. L. Robinson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 18 Benton St., Kitchener, Ont.

F16277 CQMS B. J. Dean, Canadian Infantry Corps, 860 Barrington St., Halifax, N.S.

F39567 Sgt. (A/CQMS) A. W. Campbell, Canadian Infantry Corps, Laconia, N.S.

L1790 Sgt. R. H. Acheson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Welwyn, Sask.

C103107 Sgt. T. H. Hamilton, Canadian Infantry Corps, Iroquois Falls, Ont.

F35455 Sgt. H. W. Kidston, Canadian Infantry Corps, 98 Elm St., Halifax, N.S.

L1185 Sgt. N. W. Kilborn, Canadian Infantry Corps, Lac Vert, Sask.

B72673 Sgt. A. Lea, Canadian Infantry Corps, 99 Harcourt Ave., Toronto, Ont.

G17873 Sgt. C. J. MacDonald, Canadian Infantry Corps, King's Co., P.E.I.

B73641 Sgt. H. G. Notley, Canadian Infantry Corps, 9 Albion Ave., Toronto, Ont.

C63003 Sgt. G. A. Ross, Canadian Infantry Corps, Buckingham, Que.

F34765 Sgt. F. H. Tomes, Canadian Infantry Corps, 15 St. Albans St., Halifax, N.S.

P22321 Sgt. G. W. Upton, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1851 Comox St., Vancouver, B.C.

M17185 Sgt. E. A. White, Canadian Infantry Corps, Spirit River, Alta.

F55358 L/Sgt. W. F. Briand, Canadian Infantry Corps, Richmond Co., N.S.

H16295 L/Sgt. J. T. King, Canadian Infantry Corps, Oxdrift, Ont.

K52606 L/Sgt. R. P. Leon, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4153 Regent St., New Westminster, B.C.

A3220 L/Sgt. J. K. Stover, Canadian Infantry Corps, 14 Alice St., Brantford, Ont.

E52714 L/Sgt. W. J. Whitticks, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4840 Ste-Emilie St., Montreal, P.Q.

Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

A106665 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) J. E. Bain, Canadian Infantry Corps, Springfield, Ont.

A11270 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) H. Crawford, Canadian Infantry Corps, Wiarton, Ont.

F34819 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) A. P. O'Toole, Canadian Infantry Corps, 17 Hennessey Place, Halifax, N.S.

A152 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) E. G. Richardson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 23 Peglar St., London, Ont.

M16814 Cpl. W. Bird, Canadian Infantry Corps, Calgary, Alta.

B32004 Cpl. H. D. Black, Canadian Infantry Corps, 100 A Admiral Rd., Toronto, Ont.

F40611 Cpl. W. G. Brown, Canadian Infantry Corps, Stony Island, Shelbourne Co., N.S.

K75278 Cpl. E. F. Dayton, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2710 Scott St., Vancouver, B.C.

G32032 Cpl. R. A. Desjardins, Canadian Infantry Corps, 125 City Line, Saint John, N.B.

U1642 Cpl. H. M. Embleton, Canadian Infantry Corps, Sunderland, England.

K47095 Cpl. R. G. D. Foster, Canadian Infantry Corps, 620-3rd Ave., New Westminster, B.C.

H17551 Cpl. W. Harachka, Canadian Infantry Corps, Glencairn, Man.

L12779 Cpl. F. D. McKenzie, Canadian Infantry Corps, 338 Trumbull St., Conn., U.S.A.

B73140 Cpl. A. Payton, Canadian Infantry Corps, 443 Bathurst St., Toronto, Ont.

K66236 Cpl. L. Peterson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1528 Commercial Dr., Vancouver, B.C.

E57641 Cpl. A. Pitre, Canadian Infantry Corps, St. Alexis, P.Q.

K85214 Cpl. J. E. Pombert, Canadian Infantry Corps, Crofton, B.C.

M31130 Cpl. T. E. Scott, Canadian Infantry Corps, 854 A Braemer St., Medicine Hat, Alta.

A27016 L/Cpl. E. H. Brown, Canadian Infantry Corps, 48 Duke St., W., Guelph, Ont.

K46106 L/Cpl. H. R. Chrishop, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1534 Balsam St., Vancouver, B.C.

D125369 L/Cpl. R. Dubois, Canadian Infantry Corps, 21 Galt Ave., Verdun, P.Q.

B60797 L/Cpl. R. E. Emerick, Canadian Infantry Corps, Hornings Mills, Ont.

L1772 L/Cpl. P. B. Camble, Canadian Infantry Corps, Landis, Sask.

C6051 L/Cpl. E. Grogan, Canadian Infantry Corps, 266 Argyle St., Renfrew, Ont.

D71399 L/Cpl. H. Smith, Canadian Infantry Corps, 994 Melrose Ave., Verdun, P.Q.

M107262 L/Cpl. O. M. Witbeck, Canadian Infantry Corps, Raymond, Alta.

F54795 Pte. (A/Sgt.) F. MacNeil, Canadian Infantry Corps, Mapel Hill, New Waterford, N.S.

A22743 Pte. (A/Cpl.) G. F. Cote, Canadian Infantry Corps, Windsor, Ont.

D11176 Pte. (A/Cpl.) G. Poliquin, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3938 DeBullion St., Montreal, P.Q.

P22318 Pte. S. Adams, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2121 1st Ave. W., Prince Albert, Sask.

B127690 Pte. J. Blanchard, Canadian Infantry Corps, 171 Sammon Ave., Toronto, Ont.

F52446 Pte. R. K. Boyle, Canadian Infantry Corps, Belcher St., Kentville, N.S.

F56041 Pte. C. K. Chandler, Canadian Infantry Corps, 125 Pitt St., Sydney, N.S.

G17467 Pte. F. Degrechie, Canadian Infantry Corps, Jacquet River, N.B.

A89227 Pte. A. A. Foethers, Canadian Infantry Corps, Harriston, Ont.

K53191 Pte. A. French, Canadian Infantry Corps, 315 Georgia St. W., Vancouver, B.C.

M146 Pte. N. J. French, Canadian Infantry Corps, Shaughnessy, Alta.

B51890 Pte. L. C. Green, Canadian Infantry Corps, Freeman, Ont.

D77463 Pte. C. Harrison, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3815 Claude St., Verdun, P.Q.

K69853 Pte. G. E. Hayes, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2132-47th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

F32124 Pte. A. Hickey, Canadian Infantry Corps, East Broadway, Sydney, N.S.

C4794 Pte. W. E. Johnston, Canadian Infantry Corps, Sharp Corners, Ont.

M102545 Pte. W. O. Ladouceur, Canadian Infantry Corps, Styal, Alta.

M15649 Sgt. J. B. McDonald, Canadian Infantry Corps, Fort Saskatchewan, Alta.

L34008 Pte. S. W. Myslicki, Canadian Infantry Corps, 420 Forget St., North Regina, Sask.

B132944 Pte. F. D. O'Neill, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1 Triller Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B134939 Pte. W. G. Pitchford, Canadian Infantry Corps, 268 Sumach St., Toronto, Ont.

A106881 Pte. R. A. Prashaw, Canadian Infantry Corps, 102 Maple St., Dunnville, Ont.

B4700 Pte. J. R. Reid, Canadian Infantry Corps, Phelpston, Ont.

B103129 Pte. J. J. Rocke, Canadian Infantry Corps, 9 Turner Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B132173 Pte. R. F. Smith, Canadian Infantry Corps, 34 Avenue St., Oshawa, Ont.

C40696 Pte. M. J. Trick, Canadian Infantry Corps, Millbrook, Ont.

F65282 Pte. A. E. Ward, Canadian Infantry Corps, Bass River, N.B.

B111541 Pte. G. White, Canadian Infantry Corps, 60 Jones Ave., Toronto, Ont.

H/Maj. W. J. Gilling, Canadian Chaplain Services, Watford, Ont.

H/Maj. D. J. Harrington, Canadian Chaplain Services, Brudenell, Ont.

H/Capt. H. K. Ashdown, Canadian Chaplain Services, 126-3rd Ave., Longueuil, P.Q.

H/Capt. J. J. Vallely, Canadian Chaplain Services, New York, N.Y., U.S.A.

Lt.-Col. C. E. Bulmer, ED, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 43 Whittan Road, Hamilton, Ont.

Maj. L. S. Eckardt, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 6030 Granville Street, Vancouver, B.C.

Maj. D. M. Pilley, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 438 Agnes St., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. (A/Maj.) D. R. Beaton, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Whitby, Ont.

Capt. T. N. Beaupre, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps. 64 rue St. Louis, Beaurepaire, P.Q.

Capt. J. F. H. Clare, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 59½ Henry St., Halifax, N.S.

Capt. J. R. Griffiths, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 5850 Cree St., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. E. F. Munro, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 5 Inglis St., Sydney, N.S.

Capt. R. D. Reid, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 4575 West 6th St., Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. A. A. Edgington, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1180 Drummond St., Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. J. M. R. Garneau, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 37 Sous-le-Ford, Quebec City, P.Q.

Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

Lieut. W. M. Markham, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 4015 Hampton Avenue, Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. R. E. McDiarmid, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Alvinston, Ont.

Lieut. A. M. McKibben, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 2412 Wark St., Victoria, B.C.

Lieut. H. V. E. Phasey, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Orono, Ont.

A9292 W.O. I (S.M.) E. E. Wilmott, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Dresden, Ont.

L7098 W.O. II (C.S.M.) (A/W.O. I) (R.S.M.) G. J. Ryder, MM, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 108-8th Ave., Saskatoon, Sask.

B86068 W.O. II (C.S.M.) G. J. Goldsmith, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 140 Burlington St., Hamilton, Ont.

B84192 W.O. II (R.Q.M.S.) W. Matthews, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 2027 6th Ave. East, Owen Sound, Ont.

D106804 W.O. II (C.S.M.) D. Savoy, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Dalhousie, N.B.

A9184 S/Sgt. R. J. Butchart, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Rapid City, Man.

H52155 S/Sgt, P. C. Collyer, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 279 Roseberry St., St. James, Man.

C11536 C.Q.M.S. G. A. Froats, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 130 Hinton Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

H51757 Sgt. L. G. Bryant, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Miniota, Man.

B86009 Sgt. J. S. Grabiec, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 182 Queen St. North, Hamilton, Ont.

D115488 J. M. Hobbs, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 2249 Dalchester St. W., Montreal, P.Q.

P22137 Sgt. L. H. Holten, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 620 Langside St., Winnipeg, Man.

L7405 Sgt. F. Moir, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Regina, Sask.

B81743 Sgt. J. Murray, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 35 Enderby Rd., Toronto 13, Ont.

B98394 Sgt. W. H. Patterson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Chesley, Ont.

B86484 Sgt. C. Pierce, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 299 Wilson St., E., Hamilton, Ont.

D10602 Sgt. C. E. Saunders, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 5161 Queen Mary Rd., Montreal, Que.

M20558 Sgt. T. J. Thompson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Fielding, Sask.

M42081 Sgt. S. T. R. Witham, The Royal Canadian Army Service Sorps, 210-19th St. N., Lethbridge, Alta.

K78952 Cpl. (A/Sgt) R. H. Grant, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Burnaby, B.C.

G54570 Cpl. C. J. Anderson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Markerville, Alta.

D91651 Cpl. E. Bolduc, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 100 Abbott St., Westmount, Que.

M55441 Cpl. A. E. Cruickshank, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 2107-4th St. W., Calgary, Alta.

B56287 Cpl. A. Y. Elliott, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 62 Heddington Ave., Toronto 16, Ont.

B3608 Cpl. R. E. Good, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 362 Lonsdale Road, Toronto, Ont.

A58529 Cpl. H. E. Hofstetter, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 29 Krug St., Kitchener, Ont.

D6756 Cpl. M. Lapointe, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 744 Bourgeois St., Montreal, Que.

C11632 Cpl. C. T. Unsworth, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Carlington, Ont.

M40532 L/Cpl. N. Beaton, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Calgary, Alta.

B92377 L/Cpl. S. Berzowski, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 39 Blackburn St., Toronto, Ont.

B96962 L/Cpl. R. Bisson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Kapuskasing, Ont.

C33122 L/Cpl. R. McKee, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 489 Arlington Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

L7546 L/Cpl. J. Novak, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Esterhazy, Sask.

M63140 L/Cpl. T. Sorensen, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Calgary, Alta.

B38062 L/Cpl. J. B. Sweeney, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 60-24th St., Mount Hamilton, Ont.

B82755 Pte. (A/Cpl.) J. Crowe, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 11 Corley Ave., Toronto, Ont.

H2220 Pte. (A/Cpl.) E. Hauk, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 2621-15th St. SW., Calgary, Alta.

B89259 Pte. (A/Cpl) T. I. McCord, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 6 Savoy Ave., E., Toronto, Ont.

H57885 Pte. J. G. S. Aseltine, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 737 McCalman Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

M55455 Pte. H. Barton, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 324 Douglas Cres., Elburne, B.C.

B87190 Pte. F. Baxter, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Port Colborne, Ont.

H58005 Pte. G. H. Bertram, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Mainitonas, Man.

B87724 Pte. R. L. Bowman, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Middleport, Ont.

M60288 Pte. E. N. Bride, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 2 Thorald Rd., St. Catharines, Ont.

B87420 Pte. C. E. Bridge, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, King St., Palmeston, Ont.

L8044 Pte. K. Buckingham, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Mullingar, Sask.

L22049 Pte. E. Cadrain, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, St. Raphael, Bellechasse, P.Q.

D114933 Pte. P. E. Champoux, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 748 Radisson, Three Rivers, P.Q.

A102631 Pte. L. P. Chevalier, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 3161 Girardot St., Windsor, Ont.

D9104 Pte. P. Demers, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 3582 Joseph St., Montreal, P.Q.

F43863 Pte. L. A. d'Entremont, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Kentville, N.S.

F5750 Pte. J. C. Doiron, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, North Rustice, P.E.I.

Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

D114523 Pte. J. D. Duval, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, L'Islet, P.Q.

B85376 Pte. J. E. Enfield, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 17 Severn St., Hamilton, Ont.

M60354 Pte. R. J. Garrett, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Bellevue, Alta.

B56316 Pte. F. A. Generoux, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Gravenhurst, Ont.

B89562 Pte. E. F. Goodwin, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Bracebridge, Ont.

M42027 Pte. H. P. Harrod, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1834-5th Ave. E., Lethbridge, Alta.

L110160 Pte. W. A. Kennedy, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Wierdale, Sask.

L104299 Pte. R. D. Kitchen, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 431 Dufferin Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

E14162 Pte. R. Lafleur, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 125-5th St., Quebec, P.Q.

B57170 Pte. E. A. Lavery, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, New Liskeard, Ont.

L7425 Pte. H. E. Light, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Regina, Sask.

B88830 Pte. W. D. Little, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Palermo, Ont.

A57755 Pte. H. MacGinnis, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 274 Dufferin St., Stratford, Ont.

H195573 Pte. D. T. McDonald, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 415 Ambrose St., Port Arthur, Ont.

B83882 Pte. H. McRae, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 262 Beresford Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B92372 Pte. G. Mujeredian, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 46 Yardley St., Toronto, Ont.

L8186 Pte. G. Nisbet, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Conquest, Sask.

M106981 Pte. L. C. Ockey, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Springbank, Alta.

H51809 Pte. W. C. Pethybridge, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Elm Creek, Man.

F86107 Pte. G. H. Rector, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Elderbank, N.S.

M50827 Pte. R. A. Richardson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Burmis, Alta.

D126668 Pte. J. M. Sevigny, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Sutton, P.Q.

B88774 Pte. A. W. Simonsen, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 85 Richmond St. W., Toronto, Ont.

C11579 Pte. J. A. Steele, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 137 Elm St., Ottawa, Ont.

L7529 Pte. J. M. Thompson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1007-6th Ave., New Westminster, B.C.

L7489 Pte. W. F. Watson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Spy Hill, Sask.

Lt.-Col. (A/Col.) C. A. McIntosh, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 120 Arlington Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. W. H. P. Hill, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1108 Elgin Terrace, Montreal, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. J. S. McCannel, OBE, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 260 University Ave., Fredericton, N.B.

Major L. W. Bassett, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1916 Shakespeare St., Victoria, B.C.

Major T. G. Fyshe, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 2075 Lincoln Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Major (P/Matron) B. G. Herman, RBC, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Lunenburg, N.S.

Major J. F. Nicholson, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 13 Catherine St., Glace Bay, N.S.

Capt. (Q.M.) N. P. Fraser, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 61 Oriole Road, Toronto, Ont.

Capt. M. L. Harley, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1241 King St. W., Hamilton, Ont.

Capt. M. Lerner, MC, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 359 College Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. R. M. Levine, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 3410 Atwater Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. H. G. Metcalfe, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 26 Broad St., Brockville, Ont.

Capt. R. F. M. Myers, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 310-12th St., Brandon, Man.

Capt. W. A. Reed, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 11033-89th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

Capt. W. H. White, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Penticton, B.C.

Lieut. (N/S) R. G. Austin, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 28 Butternut St., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. E. Shaw, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Regina, Sask.

2/Lt. (N/S) E. J. LePan, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 82 Walmer Rd., Toronto, Ont.

A27207 WO I (RSM) J. D. Cooper, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 867 Adelaide St., London, Ont.

D98661 WO I (RSM) J. MacIver, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 711 Woodland Ave., Verdun, Que.

D92513 WO I (RSM) H. P. McGowan, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 3560 Dezery St., Montreal, Que.

K25036 WO II (QMS) F. A. Garland, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 2195 W. 7th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

M25826 S/Sgt. (A/WO I) (RSM) R. H. Miller, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Edmonton, Alta.

B91116 Sgt. W. E. Bateman, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 12 Bramley Grove, Fairbank, Toronto, Ont.

L25328 Sgt. J. Ellis, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 2611 Maple St., Vancouver, B.C.

K80519 Sgt. D. G. Galliford, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Mission City, B.C.

A47556 Sgt. C. I. C. Monk, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 280 Moore Ave., Waterloo, Ont.

C93016 Sgt. N. C. Quick, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 7 Litchworth Rd., Ottawa East, Ont.

D98617 Sgt. A. Reid, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 817-4th Ave., Verdun, Que.

H11112 Sgt. W. J. Tams, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 96 North Windermere Ave., Port Arthur, Ont.

M24226 Sgt. H. Thorgrimson, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Lundar, Man.

Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

H57849 Sgt. W. J. Torrance, The Royal Canadian Medical Corps, 68 Rousseau Ave., Transcona, Man.

H40774 Cpl. H. G. Anaka, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Powell River, B.C.

B91070 Cpl. N. A. Andrew, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 48 Hilldale Rd., Mount Dennis, Ont.

D93883 Cpl. R. Gosselin, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 5179 Marquette St., Montreal, Que.

L21150 Cpl. W. J. Lott, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Fairview, Alta.

M24083 Cpl. D. H. Moffatt, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 633-2nd Ave. N.W., Calgary, Alta.

D93619 Cpl. G. H. Spencer, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 4916 Sherbrooke St. W., Montreal, P.Q.

A3825 Pte. C. Bloomfield, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Goderich, Ont.

H35748 Pte. L. C. Fryer, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 20 Regal Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

C29521 Pte. B. Grayson, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Kingston, Ont.

B84424 Pte. W. Jackson, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 718-5th St., N.E., Calgary, Alta.

A47629 Pte. F. King, The Royal Canadian. Army Medical Corps, 84 Edward St., Kitchener, Ont.

B72114 Pte. J. A. King, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 270 Barton St., Toronto 4, Ont.

H65521 Pte. G. F. LeSage, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Fort William, Ont.

H35844 Pte. J. Pauls, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 280 Muriel St., Kirkfield Park, Man.

B89868 Pte. J. B. Pinkney, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 112 Grosvenor Ave., N., Hamilton, Ont.

D98622 Pte. R. F. Prichard, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 364 Redfern Ave., Westmount, Que.

C27261 Pte. J. B. Silvester, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 334 Bell St., Ottawa, Ont.

H11017 Pte. G. Starchuk, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 116½ S. Syndicate Ave., Fort William, Ont.

Major T. R. Hunter, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 194 Rosedale Heights Drive, Toronto 5, Ont.

Major B. W. Ingram, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 1551 W. 16th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Major D. E. Mounteer, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 58 Clergy St., E., Kingston, Ont.

Capt. J. D. Duncan, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 580 King St., London, Ont.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) J. P. Edwards, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Melfort, Sask.

C38000 WO I (Condr) D. Kronick, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 37 William St., Ottawa, Ont.

K25616 WO I (Condr) C. J. Wallace, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 127-10th St., E., Calgary, Alta.

A50077 Sgt. J. F. Hallam, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 975 Elias St., London, Ont.

C100337 Cpl. O. D. Davis, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Lakefield, Ont.

B57226 Cpl. R. B. Forbert, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, King St., Bobcaygeon, Ont.

A56764 Cpl. J. H. F. Gellatly, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 40 Fairview Ave., Kitchener, Ont.

G50247 Cpl. H. S. Smith, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 194 Highfield St., Moncton, N.B.

F5602 L/Cpl. A. W. Boyle, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Conway Freeland, P.E.I.

B2833 L/Cpl. F. B. Krafchick, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 154 Weber St., W., Kitchener, Ont.

B89943 Pte. A. G. Martin, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 282 Moore St., Waterloo, Ont.

Major A. J. R. Stethem, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 64 Nassau St., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. L. K. Shrum, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Smithville, Ont.

Capt. J. G. Wilkin, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 7 Abbott Ave., Islington, Ont.

Lieut. B. Cowan, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 36 Camberwell Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. S. G. Tait, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 214 Keary St., New Westminster, B.C.

B94152 WO I (Supt. Clerk) V. E. Blueman, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 225 Ranleigh Ave., Toronto, Ont.

P35378 WO I (Supt. Clerk) D. A. Saunders, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 1323 Coventry Ave., Victoria, B.C.

B75746 WO II Armt. QMS (A/WO I Armt. SM) J. S. McIntyre, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 381 Victoria Pk., Ave., Toronto 8, Ont.

K65310 WO II (QMS) J. O. Boyce, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 283 Prest Rd., Chilliwack, B.C.

C37814 WO II (SQMS) W. H. Cutler, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 53½ Third Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

A2125 WO II (Armt. QMS) C. L. Harris, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 277 Harris St., Ingersoll, Ont.

B94594 WO II (Armt. QMS) C. W. Hodder, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Marystown, Nfld.

A29004 WO II (Armt. QMS) W. Richardson, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 665 Piccadilly St., London, Ont.

B94614 WO II (Armt. QMS) R. D. Young, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 84 Robert St., Mimico, Ont.

B94470 S/Sgt. (A/WO II Armt. QMS) I. A. Dawson, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Utterson, Ont.

K31525 Armt. S/Sgt. W. Galech, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 616 St. Paul St., Kamloops, B.C.

K90020 S/Sgt. R. A. Neely, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 1503 Arthur Rd., Windsor, Ont.

A29605 S/Sgt. W. S. Sanderson, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Thorndale, Ont.

M41913 S/Sgt. S. J. Smith, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 6605-18A St., S.E., Calgary, Alta.

Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

D117335 Sgt. (A/S/Sgt.) W. R. Brown, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Matheson, Ont.

L67082 Sgt. A. E. Barkley, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 87 East 47th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

B69645 Sgt. H. F. B. Davis, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 223 William St., Toronto 15, Ont.

A11544 Sgt. O. G. Hardy, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Grand Valley, Ont.

A29440 Sgt. F. W. Harwood, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 581 Mary St., Woodstock, Ont.

M28061 Sgt. U. L. Koenen, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 724 Yates St., Victoria, B.C.

D82468 Sgt. N. Parker, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 5475 Coolbrook Ave., N.D.G. Montreal, P.Q.

A29450 Sgt. D. C. Westbrook, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Belmont, Ont.

L86707 Cpl. R. J. Sully, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Biggar, Sask.

B2840 L/Cpl. F. R. Clark, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 115 Benson Ave., Toronto 10, Ont.

B8555 L/Cpl. D. H. Hadley, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 219 Victoria St., Point Edward, Ont.

G52128 L/Cpl. H. R. MacGregor, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Halifax, N.S.

B94511 L/Cpl. F. J. McKillop, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 329 Nairn Ave., Toronto, Ont.

M41007 Cfn. A. C. Flood, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 1129 Haro St., Vancouver, B.C.

H64850 Cfn. A. C. Hanna, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Fort William, Ont.

H95437 Cfn. A. J. Jury, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Neepawa, Man.

B71114 Cfn. G. F. Nettle, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Welland, Ont.

L54823 Cfn. E. Olson, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Resource, Sask.

Capt. E. J. Benson, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, 332 Frank St., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. D. W. A. Digby, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, Carlington, Ont.

Capt. E. F. Duncan, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, Sandwick, B.C.

Capt. J. G. Eimsley, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, Yates and Douglas St., Victoria, Ont.

Capt. H. M. Quart, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, 19 Sheppard Ave., Quebec, Que.

Capt. E. M. Scott, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, 9217-99th St., Edmonton, Alta.

A99502 WO II (SQMS) M. G. Martin, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, Penetanguishene, Ont.

B5612 S/Sgt. O. J. F. M. Dagenais, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, Marionville, Ont.

C95040 Sgt. G. F. Haberer, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, 1569 Macgregor St., Montreal, Que.

Major S. K. Cougle, Canadian Dental Corps, 87 Main St., Fairville, N.B.

C97005 WO II (QMS) H. A. Davies, Canadian Dental Corps, 275A Preston St., Ottawa, Ont.

F87058 L/Cpl. R. C. Spicer, Canadian Dental Corps, Bridgetown, N.S.

D106533 Pte. E. G. Brown, Canadian Dental Corps, 108-5th Ave., Verdun, P.Q.

B74229 S/Sgt. G. W. Andrews, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 37 Triller Ave., Toronto, Ont.

C96297 Sgt. J. D. Coad, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, Toledo, Ont.

B50021 Cpl. J. B. Noakes, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 104 Gould St., Toronto, Ont.

A47611 L/Cpl. E. G. Wildfong, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 112 Walter St., Kitchener, Ont.

Major I. R. Cotnam, Canadian Postal Corps, 189 Glouchester Gr., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. F. J. Pollard, Canadian Postal Corps, 11709-91st St., Edmonton, Alta.

C97218 Sgt. R. H. Milthorpe, Canadian Postal Corps, 250 Talbott St., London, Ont.

B28516 Cpl. H. G. Pearce, Canadian Postal Corps, Sprucedale, Ont.

Maj. (A/Lt.-Col.) L. H. Nicholson, MBE, Canadian Provost Corps, 265 Church St., Moncton, N.B.

Lieut. E. V. Carter, Canadian Provost Corps, 3501 Point Grey Rd., Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. T. E. Clarke, Canadian Provost Corps, 291 Clemow Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

H3519 Sgt. T. Barbour, Canadian Provost Corps, 295 St. Mary's Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

A3300 Sgt. M. L. Shantz, Canadian Provost Corps, 48 Cameron St. S., Kitchener, Ont.

D9526 Sgt. L. W. Smith, Canadian Provost Corps, Shigawake, P.Q.

L12988 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) P. Mazurak, Canadian Provost Corps, Whitefox, Sask.

A11997 Cpl. H. R. Hobson, Canadian Provost Corps, 100 Water St., Kitchener, Ont.

D1527 Cpl. L. C. Jones, Canadian Provost Corps, 220 Egan St., Verdun, P.Q.

C75818 L/Cpl. I. W. Pickerill, Canadian Provost Corps, 262 North Kootenay St., Vancouver, B.C.

C32960 Pte. (A/Cpl.) F. S. Morris, Canadian Provost Corps, Church Ave., Sussex, N.B.

W13018 Pte. (A/Sgt.) I. Lockhead, Canadian Women's Army Corps, 313-23rd Ave., W., Calgary, Alta.

W15108 Pte. H. M. Reeves, Canadian Women's Army Corps, Louth Lincs, Eng.

K23031 Sgt. J. O. Poissant, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 425 St. Jean St., Quebec, P.Q.

B66070 Cpl. P. A. E. Johnston, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 42 Schofield Ave., Toronto, Ont.

K52293 Cpl. B. M. Smith, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 4431 Quebec St., Vancouver, B.C.

D36628 Pte. (A/Cpl.) J. S. Myyra, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 1632 Dorchester St. W., Montreal, P.Q.

Maj. (A/Lt-Col) H. F. Chritchley, MBE, General List, 3825-7 A St. S. W., Calgary, Alta.

Major A. O. MacKay, General List, Vertu Rd., St. Laurent, P.Q.

Major H. M. Travers, General List, 211 Grand River, North Paris, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) R. L. Montrose, General List, 78 Duke St., Hamilton, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) N. C. Phillips, General List, 2 Beaumont Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. R. E. Belanger, General List, 283 Stewart St., Ottawa, Ont.

Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

Capt. G. A. Boyle, General List, 7 Victoria Ave., Brockville, Ont.

Capt. R. B. Watson, General List, 823 River Rd., Niagara Falls, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) C. V. Lilley, General List, 11030-81st Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

Lieut. J. R. Martin, General List, 377 Brock St., Kingston, Ont.

APPENDIX "B"

Foreign Awards

U.S.A. Awards
French Awards
Polish Awards
Czechoslovakian Awards
Belgian Awards
Dutch Awards

Foreign Awards (U.S.A.)

Distinguished Service Medal

Gen. H. D. G. Crerar, CH, CB, DSO., First Canadian Army, Roxborough Apt., Ottawa, Ont.

Distinguished Service Cross (U.S.A.)

L86555 Sgt. E. S. Fines, Canadian Infantry Corps, South Wellington, B.C.

B92211 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) J. H. McInnis, Canadian Infantry Corps, Indian River, P.E.I.

B111439 Sgt. J. T. Barlow, Canadian Infantry Corps, 209-18th Ave. E., Calgary Alta.

M3328 Sgt. (now Lieut.) A. L. Wright, Canadian Infantry Corps, Grande Prairie, Alta.

C75979 Sgt. (A/S/Sgt.) R. W. Orr, Canadian Infantry Corps, 131 Oka Rd., St. Eustache, Sur-le-Lac, Que.

Lieut. P. H. Turner, Canadian Infantry Corps, 548 Gilmour St., Peterborough, Ont.

The Silver Star Medal

Capt. W. E. Watt, Canadian Infantry Corps, 230 Frank St., Ottawa, Ont.

U1805 S/Sgt. D. Serrick, Canadian Infantry Corps, Jollimore, N.S.

The Bronze Star Medal

B137590 Sgt. T. C. Potenza, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2091 Prospect St., Niagara Falls, Ont.

Lt.-Col. E. L. Gibbs, MBE, General List, 10851-94th St., Edmonton, Alta.

Lt.-Col. T. Warren, OBE, General List, 194 Park St. S., Hamilton, Ont.

L86836 K. G. Cutt, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1401-10th Ave. & 13th St., Calgary, Alta.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) A. M. Cormie, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 136 Claremont Ave., Norwood, Man.

Lieut. T. H. Harrison, Canadian Infantry Corps, 415 Aberdeen St., Medicine Hat, Alta.

Major (A/Lt.-Col.) J. P. Page, ED, Canadian Infantry Corps, 55 Mason Blvd., Toronto 12, Ont.

Lieut. J. S. Bateman, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 34 Alfred St., Thetford Mines, Que.

L36868 Sgt. S. Sheard, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 936 Retallack St., Regina, Sask.

Oak Leaf Cluster to Bronze Star Medal

Capt. W. R. Bennett, Canadian Infantry Corps, Hagerstown, M.D., U.S.A.

Foreign Awards (French)

Legion d'Honneur (Commandeur)

General H. D. G. Crerar, CH, CB, DSO, Canadian Army, Roxborough Apts., Ottawa, Ont.

Lt.-Gen. C. Foulkes, CBE, DSO, Canadian Army, Foulbay Rd. Victoria, B.C.

Lt. Gen. G. G. Simonds, CB, CBE, DSO, Canadian Army, Kingston, Ont.

Legion d'Honneur (Officer)

Maj.-Gen. H. W. Foster, DSO, Canadian Army, Winnipeg, Man.

Maj.-General R. F. L. Keller, CBE, Canadian Army, 2840 Cardigan Rd., Uplands Victoria, B.C.

Croix de Guerre avec Etoile d'Argent

Lieut. J. H. M. Dehler, MM, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 323 Besserer St., Ottawa, Ont.

H56862 Sgt. R. E. Tinsley, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1055 Valour Rd., Winnipeg, Man.

D82356 Sgt. (A/WOII CSM) W. N. Price, Canadian Infantry Corps, 505 Osborne Ave., Verdun, P.Q.

L403 Sgt. (A/WOII BSM) C. A. Moffat, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Moosomin, Sask.

L27240 WOII (CSM) J. A. Snyder, Canadian Infantry Corps, Battleford, Sask.

K62196 WOII (CSM) R. S. Proverbs, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1430 Harwood St., Vancouver, B.C.

A21624 WOII (CSM) J. Donaldson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Detroit, Mich., U.S.A.

G23571 WOII (CSM) P. Desylva, Canadian Infantry Corps, Island River, Gloucester Co., N.B.

M3009 WOII (BSM) H. Craig, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 760A-6th Ave. W., Calgary, Alta.

H42398 WOII (CSM) J. H. Conde, Canadian Infantry Corps, Ste. 14, Harrow Apts., Winnipeg, Man.

D26001 WOI (SSM) (A/RSM) W. O. Percival, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 5653 Sherbrooke St., Montreal, P.Q.

K37210 WOI (RSM) R. D. Jay, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Port Alberni, B.C.

P94545 WOI (S/Condr) M. T. Burditt, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 91 Garden Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut H. Vodden, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Ramsayville, Ont.

Lieut H. R. Turley, The Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 4407 Coolbrook, Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. A. E. J. Sudbury, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 6572 Sperling St., Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. J. E. A. Smith, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 18 Elm Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. S. M. Schofield, Canadian Infantry Corps, Royal Oak West Saanich, B.C.

Lieut. R. W. Ross, Canadian Infantry Corps. 9761-90th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

Croix de Guerre avec Etoile d'Argent—*Con.*

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

Lieut. R. B. W. Pyke, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. J. Paul, Canadian Infantry Corps, Battleford, Sask.

Lieut. J. O. Nesbitt, Canadian Infantry Corps, Ritz Apts., Georgia St., Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. G. U. Murray, Canadian Infantry Corps, 15 Gordon Apts., Victor St., Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. W. S. McKeough, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, London, Ont.

Lieut. H. G. MacAdam, Canadian Infantry Corps, Margaree Harbour, C.B., N.S.

Lieut. G. Lalande, Canadian Infantry Corps, Nominingue, P.Q.

Lieut. L. D. Johnson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 610 Querbes Ave., Outremont, P.Q.

Lieut. G. E. Irving, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 817-6th Ave. W., Calgary, Alta.

Lieut. J. R. Flowers, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 24 Roslyn Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. D. M. Ferguson, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 55 High Park Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. H. A. Dyson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 128 Bannerman Ave. Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. R. V. Darling, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 109 Maple St. N., Timmins, Ont.

Lieut. D. N. Crocker, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 235 Ross St., St. Thomas, Ont.

Lieut. H. C. Craig, The Royal Canadian Corps, of Signals, MacLeod, Alta.

Lieut. J. D. Corless, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Prince George, B.C.

Lieut. J. D. Campbell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 596 Victoria Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

Lieut. J. E. Cameron, Canadian Infantry Corps, 36 Glenarden Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. W. L. Brown, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2054 Athol St., Regina, Sask.

Lieut. C. H. E. Askwith, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1561 Bishop St., Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. R. G. Ashman, Canadian Infantry Corps, Bellamays, Ont.

Lieut. G. G. Armour, Canadian Infantry Corps, 731 Lakeside Park, Apt. 1, Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. B. E. Harper, Canadian Infantry Corps, Atholville, Rest. Co., N.B.

Lieut. F. Evans, Canadian Infantry Corps, 504 Merton St., Toronto, Ont.

Croix de Guerre avec Etoile de Vermeil

Lt. (A/Capt) J. R. Milani, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Balgonie, Sask.

Lt. (A/Capt) D. M. McPherson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 112 Glenig St. W., Lindsay, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt) J. A. McDiarmid, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 2604 Glover Rd., Milner, B.C.

Lt. (A/Capt) J. U. R. G. Lamothe, Canadian Infantry Corps, 224 Rue St. Georges, Three Rivers, P.Q.

Lt. (A/Capt) G. K. Henry, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 214 St. James St. W., Montreal, P.Q.

Lt. (A/Capt) V. T. L. Eriksson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Hugheden, Alta.

Lt. (A/Capt.) J. A. Dunlop, Canadian Infantry Corps, Moonstone, Ont.

Capt. P. White, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 249 Dunvegan Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. J. C. Treleaven, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2344 Robinson St., Regina, Sask.

Capt. R. T. Suckling, Canadian Infantry Corps, Toronto, Ont.

Capt. C. L. Stuart, Canadian Infantry Corps, 232 Union Blvd., St. Lambert, P.Q.

Capt. S. H. Standen, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 3006 Miller Ave., New Westminster, B.C.

Capt. N. D. Slater, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 73 Adelaide St. W., Toronto, Ont.

H/Capt. R. L. Seaborn, Canadian Chaplain Services, 10 Wychwood Park, Toronto, Ont.

Capt. A. Melville, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Ste 8, 2264 Cornwall St., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. N. M. McDougall, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 19 Trafalgar St., St. Thomas, Ont.

Capt. O. G. Larsson, Canadian Forestry Corps, 310 Central Ave., London, Ont.

Capt. R. H. King, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 6 Strathearn Ave. S., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. W. S. Hamilton, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 1864 Ogden Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. W. P. Hair, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 287 Forest Hill Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. S. G. M. Grange, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2 Clarendon Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. J. Y. Gosselin, Canadian Infantry Corps, 20 Ste. Ursule St., Quebec, P.Q.

Capt. A. T. P. Gilbert, ED, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 93 Tupper Ave., Yorkton Sask.

Capt. A. M. Fyfe, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 103 Northview Ave., Montreal West, P.Q.

Capt. A. G. Faulkner, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Dryden, Ont.

Capt. A. C. F. De Serres, Canadian Infantry Corps, 748 Bidwell St., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. L. H. Denison, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1015 McMillan Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

H/Capt. J. A. L. Clermont, Canadian Chaplain Services, 10228 rue St. Charles, Ahuntsic, P.Q.

Capt. E. P. D. Cavendish, The Royal Canadian Artillery, "Cliffe" Dorchester, Dorset, England.

Capt. D. R. Brown, Canadian Infantry Corps, 109 Charlotte St., Brantford, Ont.

Capt. J. T. S. F. Boucher, Canadian Infantry Corps, 140-18th St., Quebec, P.Q.

Capt. R. L. Bickford, Canadian Infantry Corps, 36 Wychwood Park, Toronto, Ont.

Capt. (A/Major) A. F. Smith, Canadian Infantry Corps, 982 Cathedral St., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. (A/Major) D. S. F. Bult-Francis, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 492 Mountain Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

Major E. C. Scott, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 360 Slater St., Ottawa, Ont.

Major A. B. Peene, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 145 Emerald St. South, Hamilton, Ont.

Major W. B. Parker, Canadian Infantry Corps, Kentville, N.S.

Major T. A. O'Hara, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 5453 Dupuis Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Major L. C. Monk, Canadian Infantry Corps, 54 Junction Road, Grand Falls, Nfld.

Major R. D. Medland, Canadian Infantry Corps, 63 Parkwood Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Major A. H. Lowe, Canadian Infantry Corps, 167 Lakeshore Road, Lakeside Pointclaire, P.Q.

Major A. W. Jefferson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Upper Granville, N.S.

Major R. L. Houston, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Arnprior, Ont.

Major R. D. Hodgins, Canadian Infantry Corps, 322 Concession Road, Preston, Ont.

Major J. M. Hockin, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Dutton, Ont.

Major N. M. Gemmell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 333 Burnham St., Peterborough, Ont.

Croix de Guerre avec Etoile de Vermeil—*Con.*

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

Major J. J. D. Gagnon, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1148 Thurlow St., Vancouver, B.C.

Major C. J. Carter, General List, 1172 Avenue Road, Toronto, Ont.

Major E. G. Brooks, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 145 Wolseley Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Major W. C. Baird, Canadian Infantry Corps, Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. R. Vanier, MM, General List, St. Antoine de Padoue, P.Q.

Lieut. R. Labrosse, MC, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 257 Wilbrod St., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. L. G. Sneath, Canadian Infantry Corps, Dauphin, Man.

Croix de Guerre avec Etoile de Bronze

K16195 Gnr. C. G. Westley, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2392 Linden Ave., New Westminster, B.C.

D15822 Spr. G. Villiard, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 10 rue Georges, Sorel, P.Q.

D6735 Gnr. J. A. Turner, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 56 Nassau St., Toronto, Ont.

M56588 Gnr. D. J. Tiedemann, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Tofield, Alta.

L6676 Gnr. G. H. Stevenson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Birch Hills, Sask.

D86037 Pte. H. J. Snodgrass, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2314 Beaconsfield Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

B9521 Gnr. C. P. Rouleau, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Whitefish, Ont.

C10224 Gnr. W. D. Riddell, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Sharbot Lake, Ont.

B29473 Spr. R. T. Rankin, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 150 Harlandale Ave., Lansing, Ont.

B62495 Tpr. P. A. Paquette, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Kearns, Ont.

F867 Pte. W. MacKay, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Hunter River, P.E.I.

K100130 Spr. J. J. McCrory, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Musketeer Mines, Tofino, B.C.

C50762 Gnr. D. G. Jamieson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 282 Montreal St., Kingston, Ont.

M41526 Spr. N. J. Hore, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 163050 95th St., Edmonton, Alta.

K70954 Spr. T. J. Hilton, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 3330 Barker Ave., New Westminster, B.C.

B21151 Gnr. P. A. Falconer, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1099 Danforth Rd., Toronto, Ont.

H67677 Gnr. F. Duchnicki, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 912 Gore St., Fort William, Ont.

G22322 Pte. J. E. Doucet, Canadian Infantry Corps, East Bathurst, N.B.

G32850 Pte. H. C. Colbourne, Canadian Infantry Corps, Harcourt, N.B.

A55988 Gnr. W. Capnerhurst, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 14904 Parkide St., Detroit, Mich., U.S.A.

C2955 Pte. R. Bertrand, Canadian Infantry Corps, Casselman, Ont.

B144875 Pte. M. B. Beauchamp, Canadian Infantry Corps, Porcupine, Ont.

K14081 Gnr. E. Barton, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1234 Pandora Ave., Victoria, B.C.

B8121 Gnr. J. Barlow, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 89 Springdale Blvd., Toronto, Ont.

M59085 Gnr. (A/Bdr.) E. Schauer, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Warburg, Alta.

L91708 L/Cpl. C. G. N. F. Nurse, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Rocanville, Sask.

B23868 L/Bdr. L. R. Munce, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 36 Balsam Ave. N., Hamilton, Ont.

M100979 L/Cpl. J. MacIntyre, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Westlock, Alta.

B47520 L/Bdr. W. R. Durno, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 748 Coxwell Ave., Toronto, Ont.

C100169 L/Cpl. J. M. Burchell, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Prescott, Ont.

B63754 Rfn. (A/Cpl.) H. D. Stockdale, Canadian Infantry Corps, 398 Duplex Ave., Toronto, Ont.

H45576 Pte. (A/Cpl.) C. A. MacNicol, Canadian Infantry Corps, Collingwood, Ont.

B148707 Pte. (A/Cpl.) J. Leclair, Canadian Infantry Corps, Sudbury, Ont.

C31286 Cpl. A. Vezina, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 425 Sussex St., Ottawa, Ont.

B65787 Cpl. J. A. Scott, Canadian Infantry Corps, 210 Ashdale Ave., Toronto, Ont.

D15253 Cpl. P. Negridge, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Teulon, Man.

M101069 Cpl. W. C. Kimmel, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Brightview, Alta.

B131588 Cpl. R. S. W. Hunter, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 64 Lyndhurst Ave., Toronto, Ont.

M1026 Bdr. G. A. Grassick, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Blairmore, Alta.

B22317 Bdr. L. G. Furniss, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 203 Farrens Ave., Toronto, Ont.

G4533 Cpl. E. A. Hosford, Canadian Infantry Corp, Trout Creek, N.B.

L12202 Cpl. F. P. Forness, Canadian Infantry Corps, Assiniboia, Sask.

L27610 Cpl. W. H. Edwards, Canadian Infantry Corps, 486½ Montague Ave., Sudbury, Ont.

D24009 Cpl. L. G. Corbett, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 6903 Garnier St., Montreal, P.Q.

M56886 Cpl. R. T. Burton, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Jarvie, Alta.

H38941 Cpl. T. W. Brown, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 838 Wolseley Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

B24414 Pte. (A/Sgt.) J. M. Jones, Canadian Infantry Corps, 64 Ferrier Ave., Toronto, Ont.

A2424 L/Sgt. C. H. Harkness, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 253 Rusholme Rd., Toronto, Ont.

M11034 L/Sgt. S. R. Harbut, Canadian Infantry Corps, 503A-6th Ave., Medicine Hat, Alta.

D137011 L/Sgt. J. W. Fyfe, The Royal Canadian Artillery, McMasterville, P.Q.

K53467 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) Ridout, Canadian Infantry Corps, 133 Janette Ave., Windsor, Ont.

A37631 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) W. H. Graham, Canadian Infantry Corps, Ailsa Craig, Ont.

D59194 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) L. Frechette, Canadian Infantry Corps, 61 St. Piere St., Farnham, P.Q.

L13446 Sgt. D. L. Yonge, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Mawer, Sask.

A22677 Sgt. C. C. Wold, Canadian Infantry Corps, 83 Seaton St., Toronto, Ont.

H42200 Sgt. W. J. Walsh, Canadian Infantry Corps, 496 Walker Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

B41341 Sgt. G. Sim, Canadian Infantry Corps, 184 Hanson St., Toronto, Ont.

Croix de Guerre avec Etoile de Bronze—*Con.*

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

D3395 Sgt. J. Raich, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 4473 Draper Ave., N.D.G., Montreal, P.Q.

M45358 Sgt. D. S. Prenevost, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, St. Paul, Alta.

H26215 Sgt. B. R. Paulson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 504 Simcoe St., Winnipeg, Man.

B38048 Sgt. A. E. Mavin, Canadian Infantry Corps, New Castle, Ont.

B129513 Sgt. W. V. McIlveen, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 35 Jones St., Hamilton, Ont.

D27103 Sgt. H. W. MacDonald, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Apt. 51, 406 Pine Ave. W., Montreal, P.Q.

A87107 Sgt. G. M. Leishman, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 658 Randolph St., Windsor, Ont.

E5968 Sgt. E. Lacroix, Canadian Infantry Corps, 438 St. Joseph St., Quebec, P.Q.

B63577 Sgt. D. M. Kingston, Canadian Infantry Corps, 145 Essex Ave., Toronto, Ont.

C58223 Sgt. G. J. Kimberley, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Renfrew, Ont.

C50080 Sgt. W. T. Jones, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 164 Gordon Ave., Peterborough, Ont.

B17419 Sgt. A. E. Jones, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 31 Coxwell Ave., Toronto, Ont.

K28511 Sgt. H. H. James, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1118 Johnson St., Victoria, Ont.

F50268 Sgt. L. G. Hurley, Canadian Infantry Corps, Maccan, Cumberland Co., N.S.

C40865 Sgt. G. C. Hummell, Canadian Infantry Corps, Morrisburg, Ont.

B46438 Sgt. F. O. Hamilton, Canadian Infantry Corps, 177 Brock St., Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.

C58264 Sgt. E. W. Godin, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Renfrew, Ont.

P1109 Sgt. L. R. Gariepy, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 4147 des Erables St., Montreal, P.Q.

K57764 Sgt. W. Garner, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1017 Chamberlain St., Victoria, B.C.

B64222 Sgt. T. J. Cornett, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1940 McDonald Ave., Brandon, Man.

Croix de Guerre avec Palme

Lt.-Col. C. E. Woodrow, ED, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 249 London Rd., Sarnia, Ont.

Lt.-Col. J. W. Johanson, ED, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 84 Byron Ave., London, Ont.

Lt.-Col. R. E. Hogarth, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Ottawa, Ont.

Lt.-Col. W. J. Hastie, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 224 High Park Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lt.-Col. W. W. Halpenny, ED, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 570 Wardlaw Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Lt.-Col. G. O. Gamble, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 582 Somerset St., Ottawa, Ont.

[Mr. Abbott.]

Lt.-Col. W. A. Capelle, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 291 Trent, Ave., East Kildonan, Winnipeg, Man.

Col. G. E. Beament, OBE, ED, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Ottawa, Ont.

Brig. J. C. Jefferson, DSO, ED, Canadian Army, 10470-83rd Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

Brig. G. U. Francoeur, OBE, VD, Canadian Army, 5159 Decarie Blvd., Montreal, P. Q.

Brig. H. O. Brownfield, CBE, MC, Canadian Army, Brockville, Ont.

Lieut. C. Lafleur, DCM, MM, General List, Mansonville, P.Q.

General H. D. G. Crerar, CH, CB, DSO, Canadian Army, Roxborough Apts., Ottawa, Ont.

Foreign Awards (Polish)

Virtuti Milatari (5th Class)

Lieut.-Gen. G. G. Simonds, CB, CBE, DSO, First Canadian Army, 18 Debary Ave., Wardlaw Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. P. Sevigny, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 76 Ave de Bernieres, Quebec, P.Q.

The Cross of Valour

Major E. W. Tremblay, Royal Canadian Artillery, 2179 Sherbrooke St., Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. G. L. Caron, Royal Canadian Artillery, 3425 University St., Apt. 1, Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. L. J. Holton, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Freeman, Ont.

Foreign Awards (Czech)

Military Medal for Merit (1st Class)

Lieut. (N/S) J. A. Hovorka, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 260 Furby St., Winnipeg, Man.

Order of the White Lion (3rd Class)

Brig. J. F. A. Lister, OBE, Canadian Army, 2149 Granite St., Victoria, B.C.

Col. G. E. Beament, OBE, ED, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 9 Marlborough Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Col. J. F. Haszard, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 706 Sylvia Court, Vancouver, B.C.

Foreign Awards (Belgian)

Grand Officier de l'Ordre de Leopold, avec Palme

General H. D. G. Crerar, CH, CB, DSO, Canadian Army, Roxborough Apts., Ottawa, Ont.

Foreign Awards (Dutch)

Grand Cross of the Order of Orange Nassau, with Swords

Gen. H. D. G. Grerar, CH, CB, DSO, First Canadian Army, Roxborough Apts., Ottawa, Ont.

APPENDIX "C"

Non-Operational Gallantry Awards

George Medal (GM)

Member of the Order of the British Empire (MBE) Commendations

---

The George Medal (GM)

Rank — Name — Corps — Address

Capt. T. F. Chandler, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 199 St. Clair Ave. E., Toronto, Ont.

British Empire Medal

D.23272 S/Sgt. (A/WO I) (Sub Condr) H. F. Hungate, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 2292 Hampton Ave., N.D.G., Montreal P.Q.

L.74074 Sgt. H. W. Fox, Canadian Infantry Corps, Saskatoon, Sask.

K.68691 Sgt. F. J. Lockhart, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 1298 W. 10th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

C.89858 Cpl. O. H. Wilson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 582 Bolivar St., Peterborough, Ont.

B.145227 L/Cpl. N. Schneider, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Barriefield Village, Ont.

H.19855 L/Cpl. G. H. Hanson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 778 Logan Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Commendations

L.26241 Sgt. J. Burkosky, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Long Branch, Ont.

L.26329 Bdr. A. S. Davis, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 236 19th St. E., Prince Albert, Sask.

M.43475 Bdr. J. W. Franklin, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Calgary, Alta.

M.43908 Bdr. J. F. Morice, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Herrett Rd., Springhill, N.S.

B.44373 Gnr. L. O. Coon, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 204 Dovercourt Rd., Toronto, Ont.

H.37019 Gnr. L. I. Forbes, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 283 Regal Ave., St. Vital, Man.

A.32031 Gnr. R. D. Pepler, The Royal Canadian Artillery, London, Ont.

M.43976 Gnr. L. E. Shoemaker, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Bashaw, Alta.

M.43983 Gnr. G. Wilson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Clive, Alta.

C.11678 L/Cpl. D. J. Drummond, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 12 Second Ave., Westboro, Ont.

B.87487 Spr. H. P. Walker, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, North Cobalt, Ont.

Capt. H. C. Maxwell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 236 Brock St., Kingston, Ont.

Lieut. G. Fawcett, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 2632 Burdick Ave., Victoria, B.C.

G.53042 W. B. Pendrigh, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 31 Elgin St., Saint John, N.B.

Mr. GREEN: Could the minister give the approximate number for the reserve army?

Mr. ABBOTT: I am afraid I cannot at the moment. The strength of six divisions plus would indicate that it would be somewhere in the vicinity of 130,000 to 150,000 men, with supporting troops which might be somewhat substantially in excess of that. Before giving a definite answer I would want to discuss it with the chief of the general staff to see what his views are as to that. The general picture, as I have indicated, is a force of six divisions plus the usual headquarters staff and supporting troops.

The committee will recall that lists of operational awards and honours have been submitted previously. With those which I have presented to-day, the total is 5,765. Included in the list are the names of three members of the army who received the Victoria Cross. I regret to say that one of these, Sergeant Aubrey Cosens, of the Queen's Own Rifles of Canada, was killed in action and the cross was awarded posthumously. The other two, Major Frederick Albert Tilston of the Essex Scottish and Corporal Frederick George Topham of the first Canadian parachute battalion, happily survived and have been repatriated.

The citations in the cases of Sergeant Cosens and Captain Tilston appeared in the Canada *Gazette* of May 26, 1945, and in the case of Corporal Topham in the *Gazette* of August 4, 1945. I shall read them, Mr. Chairman, in order that they may be on *Hansard*.

First, that of Sergeant Cosens reads as follows:

> The king has been graciously pleased to approve the award of the Victoria Cross (posthumously) to:
>
> B.46495 Sergeant Aubrey Cosens,
> the Queen's Own Rifles of Canada
>
> In Holland on the night of February 25-26, 1945, the first battalion the Queen's Own Rifles of Canada launched an attack on the hamlet of Mooshof to capture ground which was considered essential for the successful development of future operations.
>
> Sergeant Cosens platoon with two tanks in support attacked enemy strong-points in three farm buildings but were twice beaten back by fanatical enemy resistance and then fiercely counter-attacked during which time the platoon suffered heavy casualties and the platoon commander was killed.
>
> Sergeant Cosens at once assumed command of the only other four survivors of his platoon whom he placed in a position to give him covering fire while he himself ran across open ground under heavy mortar and shell fire to

the one remaining tank where, regardless of danger, he took up an exposed place in front of the turret and directed his fire.

After a further enemy counter-attack had been repulsed, Sergeant Cosens ordered the tank to attack the farm building while the four survivors of his platoon followed in close support. After the tank had rammed the first building he entered alone killing several of the defenders and taking the rest prisoners.

Single-handed he then entered the second and third buildings and perosnally killed or captured all the occupants although under intense machine gun and small arm fire.

Just after the successful reduction of these important enemy strong-points Sergeant Cosens was shot through the head by an enemy sniper and died almost instantly.

The outstanding gallantry, initiative and determined leadership of the brave N.C.O. who himself killed at least twenty of the enemy and took an equal number of prisoners resulted in the capture of a position which was vital to the success of the future operations of the brigade.

The second, the citation of Major Frederick Albert Tilston, reads as follows:

The king has been graciously pleased to approve the award of the Victoria Cross to:

Captain (Acting Major) Frederick Albert Tilston,
the Essex Scottish.

The second Canadian division had been given the task of breaking through the strongly fortified Hochwald forest defence line which covered Xanten, the last German bastion west of the Rhine protecting the vital Wesel bridge escape route.

The Essex Scottish regiment was ordered to breach the defence line northwest of Udem and to clear the northern half of the forest through which the balance of the brigade would pass.

At 0715 hours on first March, 1945, the attack was launched but due to the softness of the ground it was found impossible to support the attack by tanks as had been planned.

Across approximately 500 yards of flat open country in face of intense enemy fire Major Tilston personally led his company in the attack keeping dangerously close to our own bursting shells in order to get the maximum cover from the barrage. Though wounded in the head, he continued to lead his men forward through a belt of wire ten feet in depth to the enemy trenches shouting orders and encouragement and using his sten gun with great effect. When the platoon on the left came under heavy fire from an enemy machine gun post, he dashed forward personally and silenced it with a grenade. He was first to reach the enemy position and take the first prisoner.

Determined to maintain the momentum of the attack he ordered the reserve platoon to mop up these positions and with outstanding gallantry pressed on with his main force to the second line of enemy defences which were on the edge of the woods.

As he approached the woods he was severely wounded in the hip and fell to the ground. Shouting to his men to carry on without him and urging them to get into the wood he struggled to his feet and rejoined them as they reached the trenches on their objective. Here an elaborate system of underground dugouts and trenches was manned in considerable strength and vicious hand to hand fighting followed. Despite his wounds, Major Tilston's unyielding will to close with the enemy was a magnificent inspiration to his men as he led them in systematically clearing the trenches of the fiercely resisting enemy. In this fighting two German company headquarters were overrun and many casualties were inflicted on the fanatical defenders.

Such had been the grimness of the fighting and so savage the enemy resistance that the company was now reduced to only twenty-six men, one-quarter of its original strength. Before consolidation could be completed the enemy counter-attacked repeatedly supported by a hail of mortar and machine gun fire from the open flank. Major Tilston moved in the open from platoon to platoon quickly organizing their defence and directing fire against the advancing enemy. The enemy attacks penetrated so close to the positions that grenades were thrown into the trenches held by his troops but this officer by personal contact, unshakeable confidence and unquenchable enthusiasm so inspired his men that they held firm against great odds.

When the supply of ammunition became a serious problem he repeatedly crossed the bullet swept ground to the company on his right flank to carry grenades, rifle and bren ammunition to his troops and replaced a damaged wireless set to reestablish communications with battalion headquarters. He made at least six of these hazardous trips each time crossing a road which was dominated by intense fire from numerous well-sited enemy machine gun posts.

On his last trip he was wounded for the third time, this time in the leg. He was found in a shell crater beside the road. Although very seriously wounded and barely conscious he would not submit to medical attention until he had given complete instructions as to the defence plan, had emphasized the absolute necessity of holding the position and had ordered his one remaining officer to take over.

By his calm courage, gallant conduct and total disregard for his own safety, he fired his men with grim determination and their firm stand enabled the regiment to accomplish its object of furnishing the brigade with a solid base through which to launch further successful attacks to clear the forest thus enabling the division to accomplish its task.

The final citation, Mr. Chairman, is that of Corporal Frederick George Topham, which reads as follows:

The king has been graciously pleased to approve the award of the Victoria Cross to:

B.39039 Corporal Frederick George Topham,
1st Canadian Parachute Battalion

On 24th March, 1945, Corporal Topham, a medical orderly, parachuted with his battalion onto a strongly defended area east of the Rhine. At about 1100 hours whilst treating casualties sustained in the drop, a cry for help came from a wounded man in the open. Two medical orderlies from a field ambulance went out to this man in succession but both were killed as they knelt beside the casualty.

Without hesitation and on his own initiative Corporal Topham went forward through intense fire to replace the orderlies who had been killed before his eyes. As he worked on the wounded man, he was himself shot through the nose. In spite of severe bleeding and intense pain he never faltered in his task. Having

completed immediate first aid, he carried the wounded man steadily and slowly back through continuous fire to the shelter of the woods.

During the next two hours Corporal Topham refused all offers of medical help for his own wound. He worked most devotedly throughout this period to bring in wounded, showing complete disregard for the heavy and accurate enemy fire. It was only when all casualties had been cleared that he consented to his own wound being treated.

His immediate evacuation was ordered, but he interceded so earnestly on his own behalf that he was eventually allowed to return to duty.

On his way back to his company he came across a carrier, which had received a direct hit. Enemy mortar bombs were still dropping around, the carrier itself was burning fiercely and its own mortar ammunition was exploding, an experienced officer on the spot had warned all not to approach the carrier.

Corporal Topham, however, immediately went out alone in spite of the blasting ammunition and enemy fire, and rescued the three occupants of the carrier. He brought these men back across the open and, although one died almost immediately afterwards, he arranged for the evacuation of the other two, who undoubtedly owe their lives to him.

This non-commissioned officer showed sustained gallantry of the highest order, for six hours, most of the time in great pain. He performed series of acts of outstanding bravery and his magnificent and selfless courage inspired all those who witnessed it.

Mr. PEARKES: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Abbott) has just read the government's appreciation of the work our soldiers have carried out during the war. I am quite certain every hon. member of this party, and every member on this side of the house would like to join the government in its heartfelt and humble thanks for the sacrifices those men made.

To-day the streets of every Canadian city are bedecked with flags in honour of those gallant regiments which are returning. Over a great many doorways one will see the sign, "Welcome home, son." True to the traditions of our country, the crowning victories of these campaigns, which have just been concluded, have not been won by regular soldiers, but have been won by that great host of citizens who came forward when their freedom was threatened, and when the principles they held dear were in danger. They left their peaceful pursuits in order that they might do battle.

Before the war our permanent force was small. Its members lived a cloistered life, far removed from the industrial and national economy of the country. When war came they, as indeed the whole nation, were ill prepared for global or total warfare. They gave of their best. Many individuals have done exceptionally well; but the fact remains that the great battles of this war were fought by men who, a short time before, were unskilled in the art of warfare.

In the tragic and costly operations against Dieppe in the summer of 1942, not more than half a dozen permanent force officers landed on the beaches. I believe that, in the main, Canada should continue to rely upon its citizen soldiers for its future defence; but we cannot slip back into the pre-war attitude, when the non-permanent militia, or the reserve army as it is now being called, was nearly reduced to inefficiency. Had it not been for the contributions made by the officers of that force, and by other patriotic citizens, it would never have been as efficient as it was at the outbreak of this war.

The efficiency of our reserve army must be assured. Our permanent force must be brought into much closer touch with the civilian life of the country, and with scientific development, than was the case before this war. The Minister of National Defence has declared that this is an interim period. I do not wish to see a drifting back into the laissez-faire attitude or to conditions of pre-war life. The time should be spent in planning and remodeling our future defence. We are faced with an entirely new situation as regards our position in the world, and I would suggest that now is the time that some investigating body should be set up to review our requirements,—a body such as the Haldane committee of 1908, which made a thorough survey of the military requirements of the old country, and changed the then volunteer system into the territorial army. It should be a committee of men in whom the country has confidence, consisting of representatives not only of all the services, but also of industry and industrial life. The minister gave no indication that he was setting up any such committee. He seems to be content to rely upon his professional and political advisers. The methods by which the armed forces will be enabled to retain their efficiency in the future, to keep up to date in their tactical and technical developments, and in the standardization of our equipment and plans for the simplification of production, and to link those plans with the plans which are being drawn up for the reestablishment of industry, call for new ideas and new plans. The practices of the past cannot be accepted, without full examination on a very wide basis. This is not merely an affair of the army, it is one in which the whole nation is deeply concerned.

There will be—and I see it in the remarks of the minister—a tendency to get back to an organization based on our pre-war system. Surely before this is done a full review on a non-departmental basis should be carried out.

It is now the time to review the past, and to formulate our plans for the future in such a way as to convince the country that they are founded on sound sense. A sound plan now may save us many anxious moments in the future.

Having experienced a period immediately after the last war when the permanent force was authorized for an establishment of 10,000, I remember vividly how the units of that then permanent force never attained anything like the numbers they were authorized to have. As the years went by they were reduced to the merest skeleton. The result was that at the commencement of this war the permanent force consisted of little more than 4,000 men, the majority of whom were employed in instructional and administrative duties.

The proposal for the permanent force of the future is for from 20,000 to 25,000. Care will have to be exercised to see that the units of that establishment are not allowed to become the skeletons which the old permanent force became, and that it should not be allowed in that way to become a force incapable of carrying out the functions for which the minister has detailed it.

As I said earlier, the country is now extending a welcome home to its returning men. In the excitement of the moment, are we to forget the Canadian occupational force which must remain in Germany? While the minister mentioned that occupational force, he said very little about it. The first announcement as to its objects and duties was made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) in the last session when, on April 4, as reported at page 446 of *Hansard* he said:

> In Europe it is necessary not only to secure complete victory, but that achievement must be confirmed, and the continued maintenance of peace assured. Where needed, after the cessation of military operations, the inter-allied army will continue in occupation of Germany. The size of this force has been set to give continuing assurance that Germany will not be able to resist or evade the settlement which will be imposed on her.
>
> The burden of maintaining this force will be shared among the allies and all will be appropriately represented.

He goes on to say:

> The quota which Canada has undertaken to maintain is modest having regard to our resources and to our direct interest in the maintaining and safeguarding of the peace of the world.

Elsewhere he mentioned that that force would consist of approximately 25,000 men. The retention of that force in Germany is an obligation which Canada has assumed and she cannot shirk her responsibilities. Among the tasks which that force has to perform may be included the disarmament of the enemy, a particularly difficult and lengthy operation; the distribution of food and the reestablishment of law and order. The work to be done to restore health and to bring back the starving to life must also be carried out under the protection of that occupational force.

It is difficult to visualize the tremendous responsibilities which lie ahead of it. It is well to recall that after the last war Great Britain contributed her share in the occupying of the frontier zone for a period of ten years. I suggest that there are pointers which would lead one to believe that a more extended period, in both time and space, may well follow the conclusion of this war. The difficulties under which our occupational force is operating cannot be overestimated. It is surrounded by a hostile and still arrogant population, a people who have none of the luxuries and few of the necessities of life, whose cities have been destroyed and who must face the severe winter of central Europe without adequate stocks of food or fuel. Everything that our soldiers have—mind you, many of the essentials for them are also in short supply—will be looked upon with covetous eyes by the civilian population. Our men will be surrounded by temptation. In consequence, strict discipline will have to be maintained just at a time when many would hope that restrictions might be relaxed.

I have the greatest sympathy for General Vokes and for every man who is serving under him in that occupational force. Only last week Field Marshal Montgomery, when accepting the freedom of the city of Londonderry in Ireland, said that his great fear was that disease would sweep Europe, killing millions. Our soldiers are exposed to that danger.

Our Canadian occupational force is far from being a happy one. Few of its members are there of their own free will. Of the 21,000 who now compose the force, some 11,000 to 12,000 are general service men who expressed no desire to serve in the force when they were given an opportunity of saying how they would like to continue serving after V-E day. Some 4,622 have seen more than six months actual combat service, and 1,700 are N.R.M.A. soldiers who have been ordered overseas against their wishes.

This committee must agree that it is undesirable and unfair to leave any man in that force for an extended period and that those who have already borne the brunt of their share of fighting before V-E day should be replaced without delay. No doubt a certain number of replacements are available among low-point men who are now in England, but

their number is limited and it is decreasing daily. The minister did not indicate to us what other troops he had available for the replacements which may be required for that occupational force. I presume those men who have signified their willingness to join the interim army, namely, the men now in the active army or those who have recently been discharged and who are willing to serve wherever required, can also be made available, but their number in Canada is limited.

Has recruiting at large started up? I do not believe that recruits are being taken into the interim army at the present time with the exception of those who have already seen service in the active army. Therefore, I ask: What reinforcements and what replacements are there for that occupational army if the disease, which Field Marshal Montgomery feared might sweep through Europe, should attack our men? What men has the Minister of National Defence available to replace those who are in occupational service and who have already seen fighting or who have been more than six months in an actual theatre of war?

I have endeavoured to point out some of the difficulties of that occupational force. I think it is obvious that well trained, well disciplined soldiers having good morale, are required. Therefore it is the solemn duty of the minister and the government to develop those qualities to the greatest possible extent in all potential replacements or reinforcements for that army. I suggest that this can never be achieved so long as certain categories of men are segregated into special units or subunits, so long as men must wear uniforms with certain badges designed so that the public points the finger of scorn at them, or so long as men have different terms and conditions of service while in this country.

A few weeks ago the minister described the steps which are being taken in order to avoid having any difference between N.R.M.A. soldiers and volunteers for overseas. I should like to quote from page 380 of *Hansard* of September 24, 1945, where he is reported as follows:

> The policy from the very outset with respect to these N.R.M.A. men has been this: Once they stepped on a ship there was no distinction made between the N.R.M.A. man and the volunteer soldier. They were all going over to fight.

And again:

> There has been no distinction made between the volunteer soldier and the man sent over under the National Resources Mobilization Act. Once the N.R.M.A. man got over there he took his place in the reinforcement pool, and when his turn came he went over to France as part of the reinforcements and was posted to a unit, just the same as any other soldier. General Foulkes told me only this morning that when people asked him over there how the N.R.M.A. men were doing, he replied, "I do not know, because I do not know who they are. So far as I am concerned they are soldiers just the same as any other soldier."
>
> So there has been no distinction made, and so long as I am minister there will not be any distinction made, between the soldier who is over there compulsory and the soldier who is over there voluntarily. And to old soldiers it is obvious why that must be so. There must be mutual trust and confidence in the man beside you when you are fighting, and to make a distinction between the men who have volunteered and the men who have been sent over under the N.R.M.A. would be indefensible.

I ask the minister, why wait until those men get on board ship? Is it not absolutely indefensible, just the same as it is overseas, to have a distinction made between them here in Canada? There are some thirty thousand N.R.M.A. men—that is an approximate figure—still in Canada. If it is indefensible that there should be any distinction made overseas, why is it that the minister still continues to keep his two-army system here in Canada? In the interests of efficiency, for the well being of these N.R.M.A. soldiers themselves, and for the sake of national unity, will he not now declare that this abominable system shall cease?

These N.R.M.A. soldiers are not drawn exclusively from people of any one racial origin, and their attitude has frequently been misunderstood. Some of these men come from families whose parents and grand-parents recently moved to Canada from central Europe. I am proud to say that I have had close associations with many of them over many years. I was pleased to hear the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Hlynka) a few weeks ago speak about the Ukrainian population in his constituency. These people I also know. These men, sons of immigrants from central Europe, have in many respects still the peasant's outlook. They have learned at their mother's knee that they are the true sons of the soil and that their duty is with the soil, and that if they are ever required to defend their soil, then their government will call them to the colours, the responsibility being on the government and not upon the individual man. In fact, most of these men would find it difficult to distinguish between the term "volunteer" and the term "mercenary".

There are other N.R.M.A. soldiers both of British and of French origin, and let me say here that my connections with French-Canadian soldiers have also been long and intimate. During the battle of Passchendaele in 1917 it was my exalted privilege to command a company of a Quebec regiment which was composed fifty per cent of French-Canadian soldiers and fifty per cent of British-Canadian soldiers. At the conclusion of that battle I

was awarded a distinction, and when I wear the ribbon on my uniform I do so in the full knowledge that that award was made every bit as much for the courage, determination and devotion of those French-speaking soldiers as for any action which I carried out myself.

At a more recent date, in 1943, it was my privilege to see the Regiment de Hull, which came from this immediate area, standing for hours in the waters of the Bering sea, unloading stores from the boats on to the island of Kiska; and on armistice day, in November, 1943, I spent that day in the tents of the Regiment de Hull. There was an arctic blizzard blowing and the instruments registered that gale as blowing at ninety miles an hour. One could hardly stand up against it. The freezing sleet would blow horizontally to the ground, and I say here, and nobody who was on that island could contradict me, that those French-Canadian soldiers of the Regiment de Hull were the life and soul of that garrison, be they Canadian or United States soldiers who were there.

Therefore when those French-Canadian soldiers who had been called up under the N.R.M.A. were appealed to last year to volunteer many of them had to wrestle between two loyalties, one loyalty that might be described as parental loyalty, a loyalty to their home and to their family, as against a loyalty to a cause which they barely understood. With regard to the decision to be made whether they should go back on promises they had made when they were first called up, promises to their parents that they would not volunteer for service outside Canada, whether that decision should be made by them or by the government, they were unanimous in feeling that the decision should be made by the government and not by the individual man. No wonder those men placed the responsibility squarely upon the shoulders of the government. This man-power skeleton will remain long in the Liberal cupboard.

I suggest that even at this eleventh hour, in the interests of efficiency, for the well-being of the N.R.M.A. soldiers who are still here and for the sake of the unity of Canada, this two-army system be discontinued from now on.

Our soldiers are returning, but I suggest that the methods by which they are being repatriated are open to the severest condemnation because those men who have had the longest and hardest service, as the minister said to-day, are not having a fair chance in being returned; that men who have served a much shorter time overseas are now coming back, while many of the men who have had the longest service still have to remain, not because they are in some particularly essential job, but because they do not happen to be in a formation which is being brought back, and because only lip-service is being given to this policy of "first in, first out; longest and hardest, first home."

The point system as described by the minister to-day is totally unjust to the man who has seen the longest and hardest fighting. Two points are allowed for service in Canada and only one additional point for service overseas. "Service overseas" does not mean overseas in a theatre of operation; it may mean service in a pleasant camp in England. The present point system should be revised immediately if fairness and justice are to be observed. That is very much the feeling of the men who are returning to Canada to-day. I have talked with men who have been repatriated to Ottawa with the Princess Louise Dragoon Guards, with men of the Hastings and Prince Edward regiment from Belleville, with men of the 48th battalion being demobilized in Toronto, and with men of the Seaforth Highlanders of Canada who passed through here a week ago on their way to Vancouver. These men who served with me in the first Canadian division in the early days of the war, some of whom I could recognize, many of whom were able to recognize me, were all loud in their protests against the unfair way in which the present point system is working, and the fact that included in their ranks were men who had seen no fighting whatever. In the last session, the Minister of National Defence gave the information that by the 1st of March of this year, three and a half months before V-E day, only 238 N.R.M.A. soldiers had reached an actual battlefield. We hear now that a hundred and eleven thousand of our men have been repatriated. A return was tabled yesterday which gave some startling figures regarding the type of men who were in those units which are now being repatriated. I jotted down a few. Of the Saskatchewan Light Infantry twenty-seven per cent are N.R.M.A. soldiers; of the Seaforths, 19·5 per cent; of the P.P.C.L.I., 18·5 per cent, and, with all but two of the infantry battalions which are back, more than ten per cent are N.R.M.A. soldiers. Compare those figures with the statement which was given by the minister last session, that by the 1st of March of this year only 238 N.R.M.A. men had reached the actual battlefield. Also compare that with the figures which were given earlier, which I mentioned, that there were over four thousand men in the army of occupation who had served for more than six months in an actual theatre of war.

It is on these facts that I feel we must criticize, and criticize severely, the present point system by which these men are being brought back. Even at this eleventh hour it should be revised, and some additional bonus, some preference should be granted or some scheme devised—I care not how you work it out—for the benefit of the men who have been in actual combat and to whom the minister referred as having the hardest and longest service. Unless we want to pay more lip-service to that policy some action must be taken in that respect.

A short time ago disciplinary action was taken against an officer who was editing the *Maple Leaf* magazine at the time. But talk to any man who is coming back and he will tell you that those editorials reflect the opinion of the troops who then were actually in Germany or elsewhere on the continent of Europe.

I have confined myself in the main to criticism of the policy. I feel that not sufficient foresight is being used at this time in preparing our future defence forces so that they may assure reasonable and adequate defence of this country in another global war where we might be faced with an enemy equipped with the most scientific developments of this atomic age. We should think twice before we go back to the time-worn policies and time-worn formations which we had before this war.

I appeal that consideration be given to our army of occupation, and that some reasonable scheme of replacing those men who have served in the army of occupation for any extended period should be worked out now. No such scheme was presented to us.

Finally, I say that even now we must revise our repatriation scheme, so that those who have served the longest and fought the hardest may have the advantage of coming back and becoming reestablished in this country, or of taking some of the many courses which are being opened for them, before they find all those opportunities gone.

I have not made any comment on the various items of the establishment because I understand that an opportunity to discuss these in detail will be presented at a later date. I therefore move that the debate on this subject be adjourned.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

Mr. MACKENZIE: In accordance with the announcement of last evening in regard to the business of the house I move that the committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again this day.

Progress reported.

UNITED NATIONS

APPROVAL OF AGREEMENT SIGNED AT SAN FRANCISCO, JUNE 26, 1945

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs) moved:

That it is expedient that the houses of parliament do approve the agreement establishing the united nations and constituting the charter of the united nations and the statute of the international court of justice signed at San Francisco on June 26, 1945, and that this house do approve the same.

He said: On the 26th of June last it was my proud privilege to append my signature, under that of the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), to authenticate on behalf of Canada the document agreed upon at San Francisco as the charter of the united nations. That authentication did not automatically make Canada a member of this great international organization because membership in the organization is to be accomplished by compliance with article 3 of the charter, which I should like to read:

The original members of the united nations shall be the states which, having participated in the united nations conference on international organization at San Francisco, or having previously signed the declaration by united nations of January 1, 1942, sign the present charter and ratify it in accordance with Article 110.

Article 110 provides:

1. The present charter shall be ratified by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

2. The ratifications shall be deposited with the government of the United States of America, which shall notify all the signatory states of each deposit, as well as the secretary general of the organization when he has been appointed.

3. The present charter shall come into force upon the deposit of ratifications by the republics of China, France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America, and by a majority of the other signatory states. A protocol of the ratifications deposited shall thereupon be drawn up by the government of the United States of America which shall communicate copies thereof to all the signatory states.

4. The states signatory to the present charter which ratify it after it has come into force, will become the original members of the united nations on the date of the deposit of their respective ratifications.

Nevertheless it was a great privilege to participate, on behalf of the Canadian nation, in making to civilized mankind, of this and of succeeding generations, the noble declaration which constitutes the preamble of the charter. I beg leave to read that preamble into

the record as a fitting setting for the discussion upon which this house is embarking at this time:

Charter of the United Nations.

We the peoples of the united nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom, and for these ends to practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours, and to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and to ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest, and to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples, have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims.

Accordingly our respective governments, through representatives assembled in the city of San Francisco, who have exhibited their full powers, found to be in good and due form, have agreed to the present charter of the united nations, and do hereby establish an international organization to be known as the united nations.

Does anybody doubt that Field Marshal Smuts, and those who collaborated with him in drafting this preamble, correctly interpreted the aspirations and the determination of the peoples of the united nations, of the hundreds of millions of men, women and children throughout the world, of the hundreds of millions of common people throughout the world, upon so many of whom the scourge of the last two wars has borne so heavily and to each of whom it has brought such untold loss and suffering and sorrow?

At San Francisco the respective governments of these hundreds of millions of common people seem to have sought, through their representatives, to set up an organization which, if all these respective governments will allow it to function in the same spirit of live and let live in which it was conceived, can realize the true aspirations and determination of these common people everywhere; the aspirations and the determination to have international peace and mutual security based upon mutual belief, confidence and trust in each other's honesty of intention and sincerity of purpose, rather upon the precarious balance of power blocs or the shifting delimitations of spheres of influence.

Can the common people everywhere and at all times make their aspirations and determination heard and implemented by all their respective governments and all those acting and speaking on their behalf in large or small, open or secret international conferences and committees?

Must we here not hope, if we hope for the ultimate success of the world organization, that an affirmative answer is or soon will be possible? We at least know that it is the correct answer in so far as our own nation is concerned, and it is because we know it that this resolution is before the house to-day.

We know that this house is truly representative of all the common people of the Canadian nation. We know that in this house the concept of a nation or state, as something different and something above the men and women and children who make up the nation, does not prevail. We know that those who attempt to speak and to act for this nation derive their right to do so from those men, women and children, and that they must at all times be mindful of their interests, of the interests of those same men, women and children, and even to a degree, of their own conception of what are their best interests.

That is why the Prime Minister, when moving on March 20 last, a resolution approving the participation of Canada in the San Francisco conference, told the house that the charter would, before ratification, be submitted to parliament for approval. At that time the Prime Minister said:

In proposing this course, the government is following the procedure customary with respect to treaties. No treaty or obligation could be more solemn than that which the united nations would assume under the charter. The course which the government is proposing would, moreover, ensure to a parliament newly elected by the people, the final word with respect to the adoption of the charter.

The charter was signed by fifty nations. A copy of it was tabled as treaty series number 7 on September 7; a copy of the report submitted on behalf of the Canadian delegation at San Francisco was tabled on September 10. I have been informed by the distribution office that copies were at that time forwarded through the mail to each hon. member of this house.

It is a significant fact that fifty states comprising the larger part of the civilized world have been able to reach agreement, and that they were all prepared to sign this charter. Those of us who were there know there were times during the San Francisco conference when difficulties and differences of view loomed very large, but in the end agreement was reached. When the conference met we were till in the midst of a great war. Most of those assembled at San Francisco represented countries whose peoples were making heroic efforts and very heavy sacrifices to

bring the war to a speedy end. Some came from lands newly liberated from the enemy. All were deeply conscious of the appalling human sufferings which war causes. I think in the end it was this profound realization which made agreement possible.

At a great international conference of this kind there are so many national interests to be reconciled, so many adjustments which have to be made for the varying views of the different states represented that what emerges in the end is bound to be a compromise. The charter in its final form bears evidence of these compromises and adjustments. I do not think anyone would contend that it is an ideal document, and in the course of my remarks I shall mention some things which the Canadian government hopes in the course of time to see changed. But each chapter, each sentence and in some cases each comma, in this charter have been discussed and considered in the conference committees. Each clause has received the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the states represented. The charter which resulted from these deliberations does represent a great cooperative achievement. Each nation has made its individual contribution; and I think it can be said that Canada had no small contribution to make.

Before the conference took place at San Francisco the parliament of Canada had approved the principle of Canada's participation in an international organization to maintain peace and security. The words of the resolution introduced in the house on March 20, 1945, were as follows:

That this house recognizes that the establishment of an effective international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security is of vital importance to Canada, and, indeed, to the future well-being of mankind, and that it is in the interests of Canada that Canada should become a member of such an organization.

It was the task of the Canadian delegation at the conference both to safeguard the interests of Canada and to incorporate in the final charter, so far as this was possible, those improvements which could best secure the loyal and continuing support of this country for the united nations organization. The government considered it essential that the Canadian delegation to the conference should be broadly representative in character. Accordingly it was decided that it should include representatives of both houses of parliament and from both sides of the house. The delegation so composed worked together at San Francisco in an atmosphere of complete mutual confidence, and though I was there I venture to say here that I do not think any group could have been chosen from among the 11,500,000 people of Canada who would have striven more effectively to act only as Canadians and in no way as partisans or members of any one political party, though for most of the time we were there a federal election campaign was in progress here at home.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

INCOME WAR TAX ACT

COMMUNICATING INFORMATION

Mr. STANLEY KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre) moved the second reading of bill No. 5, to amend the Income War Tax Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, some of the matters to which I shall refer in support of the second reading of the bill are of somewhat recent date, for that reason I should like to remind the house that I first placed the bill on the order paper at the regular session of 1943, but, in view of the restrictions against dealing with private members' bills during the war sessions, it was not possible for the matter to be discussed until now.

The effect of the bill now before the house is to add one sentence to subsection 1 of section 81 of the Income War Tax Act. The subsection to which I have referred, as it now stands, reads as follows:

No person employed in the service of His Majesty shall communicate or allow to be communicated to any person not legally entitled thereto any information obtained under the provisions of this act, or allow any such person to inspect or have access to any written statement furnished under the provisions of this act.

This section is fairly well known to hon. members as the secrecy provision of the Income War Tax Act. It also covers the Excess Profits Tax Act, 1940, since sections 40 to 87 of the Income War Tax Act are, by section 14 of the Excess Profits Tax Act, made to apply thereto.

The sentence which I suggest should be added at the end of subsection 1 is as follows:

Provided that nothing in this subsection shall operate to prevent a minister of the crown from communicating to the Senate or to the House of Commons any information obtained under the provisions of this act.

The effect of this amendment would not, I hasten to point out, result in the immediate wholesale publication of all information obtained by the Department of National Revenue under the two acts to which I have referred. It would, however, remove the prohibition now

contained in the Income War Tax Act against giving publicity to any income tax information obtained by that department.

On several occasions I have had experiences which have brought me up against the provisions of subsection 1 of section 81, and I should like to take a moment to refer to some of these experiences. Back in February, 1943, there appeared in practically all the daily newpaper in Canada a full-page advertisement inserted by the Steel Company of Canada Limited, which some of us felt was unfair in what it had to say about organized labour. It had to do with a strike then in progress.

Trade union organizations throughout Canada, in common with some of us here, wondered if the costs of advertising of this kind were chargeable as a deduction under the Income War Tax Act, and endeavoured to find out if that was so. However, our efforts were met with the reply of the then Minister of National Revenue, who is now Minister of National Defence for Air (Mr. Gibson), that this information could not be given, in view of the secrecy provision of subsection 1 of section 81 of the act.

On another occasion I was interested in the efforts of the employees of a certain branch of the Winnipeg Electric Company to obtain an adjustment in their wages. I discovered that when the employees of the company were before the regional war labour board in Manitoba, one of the arguments advanced by the company had to do with the income tax status granted them by the Department of National Revenue. To put it in the language which was used at the time, they declared that they had been given the status of a depressed industry. That was advanced as an argument as to why they could not agree to certain wage increases.

I endeavoured to find out here in the House of Commons, by placing a question on the order paper, if such was the case; and, if so, on what basis this status had been granted. This, too, was in 1943. Again I was met with the reply by the then Minister of National Revenue that my question could not be answered because of the provisions of subsection 1 of section 81 of the Income War Tax Act.

In connection with the same matter, I moved on another occasion in 1943 for the tabling of the relevant documents and all the correspondence that had passed between the Winnipeg Electric Company and any department of government relating to the matter. My motion was passed by the house, but when the return came down it consisted of a series of pages almost blank. All the house was given was information respecting the dates upon which certain letters had been written, to whom they had been written and by whom they were signed. But the bodies of the letters were left out because of the secrecy provision in the act, to which I have just referred.

I was also interested during the war years, and I still am, in matters relating to the Aluminum Company of Canada and its parent company, Aluminium Limited. During the war we were given certain information respecting income tax depreciation allowances in relation to these organizations. However, when I endeavoured by placing questions on the order paper to obtain information respecting the income tax arrangements made by these companies with the government in the years before the war, again I was met with the same argument that the information could not be given because of the secrecy provision in the act.

Mr. REID: You can know all about my income tax at any time.

Mr. KNOWLES: I am glad to know I have support from across the way.

Mr. REID: And I would like to know yours.

Mr. KNOWLES: I am sure this is quite in line with a view which has been expressed in the house concerning publicity in connection with other matters. I think of the squabbles we had over the question as to whether or not the committee on war expenditures should sit in camera.

Mr. HOMUTH: Now now; that is a different matter entirely.

Mr. KNOWLES: You see, the shoe is on the other foot.

Mr. HOMUTH: That is a different matter; we like to be sensible.

Mr. KNOWLES: That is what has happened; the shoe is now on the other foot. When the question as to whether or not the committee on war expenditures should sit openly or in camera was before the house, all some of us were concerned about—and rightly, I suggest—was that the government should not be given the protection of secrecy, if it were not necessary to have that protection because of the war.

Mr. HOMUTH: We were dealing with public funds.

Mr. KNOWLES: Exactly; and when the Steel Company of Canada is spending money, and sending out that kind of advertising; and when the Aluminum Company of Canada is making money and piling up profits, these

companies, too, are using funds derived from the public. Just as we feel that the government should not be given the undue protection of secrecy, so do we feel that private corporations should not be given the protection of the secrecy they have under the act.

In addition to the kind of thing to which I have just referred, I should like to say a word about two other organizations which have appeared in recent years. In fact, they appeared on the horizon since I first placed this bill on the order paper. First there is the organization known as Responsible Enterprise which is carried on by one Gladstone Murray. This gentleman wrote letters to certain corporations and firms to tell them of the mounting success of socialism and the things they must do to stop the advance of a certain political movement. He called upon them—

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Page Manitoba.

Mr. KNOWLES: We shall have an opportunity to say a word about Manitoba in a moment or two, and with a great deal of pleasure.

Mr. GRAYDON: Manitoba has just spoken.

Mr. KNOWLES: He appealed to these people, as individuals or on behalf of their firms, to make contributions to Responsible Enterprise, I think it is a perfectly legitimate request to ask that the country be told whether these contributions are being allowed as income tax deductions. If they are, it means that the people of the country are paying for the misinformation they get from an organization such as Responsible Enterprise.

Mr. HOMUTH: Does the C.I.O. issue a balance sheet and pay income taxes?

Mr. SPEAKER: I must remind the hon. gentleman that when an hon. member has the floor no interruption should take place. An hon. member is permitted to ask the hon. gentleman who has the floor if he may ask a question.

Mr. HOMUTH: That would take too long and it would lose its effect.

Mr. KNOWLES: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your comment with respect to the interruption of the hon. member for Waterloo South, but I confess that I always enjoy his interruptions. I was quite interested that he came to bat so quickly to-night when apparently the shoe began to pinch.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Will the hon. member permit a question? Since the hon. member is so anxious to expose private business —I am opposed to that—will he join in asking for complete publicity of all union funds? I am opposed to both, but that is the answer.

Mr. MACKENZIE: That shoe pinches too.

Mr. KNOWLES: Do not worry, I am not falling for that one.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I want the hon. member to understand that I am opposed to both.

Mr. KNOWLES: Another organization that has appeared on the horizon lately is known as General Relations Service Limited, with offices at 51 King Street West, Toronto, with which a certain Mr. B. A. Trestrail is connected. During the months just preceding the recent federal election we find that this organization, over the signature of this individual, was appealing to firms across Canada to contribute to his campaign against the political movement to which I happen to belong. In sending out letters appealing for funds Mr. Trestrail attached a printed form entitled "Retainer", and indicated that the contribution could be made by way of engaging the services of General Relations Service Limited for certain things which were listed and which all added up to the production of political propaganda.

Mr. VIAU: What about the *Manitoba Commonwealth?*

Mr. KNOWLES: I am glad the hon. member from Manitoba is interested in the *Manitoba Commonwealth.* The financial affairs of this political movement are open to the public.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. KNOWLES: Oh, yes, they are. Not only do we comply with all the requirements of the elections act about publishing expenses at election time, but at our annual provincial conventions and at our biennial national conventions we make public statements of all the funds that are handled by this organization.

An hon. MEMBER: What is a convention?

Mr. KNOWLES: A convention is something this party holds in each province every year and in the dominion every second year.

Mr. HOMUTH: It does not do you much good.

Mr. KNOWLES: I just want to say that I do not speak with any undue anxiety about Responsible Enterprise or General Relations Service Limited because in the part of the country from which I come their efforts have not had a great deal of effect. A moment ago some one asked about Manitoba. I was in Manitoba until midnight last night, thanks

to the speed with which one can travel by T.C.A., enjoying with the C.C.F. people in that province the results of yesterday's elections.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. KNOWLES: I notice considerable laughter, including a smile on the face of my genial and hon. friend, the leader of the opposition who, according to *Hansard*, was rejoicing last night at the fact that the C.C.F. had been, as he thought then, badly beaten in Manitoba. That was before he knew we were winning eight or ten seats. An interesting thing about the vote in yesterday's election in Manitoba, according to to-day's Ottawa *Citizen* is that the Progressive Conservative party polled 31,000 votes; the Liberal Progressive party 69,000 votes, and the C.C.F. 70,000 votes.

Mr. WEIR: How many acclamations were there?

Mr. KNOWLES: The results were not at all in this proportion when it came to the seats won, but when one compares the percentages of that vote with the percentages of the vote in the election of a few months ago, the picture is—

Mr. MACKENZIE: Does that include the nine seats by acclamation?

Mr. KNOWLES: It does not include the seats by acclamation and there were only seven.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Does it include the seven seats by acclamation?

Mr. KNOWLES: No.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Will you please add the votes of every one of those constituencies to the figures you have given us.

Mr. KNOWLES: It so happens that the constituencies in which acclamations took place were rural constituencies in which the vote is quite small. The C.C.F. led the field in those constituencies where the vote is large. The largest vote polled in Manitoba was polled by S. J. Farmer, the C.C.F. leader. The bearing of all this on the bill is that I wanted it to be clear that I am not saying this just to get something off my chest about Mr. Murray and Mr. Trestrail because so far as our part of the country is concerned their kind of propaganda has not had a great deal of effect. But if organizations of this kind, and individuals such as these gentlemen, are to have the privilege of collecting money in this way, that money being in turn charged up against income tax payments, which means that the people of the country are paying for it in one way or another. The people have a right to know what is going on. I do not think I need to say any more, Mr. Speaker, but—

An hon. MEMBER: Have you said anything yet?

Mr. KNOWLES: At least there seems to be a good deal of enjoyment over the differences that we have and we seem to enjoy particularly any discussion that touches upon political developments in this country. I sense in the laughter and in the readiness with which hon. members of various parties jump to their feet, the fact that all are conscious of the progress of this movement. At times it may be slow; nevertheless it is steady and sure and it is just a matter of time until we get there.

An hon. MEMBER: Which way is it going?

Mr. MACKENZIE: It is going back fast.

Mr. HOMUTH: We are not laughing with you; we are laughing at you.

Mr. KNOWLES: To go back to the bill, I just wish to say in conclusion that democracy functions best in the clear light of day. That is the case when dealing with government funds, and it is equally true in connection with the funds of large corporations which make their profits out of the people of this country. I urge the house to endorse the second reading of this bill.

Mr. RALPH MAYBANK (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all members of this chamber will agree that the people of Winnipeg are ordinarily a most agreeable set of citizens.

An hon. MEMBER: And intelligent, too.

Mr. MAYBANK: And intelligent, too. But I think on this occasion I should rise as soon as possible to indicate that in some respects there may be differences of opinion among members from that city. I cannot very well follow my hon. friend in support of this recommendation in the form of a bill which he has introduced. I think he probably stated matters correctly when he endeavoured in the midst of interruptions to show that while the people of our city disagree sometimes, they keep agreeable in the process. Such, indeed, is, I think, a fair picture of the place in which I live.

In the first place I am in disagreement with my hon. friend in respect of manner. He said at the conclusion of his remarks: Democracy best functions in the light of day—a trite observation with which no one would disagree, but on the other hand I cannot see

how the mere enunciation of a platitude such as that has anything whatever to do with the concrete and practical proposal which the hon. member has introduced. I desire to differ with him in point of manner from the very start by not endeavouring to buttress any argument of mine with appeals in that fashion to more or less clever sayings of other people. After all, this is a very simple proposition with which we have to deal.

I think my hon. friend will not object if I point out that if this bill were enacted in the manner in which it is now presented to the house it would not make one iota of difference to any of the problems that he has laid before the house this evening. Not one particle of difference would result. The sum total result of this enactment would be that this chamber would have listened to observations upon the subject by himself and to what I am now saying and what others may say who may follow me, and there would be an end of it. There would be no disclosure of anything to anybody by anybody as a result of the passage of this amendment. I do not know how carefully my hon. friend has studied the section he seeks to amend, but I am confident that in a moment or two he will agree with me that his amendment, if carried, could not possibly make any difference with regard to disclosures such as he desires to get.

My first reason for being opposed to voting for this particular amendment as it is, is that I would be merely voting for nothing; it does not mean anything. It is a great deal like a person lighting matches and throwing them into the river. They have no effect.

Mr. KNOWLES: Be careful that you do not use platitudes.

Mr. MAYBANK: The hon. member need not fear that I will imitate him in any respect. It is said that imitation is the sincerest form of flattery. I would not imitate him with a view to complimenting him and certainly I would not indulge in any flattery.

I am sure that Your Honour and hon. members will agree with me when I say that the addition to the present law of the words proposed would mean nothing. The underlined words, which are the amendment, are:

Provided that nothing in this subsection shall operate to prevent a minister of the crown from communicating to the Senate or to the House of Commons any information obtained under the provisions of this act.

When you read the whole section as it now stands you will see that the Minister of National Revenue is not prevented by the section from giving to the House of Commons information which he may obtain from various officers of the crown, which is what my hon. friend seeks to obtain. The section itself as it is now, unamended, before my hon. friend's words come in, reads:

No person employed in the service of His Majesty shall communicate or allow to be communicated to any person not legally entitled thereto, any information obtained under the provisions of this act, or allow any such person to inspect or have access to any written statement furnished under the provisions of this act.

Of course, there will be by all people different meanings assigned to the word "employed". When you have the verb "employed" you naturally think of the noun and you know that a person employed is an employee. There will not be any argument about that. One meaning of the word "employed" would be such as to comprehend a minister of the crown. Let us say that ministers of the crown, all members of the House of Commons, all members of the Senate, as well as many others are, in one way of looking at the matter. "employed" in the service of the crown that is, they are employed in the service of the country. They are not "employed" in the service of the country any more than millions of other people about the country are also employed. All good citizens are employed, in the popular sense of the word, in the service of the country. But that is not the meaning which is ascribed to such a word in the statute. A person who is employed, an employee, is one who is paid a certain sum of money and performs certain definite services, although the degree of definiteness may vary. That person is an employee. But by no stretch of the imagination could ministers of the crown, or members of parliament, or members of the senate be called "employees" of the crown, any more than His Excellency could be called an employee of the crown. I feel quite sure that my hon. friend will agree with what I am saying when he gives consideration to it. It is not just an ordinary technical legal argument such as might be offered by reason of endeavouring to exercise ingenuity. This is one of those propositions in law upon which I am confident there will not be any disagreement.

Mr. WRIGHT: Is there such a thing?

Mr. MAYBANK: Oh, yes, there are such ideas now and then, and this happens to be one of them. I appreciate the intervention from the other side of the house; it is a natural one. There is merit in such thought that lay behind that interruption, because it is true that in law, as, I have been told, in other professions even the profession to which the hon. member belongs, the clerical

profession, there arise differences of opinion; in his profession, on theological questions; and I understand that the same is the case with doctors. There can be no question that lawyers can nearly always find ways of distinguishing one thing from another, but there are some propositions on which all lawyers will agree, as there are some propositions on which all ministers and all doctors will agree; and this is one of those propositions upon which, I believe, the whole legal fraternity will agree.

Mr. KNOWLES: May I ask the hon. member a question? If that is the case, why is it that the then minister of national revenue, who I believe is a member of the legal profession, felt that this act as it now stands prevented him from giving the information for which I asked in the house?

Mr. MAYBANK: Well, I do not recall the incident to which my hon. friend has referred; and in view of the fact that he is not quoting the words of the minister I do not know whether he is correctly portraying what the minister said.

Mr. KNOWLES: I will give the hon. member several examples. One is to be found on page 2929 of *Hansard* for May 24, 1943.

Mr. MAYBANK: Yes, I know, but even so the hon. member may be a long way from accurately portraying what the minister said. I have no means of knowing. I should point out to him that if he desires to show what it was that the minister said on page so-and-so of *Hansard,* the best evidence of what the minister said will be the document itself, namely *Hansard,* and not a mere reference by him to a page number. I can quite understand that the minister may have said that he felt precluded by reason of the act from giving information. That is very natural; he would feel precluded from giving information by reason of the act and he would feel precluded from giving information by reason of the spirit of the act. But that is not the same thing as to say that he felt precluded from giving information by this section of the act. That is the point I was making; and I cannot see any sense in passing the proposed amendment, which would be utterly without effect and useless. That was the first point I was making. I am not saying at all that my learned friend—I hope there will be no objection taken to my having fallen into legal terminology and having called him "learned friend" across the floor. There was no offence intended.

Mr. KNOWLES: And none taken.

Mr. MAYBANK: I know it would be a most terrible come-down for a preacher to be called a lawyer.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. HOMUTH: It would be far worse if you ever called a lawyer a preacher.

Mr. MAYBANK: It is certainly far from any intention of mine to insult. I say that this particular section, and that is all I have been arguing about, is not being amended to any purpose by that which is set down in the bill. But in those remarks I have not quite completed my answer to the hon. gentleman.

His remark when he asked if I would permit a question was this: "Well, supposing what you say is correct; how does it come about that the minister made such and such an answer on such and such a day?", although he has not quoted the answer that the minister made or tied it down to any particular section of the law. Of course I might be able to hazard some opinion as to why the minister made the statement in the manner in which he did, but I hardly feel called upon to do so to support the argument I am making. I am quite willing to agree with the hon. gentleman that the ways of minister of the crown are very often inscrutable, and the exact reason why the minister may have made a statement in a certain form is something I could not undertake to answer, not having a sufficient degree of clairvoyance for the purpose. I cannot say why the minister made a statement in a certain way, but I am quite confident as to the correctness of what I have said with reference to the amendment in this manner of this particular section, no matter what the minister said. While I cannot unscrew the inscrutability of ministers of the crown, nevertheless I am quite confident that if, as, and when this amendment is passed absolutely nothing will have been accomplished. For that reason I would be bound to vote against something which I believe would be a nullity after it was passed. That is about the sole reason at the moment that I would advance for declaring myself definitely against the proposed amendment.

So far as the general idea of opening up records—

Mr. KNOWLES: Mr. Speaker, I wonder, before the hon. member wanders around some more in search of another point, if he would mind my reading the quotation which he said I was not giving? To have the record clear, I refer to *Hansard* of May 24, 1943, at page

2929. At that time, in answer to a question which I asked about the Aluminum Company of Canada, the minister replied as follows:

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Speaker, it has never been considered to be in the public interest to divulge information as to the affairs of individual taxpayers, and in any case to do so would be contrary to the provisions of section 81 of the Income War Tax Act.

Later in the same year, on June 7, 1943, the same minister tabled sessional paper 348, in answer to other questions which I had asked which had to do with the Winnipeg Electric company, and the document reads as follows:

The information asked for cannot be furnished as it clearly falls within the provisions of section 81 of the Income War Tax Act reading as follows.

And then the section is quoted. I merely rose to correct the hon. member's remark about my making references without supporting them with the actual documents. I am sure he will now agree with me that I had the information at hand.

Mr. MAYBANK: Mr. Speaker, I say at once that I do agree, in the light of what has been read, that when the hon. member referred to a minister of the crown making a certain answer the minister of the crown was indeed directing attention to this particular section. I take issue with the hon. gentleman's manner again. I am quite sure that up until the time he interrupted me I was not in my argument, as he described it, just "wandering around". On the contrary, I believe I had been rather direct, definite, precise and, so far as interruptions permitted, concise. So far as the directness of my remarks was concerned, and I fancy, so far as ease of understanding on the part of an auditor was concerned, I believe I can call the hon. gentleman himself in witness because he himself understood me. I believe, therefore, that his reference to my having wandered around in an argument was inappropriate, and I am sure that upon thinking that over he will agree with me there too.

It is clear apparently that on a certain occasion, in answer to a certain question, a minister quoted section 81. As I have said, I cannot unscrew the inscrutable, and I do not know why a minister said that, why he put it in that way. But I am absolutely certain about the correctness of the proposition, which is basic to my argument, namely, that a minister of the crown is not an employee, and to say that an employee cannot give information is to say nothing so far as a minister of the crown is concerned.

Mr. KNOWLES: He thought it prevented him.

Mr. MAYBANK: I did not understand what the last interruption was.

Mr. KNOWLES: I say he thought it prevented him.

Mr. MacNICOL: He still does not understand it.

Mr. MAYBANK: Some hon. gentleman has called out that I apparently have some desire not to understand an attempted interruption. I do not think any interruption has been passed over either in fright or for any other reason by me so far this evening, and as long as interruptions are for a purpose and are good-natured—well, I do not care whether they are good-natured or not, as far as that goes, so long as they are for a purpose—I certainly will take note of them if I understand them.

As regards the general purpose underlying the proposed amendment, that is to say, its aiming at disclosure of income tax information —and that really is the idea here—I think the house will agree on consideration it does not accomplish anything along that line. But in spite of the fact that I do not believe arguments dealing with the spirit of this are germane to it, because of its wording, dealing with the spirit of it I must say that it is my understanding and has been for some years that there is one country in the world where considerable disclosure of this kind is permitted, and that is the very democratic country of Switzerland. I am not sure that I have been correctly informed, but I give the information to my hon. friend for what it is worth. I have been told that there has been worked out there a method whereby there is considerable disclosure, and it might be worth while to check up on that to find out whether it is correct.

Mr. HOMUTH: They always quote New Zealand. Do they do it in New Zealand?

Mr. MAYBANK: That is a very helpful suggestion from the hon. member for Waterloo South, but somehow or other I feel that this is not done in New Zealand. I am quite sure that the oratory from over on the other side of the house would have been by now replete with references to New Zealand if what is proposed in the amendement were done there.

I think the hon. gentleman who has moved this amendment would be willing to admit that there are some few things about some few countries about which he and his colleagues may not be fully and accurately informed, but matters with relation to New Zealand are not among them. I feel sure, therefore, that we can take it for granted that this is not done in New Zealand.

Mr. STEWART: In view of the fact that the hon. member might stumble across a conclusion, may I remind him that he has fourteen minutes to speak yet.

Mr. MAYBANK: You see, Mr. Speaker, the general tenor of that interruption. Obviously the hon. gentleman was not good-natured in that interruption, but I am not complaining about that, because, as I said, I do not really care whether interruptions are good-natured or not, although naturally it is better if a person is house-broken and acts with good nature.

Perhaps a correct and precise answer could be given to the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Stewart), who so gratuitously interrupted what I was saying, and that is that it would be more appropriate if he put his question on the order paper.

Mr. KNOWLES: The answer might be prohibited by section 81.

Mr. MAYBANK: While I am aware of the claim made by socialist members of the house to a monopoly of nearly all the virtues—and I am not going to argue with them about that—

Mr. HOMUTH: The people of Canada settled that.

Mr. MAYBANK: —because after all, if they think they have all the virtues, I am not one who would really without need go and try to destroy happiness, even if that happiness arises from ignorance, I would say to the hon. gentleman that I believe the virtue of candour—I think it is a virtue, by the way—might be studied a little more by him and perhaps by some of his colleagues, and an attempt might be made to become more candid and frank in the presentation of matters of this sort. The hon. member began his dissertation by saying that he supposed that he was introducing something which is efficacious. It is not so. He introduced it and spoke as if it were efficacious toward some end. He said it would not require a minister of the crown to make disclosures. Mr. Speaker, the real object of this is to have disclosures made. Surely we do not need to sit opposite each other and try to fool each other by pulling curtains in front of our faces like Turkish women outside the harem. What the hon. member wants—and I can understand his wanting it, and I must say that I think everybody has some sympathy with the idea—is to get these disclosures. That is the object of the amendment. Why he had to introduce a story about it not requiring a minister to make disclosures I cannot understand and certainly do not appreciate. It would seem to me that it is not necessary to endeavour to sugar-coat that kind of pill as though he were giving castor oil to a child.

I do not really think, sir, that there was quite the candour that this house has a right to expect from the hon. member. He first of all tried to drag the house along with him by saying that a minister would not have to give out information. I really think that when we come to deal with concrete matters we shall get along a whole lot faster and we shall get along having confidence in each other a great deal more if that sort of thing is done away with altogether. The fact of the matter is—

Mr. KNOWLES: I rise to a question of privilege—

Mr. MAYBANK: If I am in order I shall continue, but if the hon. member is in order I shall sit down. I ask for a ruling, sir.

Mr. KNOWLES: I rise to a question of privilege. The hon. member has questioned my candour.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. KNOWLES: Not only has he questioned it, but he has cast a reflection—

Mr. MAYBANK: May I reply? I understand the hon. member has risen to a question of privilege and has said that I questioned his candour. Well, I agree with him, I have. Now, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. KNOWLES: Mr. Speaker, we are enjoying the good will that is prevading here, but I feel I must object to the way in which this debate is being allowed to develop into something of a farce. I rise to a question of privilege on the following grounds. According to citation 299 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, a citation under standing order 41, there are a number of unparliamentary phrases. One prohibition reads as follows:

> No member will be permitted to say of another that he could expect no candour from him.

I am not raising any great fuss about it, Mr. Speaker. I recognize the mood the hon. member is in, but it does seem to me that he is sailing pretty close to the wind.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that the hon. member rose to a question of privilege, alleging that the hon. member who has the floor attacked his integrity. I do not think that the character, integrity or honesty of the hon. member has been attacked by the hon. member who has the floor. If the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr.

Knowles) has the impression that the hon. member who has the floor did that I am sure that the hon. member will modify it.

Mr. MAYBANK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Your Honour and hon. members will recall precisely what I said. I should now like to soften it by saying that I intended no offence at all and was not attacking the integrity of the hon. member.

Mr. HOMUTH: Just his judgment.

Mr. KNOWLES: What about the bill?

An hon. MEMBER: Three minutes to go.

Mr. MAYBANK: I should like to thank the hon. member who raised the question of privilege for the remarks he made when he said he felt that the matter in question had developed into something of a farce. Of course it will not be unnoticed by you, sir, and hon. members of the house, that he was impelled to make that remark that this debate had deteriorated into something of a farce at a certain moment. It will not have been overlooked by you, sir, that the moment which he chose for coming to that conclusion was the moment when he himself rose to speak. I must say once again this evening that I am in hearty agreement with him, because I felt it was most farcical on his part to raise such a ridiculous question of privilege as he did.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like—

Mr. KNOWLES: What about the bill?

An hon. MEMBER: Three minutes to go.

Mr. MAYBANK: The hon. member says, "what about the bill?" After he has done his utmost to get the engine off the track he complains that it is off.

Mr. KNOWLES: There are only two minutes left to talk it out.

Mr. MAYBANK: He himself spoke once or twice and said what he had to say about the elections in Manitoba and that they were related to the bill. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, he did not tell you that most of the C.C.F. candidates who were beaten there lost their deposits, but you will find that out. It will also be borne in mind that when he gave the figures—I do not know whether this was lack of candour or not—he left out of his remarks the fact that there were seven acclamations. He did not bother counting those; and, of course, the votes about which he spoke came largely from the large centres of population. Because of the manner in which our democratic processes work nearly all the candidates who were defeated lost their deposits. The house will find out a little more about this later on, but in the meantime I give it that tid-bit to sharpen the appetite.

There are several matters connected with this bill to which I should like to refer. I observe, sir, that it has now reached the hour of nine o'clock.

Mr. HOMUTH: You talked for an hour and did not know it.

Mr. MAYBANK: I was a little afraid, sir, that I might be stopped suddenly, and to avoid that I crave the privilege of adjourning the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hour reserved for private and public bills having expired, the house will revert to the order of business under consideration at six o'clock.

UNITED NATIONS

APPROVAL OF AGREEMENT SIGNED AT SAN FRANCISCO, JUNE 26, 1945

The house resumed consideration of the motion of the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs:

That it is expedient that the houses of parliament do approve the agreement establishing the united nations and constituting the charter of the united nations and the statute of the inernational court of justice signed at San Francisco on June 26, 1945, and that this house do approve the same.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Mr. Speaker, when the house rose at six o'clock I was speaking of the close cooperation between the several members of the Canadian delegation at San Francisco. There was cooperation also not only within our delegation, but with other delegations as well, in respect of the work done at San Francisco. There was, first of all, the closest consultation among members of the British commonwealth. There were frequent commonwealth meetings at which frank discussions took place, but I think the San Francisco conference has proved for once and all the absurdity of the notion that all the countries of the British commonwealth will always speak and vote as a single block.

I do not want to enter into details at this stage, but if hon. members wish they may find some report of the divergence of views taken upon matters discussed at San Francisco, if they will refer to pages 18, 27 and 41 of the conference document No. 2, the report of the activities of the Canadian delegation at the conference.

It was, on the whole, by a process of free vote and discussion in the conference committees that the charter was fashioned. The individual efforts of any one delegation to secure advantage in the discussion could not

have succeeded without the help of other delegations which shared their views. Canada met with generous support and assistance from many other like-minded states in putting forth certain amendments which seemed to our delegation to make for a better charter. Sometimes our amendments secured the support of other countries, and on other occasions we were ready to withdraw our original amendment in favour of those put forward by other states. Without such willingness on the part of all the nations to go some way toward reconciliation of diverging points of view, the charter would not have been written at all.

The actual management, the organization and administration of the conference constituted a formidable undertaking, and I should like here to pay tribute to the efficiency with which the state department of the United States dealt with the problems involved. Nor can I refrain from mentioning in passing the hospitality of the city of San Francisco, and the friendly welcome which its people accorded to all the members of the conference.

The charter of the united nations is, I think, a great improvement on the Dumbarton Oaks proposals which formed the basis for our discussions at San Francisco. Not only does it include many new provisions and changes in the original text of those proposals, but I think it is on the whole more liberal in spirit and language. Many of the alterations and additions effected there are of great importance, but the issues involved are so complex and cover so many fields that it would be quite impossible in this speech to do justice to the whole of the achievements of the conference. I shall touch only upon some of the salient points. In other respects hon. members may refer themselves to the report of the Canadian delegation to the conference, which has already been tabled in the house and which gives a reasonably full account of the proceedings.

Hon. members will have noticed that as an appendix to the report the charter of the united nations is printed on the left-hand page and that the appropriate extracts from the Dumbarton Oaks proposals appear on the right-hand page. Under this arrangement, in respect of any article one can see the text definitely adopted and also the form of the original proposal. It was felt it would be helpful to have these two texts placed side by side for purposes of closer scrutiny.

I have already directed the attention of the house to the preamble of the charter, which is largely the work of Field Marshal Smuts. I should also like to mention the widening in scope of the purposes and principles of the united nations organization. In the last five years we have witnessed the most brutal assaults on all the standards of civilized life—the dignity of the individual, respect for the pledged word and the rule of law among nations.

The preamble to the united nations charter reaffirms our faith in these values, without which no international organization can ever succeed in maintaining security; for the foundation of peace must be laid in the hearts and in the wills of individual men. If war is to be abolished we must begin by respecting the rights of individual human beings. Hence the Canadian delegation welcomed and supported the decision to place in the charter, among the purposes for which the organization had been brought into existence, the pledge to achieve international cooperation in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for the fundamental freedom of all, without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion.

The principles were set out in chapter II of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. They now form article 2 of chapter I of the charter. It will be seen at once in what respects they have been liberalized. Thus in subsection 3 of the proposals it was provided that:

> All members of the organization shall settle their disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security are not endangered.

> All members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner

This has been modified to read:

> that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.

It was felt that it would not be sufficient to enforce a peace, but that a proper peace to be enforced must be a peace which would be conformable with the principles of elemental justice.

Then subsection 4 of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals stated:

> All members of the organization shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the organization.

This has been broadened to read:

> All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the united nations.

This is an obligation, assumed by all members of the organization, to refrain from the use of force inconsistent with the purposes of the united nations. I believe the only

exception to this undertaking to abstain from the use or threat of force is contained in article 51 of the charter which states:

> Nothing in the present charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a member of the united nations, until the security council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security.

The right of individual and collective self-defence is reserved until such time as the security council has taken effective means to maintain international peace and security. But otherwise the members of the organization are solemnly pledged to abstain from the use or from the threat of force, otherwise than under and for the purposes of the international organization. If that solemn obligation is sincerely observed by the fifty nations which constitute this group of nations, may we not hope that if no war is possible among them, they will at all times be strong enough to prevent disastrous wars from being waged by others.

It was further provided in subsection 7 that there should be absolute respect of the sovereignty of each state in its domestic affairs. The provisions of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals provided that the provisions of paragraphs 1 to 6 of section A should not apply to situations or disputes arising out of matters which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of the state concerned. It was felt that this was not sufficiently specific and it was replaced by the following:

> Nothing contained in the present charter shall authorize the united nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under the present charter; but this principle shall not prejudice the application of enforcement measures under chapter 7.

The main body of the charter consists of those chapters which outline the international machinery which is to give effect to the purposes and principles of the united nations. This machinery has, I think, been strengthened and improved in many ways as a result of the work of the conference. For example, the scope of the powers of the general assembly have been considerably extended. The place of the assembly and the pattern of the organization are a matter of particular concern to the middle and smaller states. The Canadian delegation considered that the powers of the assembly should be as wide as possible and that its scope as a forum of public opinion should not be limited. On the other hand, it was important that full responsibility for the settling of disputes should be put squarely on the shoulders of the security council. This involved one important limitation on the powers of the general assembly. The assembly should not, on its own initiative, be able to make recommendations on a matter relating to the maintenance of international peace and security while it is being dealt with actively and effectively by the security council. As a result of the liberalization of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, the general assembly now possess the broadest powers of discussion and the right to initiate studies and make recommendations for the purpose of promoting international cooperation.

The Canadian delegation felt that if the assembly were to play its full part as an instrument for focusing public opinion, its sessions must be public. Although the conference left it to the general assembly to fix its own rules of procedure on this point, the Canadian suggestion was adopted that the rules of procedure should provide that "save in exceptional cases, the sessions of the general assembly shall be open to the public and press of the world."

This is not expressly provided as one of the articles of the charter. Hon. members will find on pages 27 and 28 of the report a summary of what took place in that regard. I quote:

> The delegate of Peru moved on June 8 that the following provision be inserted in the chapter on the general assembly:
>
> The sessions of the general assembly shall be open to the public and to the press of the world. In exceptional cases the general assembly may determine whether it is prudent to modify this rule.
>
> The representatives of all five great powers spoke against this amendment. They expressed their full agreement with the principle contained in it, but objected to its inclusion in the charter on the ground that it was a procedural matter which should be dealt with in the regulations of the general assembly. Since the Peruvian motion appeared to have the support of a majority of the other delegations, there was danger that a vote on it would be misinterpreted outside the conference. The Canadian representative, therefore, made the following statement:
>
> It is essential that this committee make clear its belief in the principle that the sessions of the general assembly be open to the press and public of the world. It is likewise essential that this committee make its belief clear by a unanimous vote. From the speeches which have already been made, it is obvious that the Peruvian proposal to incorporate the principle in the charter will not receive unanimous approval. The public of the world will not understand this. Therefore, as a substitute for the Peruvian motion I propose the following motion:
>
> That the rapporteur of this committee be instructed to state in his report that this committee is of the opinion that regulations to be adopted at the first session of the general

assembly shall provide that, save in exceptional cases, the sessions of the general assembly shall be open to the public and the press of the world.

The chairman decided to put the Peruvian motion first and, if it were rejected, then the Canadian motion. This enabled many delegates to vote against the Peruvian motion on the ground that it would be better to adopt the Canadian motion by unanimity than the Peruvian motion on a split vote. The Peruvian motion was defeated by a vote of 15 to 22 and the Canadian motion adopted by a vote of 34 to 0 with U.S.S.R. abstaining. The delegate of the U.S.S.R. stated that his delegation had abstained from voting on the Canadian motion since such a resolution would be without force or effect unless it were ratified by the governments of the participating countries and that it would not be submitted to them for ratification.

The discussion over the powers and organization of the security council raised what proved to be the central question of the conference—how to maintain the unity of the great powers and at the same time create an organization which should be acceptable to the middle and smaller nations. This was the issue underlying the series of debates which took place over the veto powers of the permanent members of the security council. I do not think it would serve any useful purpose here to review that controversy, but without going into detail I shall say a few words about the position which the Canadian delegation took in this matter.

It will be recalled that under the Yalta voting formula, each permanent member of the security council has the power of veto over all questions of substance coming before the councils, with the exception that with respect to the peaceful settlement of disputes the party or parties to the dispute must abstain from voting. This veto power accorded to the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, China and France extends over all those activities of the organization which depend upon decisions taken in the security council. It thus affects the entire character of the organization, and I think it is proper to point out that it does constitute a serious exception to the principle of the equal sovereignty of states regardless of their size.

This veto power was attacked with great vigour and persistence by the representatives of many of the middle and smaller countries at San Francisco. While it was generally accepted that there must be unanimity of the great powers in applying peace enforcement action, there was opposition to many other aspects of the veto power, and particularly to its extension to covering the field of the peaceful settlement of disputes. It seemed to many delegations to be unwise that a permanent member, when not a party to a dispute, should be in position to veto the application of the peaceful settlement procedures of the charter in that dispute. It was over this particular aspect of the veto power that the debate really developed.

After a long drawn out discussion the sponsoring powers produced a joint statement in reply to a questionnaire which had been addressed to them as to the application of the Yalta voting formula. The joint statement, although it cleared up some obscurities, left many delegations unsatisfied as it envisaged the application of the rule of the unanimity of the great powers to the peaceful settlement provisions under the charter. The Canadian attitude throughout this controversy was based upon two principal considerations. It was felt in the first place that that veto power as applied to the processes of peaceful settlement was undesirable. We feared too that the incorporation of such a principle would seriously weaken the security council itself. The Canadian delegation recognized that this was in essence a political question as to what was possible of achievement in the way of compromise between the great powers themselves and between the great powers and the other united nations. It was apparent that the joint interpretation of the Yalta voting formula represented the greatest possible measure of agreement which could be obtained among the great powers themselves at this time on this subject.

The Canadian delegation, therefore, considered that while we could not accept the interpretation of the voting procedure as satisfactory, it was not too high a price to pay for a world organization which held so much promise in other respects. So that on the final vote in the conference the Canadian delegation did not oppose the adoption of the Yalta voting formula as defined in the answers made by the sponsoring powers to the questionnaire. We were influenced in this decision by the statement made by the representatives of the great powers that their special voting position would be used with a sense of responsibility and consideration for the interests of smaller states and, therefore, that the veto would be employed sparingly.

In connection with the organization of the security council, an amendment was introduced at the instance of the Canadian delegation, relating to the system of electing non-permanent members of the security council. Members of the house may recall from the Prime Minister's previous statements that the Canadian government felt that the provisions of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals were unsatisfactory in that they contained no qualification for eligibility of election to the council. The principle that power is to be

combined with responsibility is recognized in the permanent membership of the great powers on the council. The application of that principle should, in our view, be carried a step further and among the six states elected to the council there should be several which can make a really substantial contribution to the purposes of the organization. The Canadian delegation, therefore, pressed for the adoption of some qualification for election to the council which should recognize this functional point of view. Our attitude was supported by a number of other delegations, but it was principally due to the cooperation of the United Kingdom delegation that an amendment was introduced by the sponsoring powers which now finds its place in article 23 of the charter.

The relevant paragraph of article 23, while it does not lay down detailed rules for the election of non-permanent members, directs that in the election of such members to the security council due regard should be "specially paid, in the first instance to the contribution of members of the united nations to the maintenance of international peace and security and to the other purposes of the organization, and also to equitable geographical distribution." It was explained by the representatives of the sponsoring powers who introduced this amendment that the phrase "in the first instance" applied to the first criterion for the election of non-permanent members; that is "to the conribution of members of the united nations to the maintenance of international peace and security and to the other purposes of the organization", whereas "equitable geographical distribution" was a secondary consideration.

It is the responsibility of the security council to maintain peace, but this does not mean that the council will function only when an emergency has arisen. Any difficult situation which threatens to develop into a disturbance of the peace may be discussed in the council and plans and recommendations may be made. It is, I think, satisfactory that the charter dealing with the peaceful settlement of disputes has been enlarged and improved, because it is before violence has broken out that the organization can do its most useful work in preventing aggression.

The peace enforcement provisions of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals have already been discussed in this house and they were not altered in many essential points at San Francisco. I should, however, mention one change which resulted from the initiative of the Canadian delegation. It was our view that there should be included in the charter some effective provision under which armed forces pledged in its military agreement by a state not a member of the security council be called out by the council only after that state had effectively taken part in the decision. Accordingly the Canadian delegation put forward an amendment, the substance of which has now been incorporated in article 44 of the charter, with article reads as follows:

> When the security council has decided to use force it shall, before calling upon a member not represented on it to provide armed forces in fulfilment of the obligations assumed under article 43—

That is the article referring to agreements to be entered into between states and the security council to provide stated quotas of armed forces:

> —invite that member, if the member so desires, to participate in the decisions of the security council concerning the employment of contingents of that member's armed forces.

Speaking to this amendment at the meeting of the committee on enforcement arrangements on May 10, the Prime Minister of Canada put forward his argument in the following terms:

> The purpose of this amendment is clear—to provide that there shall be effective consultation between the security council and a member not represented on the council before that member is called upon to dispatch outside its own territories forces which it has undertaken to make available under the military agreements contemplated in paragraph 5. It seems certain that consultation would, in fact, have to take place, and we feel that a requirement of consultation should be included in the charter itself.
>
> The powers which the proposals would vest in the security council to call upon all members to join in the imposition of sanctions—military, economic and diplomatic—raise especially difficult problems for secondary countries with wide international interests. It is likely that if sanctions have to be imposed against an aggressor, the active collaboration of some states not on the security council will be needed. Let me contrast the position in this respect of the great powers on the one hand and of the secondary countries with world-wide interests on the other. Each great power is assured not only of full participation in the consideration of the dispute from the beginning, but it can itself prevent any decision to impose sanctions, even if it be a minority of one in the security council. All the other members of the organization are asked to obligate themselves in the charter to carry out any decision of the security council, including decisions which might require them to send into action the forces which they are all expected to place at the council's disposal, as well as decisions which might gravely disrupt their economic life. The council could call upon any member to do these things, and there is no assurance that the member would be consulted rather than ordered to take action. I feel sure that whenever a particular member was desired to take serious enforcement action, consultation would be a practical necessity. Therefore, the amendment which the Canadian delegation has

proposed would not delay action, since it would only incorporate in the charter itself a step towards action which would probably have to be taken in any event. Unless this need for consultation is recognized in some manner in the charter, the process of securing public support for the ratification of the charter will be made considerably more difficult in a number of countries other than the great powers.

I think I could not do better in explanation of the way in which this provision is expected to work in practice than to quote from the report which Mr. Stettinius, Secretary of State of the United States and chairman of the United States delegation to the conference, made to the President of the United States. Mr. Stettinius has referred to the Canadian amendment in the following terms:

One significant and constructive change resulted from the debate, in the adoption of a wholly new article, 44, which contains the substance of an amendment submitted to the conference by the delegation of Canada and strongly supported by other "middle powers." It gives realization on the level of international security arrangements to the cherished axiom of American history, "no taxation without representation." Once the security council has determined on the employment of armed forces, it must give to each state asked to contribute contingents a voice in the decisions concerning the employment of its own forces. For the purpose of such decisions, in other words, the voting membership of the security council may be increased by one—but not more than one—for each decision.

Here is the way article 44 will work: If four states not represented on the security council are to be asked to furnish armed forces to cope with an emergency, they may if they desire send representatives to sit temporarily with the council; but each of these four ad hoc representatives would participate only in the decision which concerns the use of the armed forces of his own country. No similar right is given to states when the contribution involved is only the use of facilities and assistance they have agreed to provide, and the amendment to give such a right was rejected. The conference felt that there is a substantial difference between sending men to fight and, for example, making an airfield available.

It is particularly important to notice that the membership of the security council remains unchanged for all decisions leading up to and including the decisions to impose military sanctions. Thus the operation of the security machinery will not be dangerously slowed by the new provision. Moreover the provision will not affect the use of the contingents of the great powers, which will doubtless constitute the bulk of the forces used to carry out the council's decisions. Even the process of consulting the states that are not members of the council should not appreciably delay the effective functioning of their contingents.

The peace enforcement powers of the security council are concerned with the negative aspects of keeping the peace. But I think all hon. members will agree that peace is not merely the absence of war. It it a positive condition in which nations can cooperate for the common good. This side of the work of the new organization is of particular importance to Canada. In the field of economic and social progress Canada has, I believe, an important contribution to make. The Canadian delegation therefore were particularly concerned with the provisions of the charter which deal with the economic and social council.

This body, which had been allotted a subsidiary place in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, has now been made a principal organ of the united nations. Moreover its scope, which had originally been limited to economic and related social problems, has now been much widened. The objects of the economic and security council are defined in article 55 of the charter in the following words:

With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, the united nations shall promote:

(a) higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development;

(b) solutions of international economic, social, health and related problems; and international cultural and educational cooperation; and

(c) universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Will the minister permit a question, or would he rather finish his speech before he entertains a question?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Perhaps, if it is convenient to the hon. member, I might be allowed to complete, and then if there is further information that I can supply I would be glad to answer.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Will the minister tell us at this time at what point—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. BLACKMORE: It is a perfectly justifiable question. I wish to ask the minister at what point in our discussion it will be best that we do ask questions? On his speech, for example?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I shall be prepared as best I can to answer any question which you, Mr. Speaker, may allow me to answer, after I have completed my speech.

Mr. BLACKMORE: And suppose he does not allow it; when can we ask it, then?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I would not like to anticipate Mr. Speaker's decision in that re-

gard. I feel quite sure that the hon. member will not ask any improper question, and I hope I shall be allowed to answer him.

The council, that is to say the economic and social council, therefore has definite duties and powers which are quite wide. It is designed both to execute the decisions of the general assembly and to act on its own initiative. It is free to make recommendations to governments while the assembly is not in session. It differs from the security council in that all its eighteen members are elected by the general assembly and that all the questions with which it deals can be discussed by the assembly. That is, I submit, a substantial difference. The security council is not responsible to the general assembly; it has functions of its own to perform on its own responsibility, and is not in respect of those functions controlled by the assembly, while this economic and social council is elected by the assembly and all its decisions are subject to discussion and review by the general assembly.

This strengthened economic and social council can, I think, be regarded as one of the high achievements of the conference, and it should have an important continuing contribution to make to the great work which lies before the united nations organization.

It will be observed that the resolution now before the house asks for approval both of the united nations charter and of the statute of the international court of justice.

I should like now to say a word about the statute of the international court of justice.

A committee of jurists of the united nations met in Washington from April 9 to April 20, 1945, to draft a statute of the international court of justice to be submitted to the San Francisco conference. Canada was represented by Mr. J. E. Read, K.C., legal adviser to the Department of External Affairs. The Canadian delegation included the Hon. Philippe Brais, K.C., president of the Canadian Bar Association, the Hon. Wendell B. Farris, Chief Justice of British Columbia and chairman of the Canadian Bar Association committee on international questions, and Mr. Warwick F. Chipman, then Canadian ambassador to Chile, and now Canadian ambassador to Argentina. The report of the Washington jurists formed the basis of discussion in San Francisco by a technical committee of the conference. The technical committee prepared a draft text of the chapter of the charter dealing with the court, together with a revised court statute.

The new court is, in many respects, very similar to its predecessor, the permanent court of international justice. But amendments and improvements have been introduced into the new statute by the international jurists responsible for this aspect of the work of the conference. It will be recalled that when Canada on the 20th September, 1929, adhered to the optional clause of the permanent court it expressly reserved from the jurisdiction of the court disputes for which some other method of peaceful settlement was provided. It reserved expressly disputes with any members of the British commonwealth and disputes the subject of which fall within the domestic jurisdiction of Canada.

On December 7, 1939, Canada also excepted from the jurisdiction of the court disputes arising out of events occurring during the war. Thus while Canada will automatically have, by ratification of the charter, to submit its disputes to the international court, its acceptance of the court's jurisdiction will remain subject to the reservations made in 1929 and 1939.

One of the most important conditions for the success of the united nations organization is that it should be served by a genuinely international civil service whose members are responsible, not to their governments or to the governments of which they are nationals, but to the organization itself. This was the viewpoint maintained by the Canadian delegation throughout the discussion in the conference committees at San Francisco which dealt with questions relating to the secretariat of the organization and the office of the secretary-general. I might say that this is the view which prevailed.

I have attempted to touch upon some of the most important developments arising out of the San Francisco conference. The charter which emerged from the conference should be capable of growth and adaptation to changing conditions. Its constitution should not be too rigid. It follows, in the view of the Canadian representatives, that the process of securing constitutional amendments should not be too difficult. We do not look upon it as perfect in its present form. Moreover, no charter drawn up in 1945 can be complete or final. The states and peoples of the world are, in setting up the united nations organization, experimenting in many new fields of international cooperation. For some years they will be continuing to experiment in the unusual conditions of the transition period from the great war to peace. It is therefore particularly important that the charter should be capable of change by formal constitutional amendment when the world has returned to a more normal state. Unfortunately, the efforts of many of the states represented at San Francisco did not succeed in securing what I would consider a satisfactory, flexible

amendment procedure under the charter. Under that charter each of the five great powers possesses the right to veto the coming into force of any amendment. It is to be hoped they will not employ this veto power in such a way as to give the charter a rigid character.

During the interval between the signing of the charter at San Francisco and the convening of the first sessions of the principal organs of the united nations, a preparatory commission has been set up charged with making certain essential interim arrangements. The two main tasks of the commission were, first, to study and make recommendations on certain questions which could not well be handled at San Francisco, and, second, to expedite the work of the new organization by thorough preparation for its initial meetings.

In order to make it possible to set up the commission immediately, the instrument creating it was put in the form of an intergovernmental agreement with provision that it came into effect on the date on which it was signed, the 26th of June last, the same date as the signing of the charter. The commission consists of one representative of each signatory government. It is provided that the executive committee which is now sitting in London shall exercise the functions and powers of the commission when it is not in session. This committee is formed of the same states as those which made up the executive committee of the conference, namely, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Czechoslovakia, France, Iran, Mexico, the Netherlands, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, the United States and Yugoslavia.

Canada is at present represented on the committee by Mr. D. F. A. Turgeon, Canada's ambassador to Belgium. The committee's work is now well advanced, and it is hoped to hold a meeting of the preparatory commission in the near future. I understand a tentative date for the first meeting has been fixed on the 8th November, and it is hoped that a sufficient number of ratifications will have been deposited with the state department of the United States before that date.

Mr. Stettinius stated recently that already thirty of the nations had adopted approval proceedings, but formal instruments of ratification, according to the latest information available to us, had been filed only by eleven states, and it was hoped that if the two houses of the Canadian parliament are agreeable to the approval of the charter, the Canadian instrument of ratification can be signed by His Majesty and filed with the state department in Washington by the end of this month.

[Mr. St. Laurent.]

In looking back on the achievement of the San Francisco conference, I think it may be said that foundations were laid for a system of international cooperation in the interests of order, security and progress. We hope on these foundations to build world peace and security, but the work of the conference cannot be isolated from the urgent and difficult problems of the post-war period. Only if these problems are wisely solved will the united nations organization have an opportunity to develop its potentialities. In particular, the conditions under which the new organization will function will depend on the nature of the peace settlement in Europe and Asia. I use the term "peace settlement" in its widest sense to include not only the treatment to be accorded the defeated enemy but the relations between the victorious allies.

If there is to be an effective united nations organization the great powers must remain united under the strains and stresses of the post-war period. At the same time it is essential to any lasting system of security that the middle and smaller powers should be accorded a voice in the peace settlement proportionate to the contributions which they have made in winning the war and which they are willing and able to make to the problems of peace.

To build a solid and enduring structure of international security will be no easy task, but the risks of failure are beyond calculation. The coming of the atomic bomb has opened our eyes to the appalling possibilities which may face the world if the united nations should fail to achieve international cooperation. The charter of the united nations is a first step in the direction of that cooperation between the nations which appears to be essential to the survival of civilization.

In concluding my remarks in support of this motion for approval of the charter, I beg leave to quote from a short speech made by the Canadian Prime Minister at the opening of the San Francisco conference. This is what he said in part:

> The people of Canada are firm in their resolve to do whatever lies in their power to ensure that the world will not be engulfed for a third time by a tidal wave of savagery and despotism. That is why our parliament overwhelmingly endorsed the acceptance of the invitation to Canada to participate in this conference. That is why our parliament accepted the proposals of the inviting powers as a satisfactory general basis for the discussion of the proposed charter. That is why the delegation from Canada received from parliament a mandate to use its best endeavours at this conference to further an agreement to establish a world security organization.

Then further down:

It is for each nation to remember that over all nations is humanity. It is for all to remember that justice is the common concern of mankind. The years of war have surely taught the supreme lesson that men and nations should not be made to serve selfish national ends, whether these ends be isolated self-defence or world domination. Nations everywhere must unite to save and to serve humanity.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate this evening I think, like most of those who were present at the great world conference at San Francisco, I shall find some difficulty in bringing into the confines of this chamber the atmosphere and the setting of San Francisco where the charter was finally moulded in the crucible of deliberation among many nations of the world.

As a preliminary to what I have to say perhaps I might properly quote a couple of paragraphs which I wrote home from San Francisco at the beginning of the conference. This is what I said:

Every time one turns around in this almost spotless, roomless, meatless city of warm-hearted hospitable San Franciscans, with their sixty-year-old, cable-pulled, Toonerville-type streetcars, a prospective story is born. Over a billion of the globe's population has someone here speaking for them. In hotel lobbies, eating-places—wherever people gather—the garb and tongue of nations, some of which to ordinary laymen like myself were almost but a memory of old public school history days go to make up this strange but glorious and compelling international panorama.

In the first few weeks of our stay no flags flew in the streets of San Francisco save the half-masted stars and stripes, waving over this city of the Golden Gate in eloquently silent memory of a common people's president, who passed away before two of his fondest dreams had been realized—victory in Europe and permanent peace in the world.

The conference opening without Roosevelt seemed like a party without the host, but his name echoed through the auditorium and corridors of the conference more frequently than any other.

I have been asked from time to time about the Canadian delegation, and with that I desire to commence my remarks. The Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. St. Laurent) very properly pointed out to-night some of the features of the delegation's work. It was a multiple party delegation, a delegation drawn from the three parties in the House of Commons. Its structure largely followed the procedure which was adopted in the United States and in the United Kingdom.

People have asked me, and no doubt have asked other members of the delegation, "How did you get along when all three political parties were represented there together?" Well, I answered them as I answer this house to-night. My answer was the product of my own feeling. Others who were there may speak for themselves. I felt that the mission upon which we had embarked and the job which we set out to accomplish at San Francisco was one which was definitely related to the end of a war which had been hardly fought by many hundreds of thousands of Canadians. Those troops who made possible the peace we now enjoy marched shoulder to shoulder in order to win this war. While they were fighting they were not thinking very much of party differences or party divisions.

Being trustees for these men and women who had fought our battles—because, after all, that is what we were very largely, civilian trustees for them at San Francisco—we felt that we would be less than good trustees if we did not try to march shoulder to shoulder as best we could and present a united and powerful voice on behalf of Canada to the world. That is what we tried to do; that is what I hope we have succeeded in doing. I never thought that there was any room or any place for partisan politics in time of war. I did not feel that there was any room for partisan politics in maintaining the peace. It would be a poor lookout for international amity if we in Canada were not able and willing to provide a united and powerful Canadian voice in a world assembly such as this.

May I make a suggestion to the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs, a suggestion which is founded upon a remark which he made a few moments ago when he asked for the voice of Canada in the peace settlements of the world. In that I think everyone in this house concurs. I think he might go further than that. I think we may properly suggest that the plans which worked out so well at the San Francisco conference would also work out well at the peace conference. I suggest that consideration be given to taking to the peace conference representatives from every party in the House of Commons in order that we may have a proper and a fully united front in the deliberations that have to do with the peace of the world.

At this time I should like to bring to the attention of the house something which went very far toward making a success of the conference. I wish to pay a tribute at this time to the outstanding service rendered by the permanent officials and the entire staff of the Department of External Affairs as well as all who had a part in the work. It was a pleasure to work with them, as it was a pleasure to work with everyone of the Canadian delegates there. Canada's approach to the work of the security conference was one of helpful co-operation. There was no desire or determina-

tion on the part of our delegates to indulge in loud talk or unreasonable insistence upon our own particular point of view. We pressed amendments from time to time, but, may I say, Mr. Speaker, not to the point of hurting the chances of the charter being finally adopted. The charter was far too important and vital to allow considerations of that kind to interfere with its final adoption. In other words, we felt that it was better for Canada and the world if we approached the conference rather in the spirit of a meeting of minds than as a brittle collision of opinions. Canada did not attempt to be spectacular at San Francisco. I had for my objective, and I am sure I am speaking for those who were at the conference, first of all the doing of a good job for Canada and the world; and, second, trying to show the world that Canada was ready to participate to the fullest extent in connection with her contribution to world peace; that she was ready to assume and fulfil her full obligations to the world; that in so doing she was prepared to shirk not a single national or international duty, and that this nation was ready to pitch isolationism overboard, once and for all.

Of course Canada's geographical and national position meant that we had a key part to play, so far as conference deliberations were concerned. Our very close ties with the British commonwealth, our close relations with the United States of America and our friendship with every country great and small brought Canada to a key position, so far as exercising a great influence on the general activities of the conference went. At San Francisco I found that Canada was the enemy of none and the friend of all.

I believe I may speak with some considerable weight, and as a result of experience when I say that of all those nations which took part in the plenary sessions and the sittings of the committees day and night, there was none more popular at San Francisco than was the good old Dominion of Canada.

A minute ago I referred to the British commonwealth, and I should like to say a word in connection with the part the commonwealth played in the deliberations of the world conference, and what I say in this respect will, I am sure, be borne out by all who were there. I was never in my life more proud of the fact that Canada is part and parcel of the great British commonwealth than I was when I attended the San Francisco conference. There the many units of the commonwealth displayed a spirit of healthy and living collaboration which, I felt, should be known to the house. The British commonwealth met every single test to which it

was subjected at that conference. It showed that it was an exemplary, going international concern pledged to world peace, and one which had been tried and proven in the fiery crucible of experience, and had emerged therefrom after having achieved a great victory.

I think most of us who sit in this chamber this evening will remember the occasion in 1943 when the then foreign secretary for Great Britain, the Right Hon. Anthony Eden, stood at the head of the clerk's table, and delivered his address. We well recall hearing him say on that occasion that the British commonwealth was a pattern which the world might wisely follow in its quest for peace. I have come from the San Francisco conference with the conviction, one which has been confirmed since my return, that there never was a need greater than that found at this time for uniting and bringing the units of the British commonwealth closer together.

The wisdom of holding the conference when it was held must be apparent to all. It was held at a time when the world was still under the umbrella of armed hostility. I am wondering whether, if that umbrella had been lifted before its deliberations, the accomplishments and achievements of San Francisco would have been as great, as important and as vital.

In this connection I would draw the attention of hon. members to the report of a prominent Ottawa journalist, Mr. I. Norman Smith who, among others, was with us at the conference, and whose brief but cogent remarks respecting the opening of the conference might appropriately be placed before hon. members this evening. In his brief, but most informative book called "San Francisco, the First Step to Peace," Mr. Smith said this:

> At the end of 10,000 words in which realism and idealism fought themselves to a draw, the charter's authors had lost something of their enthusiasm. The text ends very prosaically: "Done at the city of San Francisco the 26th day of June, 1945." But the united nations charter is the better for having been born the hard way.
>
> The San Francisco conference had its struggles. At the beginning it was not a certain starter. Half way through it was not a certain finisher. Indeed, on looking back on these two months of discussion, those of us who were there sometimes wonder how the conference survived at all. Its father, President Roosevelt, died mere days before it got under way. Russia arrested Polish statesmen sponsored by Britain. Trouble broke out betwen France and Syria and Lebanon. Sides were drawn up on Argentina. Peace rumours occupied the minds of its great men for ten days. Germany's surrender finally came through in a naturally disconcerting fashion, and the British government called a general election.

That indicates the point of view taken by one who was very close to the conference during its deliberations. But there is another matter which might be mentioned at this time, and which is of vital concern and importance in respect of the results achieved by the conference. While it was in progress the physical devastation possible through the use of atomic energy had not been made known to the world, nor had we knowledge of the psychological changes which the unloosening of that energy would bring about. The possibilities of that great power had not reached in and gripped the hearts and minds and souls of humanity, as it has since that time.

While some may argue that the advent of atomic energy has outmoded and outdated the San Francisco charter, I do not share their view. I believe the atomic bomb has made the successful operation of the San Francisco charter even more vitally important and essential than it ever was before. It may well be, however, that in any operations which will take place under the charter in connection with taking action for the enforcement of world security, scientific laboratories may enter into the picture in a fashion which was not contemplated at San Francisco. I do believe that the power plans for enforcement envisaged by the charter may have to be revised drastically, but I am equally convinced that the charter itself is even more essential and more vital to-day than it was in those pre-atomic days. In the light of the atomic bomb, San Francisco must and will of course adapt itself.

I do not hesitate to bring to the house some of the more human elements and factors of the conference because it is difficult to convey the real meaning of San Francisco in words. One found at the committee meetings of the conference the same type of people, the same kind of approaches, the same factors and features, in a greater and larger way of course, as would be found at a municipal council meeting, in a provincial legislature or in the dominion House of Commons. After all, it was a great meeting of people and, when you have a great meeting of people, you have well known characteristics coming up and asserting themselves throughout the gathering.

One part of the conference I liked was the opportunity to meet the men and women who represented the various nations. It was a great and compelling experience to rub shoulders with people from other nations and to talk with them, to know their problems and to try to understand them. But there were difficulties. There was the difficulty, of course, of language which seems to some people to prove an almost insurmountable obstacle. But as one got used to the procedure at San Francisco, as one received the various translations that followed the speeches, one became accustomed to the procedure. In spite of all the barriers of race, creed, religion and language, when one looks at this charter and sees it printed in the Chinese, in the Russian, in the Spanish, in the French and in the English languages he realizes how difficult it is for the ordinary layman to translate one into the other, let alone reach international understanding. I think one must come to the conclusion that a masterly job was done in bringing the nations of the world as closely together as this charter has been successful so far in doing.

I should like to make a further reference to the human element that entered into the conference itself. The dry bones of the words of this charter do not begin to convey what happened at San Francisco and the evolution and changes and amendments, yes and the melting pot through which these various national aspirations, national aims and national claims had to go in order to be refined into the document which is now presented to this house for approval.

A few moments ago the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs mentioned the price which it was necessary to pay in order that there should be a charter. This country along with other countries had to make certain alterations in their positions in order that the price which had to be paid for this document would be paid for by this country as it was paid for by others. I am one who believes that the price was not too great to pay if this charter only works in the days that lie ahead.

A few moments ago I spoke about the Department of External Affairs, and at this time I want to inject another note into the discussion. After having been to San Francisco, I am more convinced than ever—I hope no one will take this as a personal reflection—that there should be a separate Minister of External Affairs for the Dominion of Canada. After having watched and observed with rather close scrutiny the other international movements of like character as well which have been taking place, I feel that the appointment or creation of a separate ministry is a "must" for this dominion.

I want to say to my hon. friends opposite something which I have said to them before in this House of Commons. I think the question of international affairs is one of the most important that this nation and this parliament must deal with. The department is growing in size and in importance. If ever a depart-

ment needed a separate minister, it is the Department of External Affairs. I would point out that not only is there no separate Minister of External Affairs, but there is no parliamentary assistant for this great department which has developed so fast in recent years. It is not enough for this country to have a Department of External Affairs which is a lean-to to the Prime Minister's house so far as parliamentary institutions are concerned. I hold the personal opinion very strongly that we in Canada are entering an era of diplomatic and international affairs of a serious nature, one which is fraught, I think, with possibilities of a kind which I need not enlarge upon to-night. I want to emphasize to this house the importance of having the government so organized that this department shall be something more than it is to-day. This nation deserves that, and in the days that lie ahead I believe the government will find that that is so.

There is one other criticism I wish to make of the government, a matter which I raised a few weeks ago in this house. I do not think the government of Canada pressed sufficiently hard to have the international peace centre of the world come to the Dominion of Canada. In my opinion there were most compelling reasons why this nation might properly have looked forward to being the great international peace centre of the future. In my view the circumstances warranted the exerting of pressure which was at least equal to that exerted by other nations. I have no desire to reflect upon the choice that has been made, but I do want to reflect upon the wisdom and judgment of the government which was remiss and in default with respect to our Canadian people n that regard.

I do not desire to-night to enter into a detailed discussion of the charter itself. There will be others in our party perhaps who will, as the debate proceeds, deal with the various sections of the charter. I was interested in the minister's report of the various aspects of the charter. He spoke about the question of withdrawal. As he properly pointed out, there is nothing in the charter which actually says that a nation may withdraw from its obligations or rights so far as the charter is concerned. However, when this matter came up in the senate of the United States the legal opinion was given, as most hon. members know, that according to the report of the conference itself, while it was not specifically mentioned in the charter, nevertheless the right of withdrawal was left to any nation which desired to exercise it.

The minister has made reference to the general assembly and the security council. There are, naturally, weaknesses in any charter of this kind, but in the setting up of the assembly and the security council, which are quite different in their outlook and jurisdiction from anything connected with the old League of Nations, the attempt was made by Dumbarton Oaks and by San Francisco to retrieve some of the mistakes that had been made in setting up the previous world organization by adopting an organization more suited to the circumstances which now face the world. So that we have in the general assembly and the security council two bodies with a peculiar relationship toward each other. Both of them stem from the charter rather than one from the other.

Let those who may think that the security council is something in the nature of an executive body of the general assembly disabuse their minds of that idea at once. The general assembly has powers to discuss and recommend and to initiate studies. It has no powers actually to enforce permanent peace and security throughout the world. The security council itself is the one organ of the united nations which may be referred to as having the steel knuckles required to take care of those recalcitrant people in the world of to-morrow who may attempt to start aggression.

As the minister pointed out a few moments ago, the security council, with its veto provisions, aroused great controversy at the conference. There was the question of the smaller nations which desired, of course, to increase the power and authority of the general assembly. After all the lengthy discussion of the veto provisions, that power was watered down in only one very minor respect. The veto that was agreed to at Yalta carried through at the San Francisco conference with but one minor change, and that was that there shall be no veto when the matter being decided in the security council is whether or not a certain question should be discussed. In every other respect the veto power remains, so that any one of the five great powers may by refusing to vote unanimously with the others block any enforcement procedure which the security council might otherwise adopt.

There was another Canadian amendment which I do not think the minister mentioned. It arose out of a set of circumstances which I think the house will recognize at once are important. This nation is not one of the five great powers. It could not be one of the five great powers because of our population and general strength. But, this nation more closely approaches a big power than most of the other nations of the world outside the big five powers. It was the feeling of the Canadian delegation, having that in mind, that

when the question of election to the security council or of election to other bodies which may from time to time required appointments from this country came up, there should be some kind of recommendation with respect to our ability and capacity to contribute to the success of such an organization; and the Canadian delegation, while the amendment it proposed did not go through as originally drafted and was watered down and perhaps made a little more temperate, did make a recommendation to the general assembly that when elections to the security council are being held, the question of a nation's ability and capacity to contribute should be taken into consideration.

One phase of the conference's work in which I was especially interested was the setting up of the economic and social council. In the redrafting of the provisions of this new organ, which does not perhaps owe to Canada its entire birth as an organ in the united nations set-up, nevertheless the Canadian people can take some credit for at least sponsoring it in its present form, because the present charter provisions setting up the economic and social council of the united nations contain, I believe, more words written in by the Canadian delegation than by any other nation in the world. That was because the Canadian delegation brought to the conference what was almost a charter in itself with respect to this council. I think we as a nation may take some credit for the fact that in this new sphere of activity, this new sphere of human relations where human values are considered perhaps more highly than almost any other, Canada took a leading part in bringing this new part of the charter on social and economic cooperation into effect.

There are many in this chamber who, I am sure, believe with me that we should not entirely confine our thoughts on peace to curative measures after difficult situations have arisen which need remedying. I think most members of the house will agree with me that the preventive side of war as well as the curative side of war must be considered in the years that lie ahead because, as has been said from time to time, and sometimes perhaps in a critical sense, in our efforts to secure world peace the social and economic aspects of world affairs must be given a more prominent and more vital position than they have ever occupied in days gone by. The economic and social council at least does provide some ray of hope that the nations of the world will yet beat their swords into ploughshares and banish man's inhumanity to man the world over; for, Mr. Speaker, this great new world of ours to-morrow must be a world of trade and prosperity and jobs, and not a world of stagnation and depression and doles. A peace based upon social and economic justice has a chance to live, but in my opinion a peace based on any other foundation faces death at its very birth. So that, having taken a position at this world conference as a Canadian nation on the side of this progressive movement which I have just outlined and which is envisaged in this great charter, we may look with no small degree of pride upon the fact, which I think will be confirmed by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), that the nations of the world have begun to look to Canada for leadership in this great and growing important field of human endeavour.

The question of the military agreements, mentioned by the minister, should not be overlooked. It is all very well for this country to approve the charter; the question is, what shall we do as a nation to implement our fair share of the obligations which it entails? That is a matter which must not be lightly considered by this house. When the military agreements involved in the charter are presented to the house, in accordance with the terms of the charter, for ratification by constitutional process in this land, as in others, the real test of the Canadian people, whether they are ready to practise what they preach, will confront the nation and parliament. One of the Canadian amendments which the minister did not mention had to do with this matter of military agreements. As the Dumbarton Oaks document was originally drawn and submitted as a basis of discussion to the San Francisco conference it was very loosely worded with respect to these agreements. It called in a vague fashion for military agreements to be made between the various members of the organization. No one knew who would initiate the agreements; no one knew who would start the procedure, and the result was that at one stage it looked as though the Dumbarton Oaks proposal if accepted would lead to a stalemate or something worse. The Canadian amendment which was finally accepted by the conference, was, I think, a good one. As a result, agreements will now be made, not loosely with such nations as a country may see fit to make an agreement, but in the future it is the security council with which each nation in connection with peace enforcement will have to deal. We set up machinery for peace once before, and we got war. This peace must this time in every sense of the term be a people's peace, because unless it is founded upon the will of the peoples of the world the temple of peace will soon crumble and decay.

One danger which I saw while meeting with delegates at San Francisco was this: It is all very well to go to an international conference, to listen to the speeches made in plenary session, and assume that the whole world is about to enter a new era of sunshine; but it is most important for those who represent a nation to make sure that, while we are lifted into international clouds of theory, we shall come down and get our feet on the ground and not forget who it is that sends us to these conferences. We have to be realists. Idealism is good, but there must be a blending of the two. As most of us took our seats at the committee tables or in the plenary sessions of that great conference, I believe the thought came to our minds that, after all, it is the people at home, not ourselves, who are to determine whether this peace will work or whether it will fail.

There is not much room now for Canada or any other nation to indulge itself in the role of an international Pollyanna. We have a real problem to face, and we shall have to face it with all the realism in the world. In this connection it may be appropriate to point out that, were another world war to break out, Canada could scarcely count on emerging from it with her own territory untouched by enemy action. Let this house and this nation realize the full significance of these words. Our experience of comparative security in that respect in the recent war is not likely to be repeated in another. We paid a heavy price in men, money and material for failure to prepare for this war. The same is true of other nations. We must not fail to profit by our experience and realize that peace will not be the lot of the Canadians of to-morrow through talk and pious hopes alone. Canada wants an opportunity of preventing wars instead of just an opportunity of fighting them after they have broken out. A peace worth having is a peace worth fighting for. Although the cost be great, this nation must join with other like-minded peace loving nations to crush aggressors who would plunge the world into another armed holocaust.

May I in my concluding remarks answer the question, what promise does San Francisco give? After all, it was not just an idle conference. It was one from which the people of the world expected and were entitled to results. In dealing with this point I wish to speak to the house as bluntly and frankly as I know how. At the time I left San Francisco, had I made this speech it might have been a little different from the one I am making in this house at the moment because, as time goes on, the seriousness of Canada's position and its vital significance in world affairs become impressed upon one more strongly than ever. In so far as San Francisco and the charter are concerned, we cannot forget that it will not be the small nations which will start or finish a world-wide conflagration. It takes big powers to begin and end wars on a global basis. Having that in mind, I would say, let us look on San Francisco, not as a cure-all, but as a great and important advance and a great adventure in international understanding. Having that in mind, I would say in laymen's language that San Francisco is nothing more and nothing less than this. It is the table under which the nations of the world may put their feet and talk things over instead of putting rifles on their shoulders and going to war to fight it out. That is San Francisco, nothing more and nothing less May I go one step farther in my argument. When people ask, will there be peace or will there be war? I say that if the big powers of the world stick together we shall have peace, but if the big powers do not stick together we may have war.

San Francisco in my opinion is the way to peace. There is an old saying that where there is a will there is a way. San Francisco is the way to peace; but unless the nations of the world have the will to peace the way will avail but little in the solution of our international affairs of to-morrow and the bringing of a permanent, just and lasting peace to all of us. Nevertheless the San Francisco document is an advanced attempt to create the best machinery possible for ensuring permanent peace. It is now up to the nations to use that machinery. Civilization cannot afford to resort to almost certain, yes, shall I make it more emphatic than that and say certain annihilation, which now seems attendant upon another world-wide resort to force. This time, the world, in my humble judgment, will think twice before taking any step which will lead to mass obliteration of mankind. That is what the next world war would most certainly mean. It is, Mr. Speaker, a case of do or die, so far as the nations of the world are concerned, and San Francisco goes far in providing the way to peace for a world with the will to have it.

May I close with just this observation. There is perhaps more sentiment attached to the problem of world peace and the San Francisco conference than almost anything which will be brought up in this House of Commons. At least I think we as a parliament have the right to hope and fervently to pray, in the years that lie ahead, that through the instrumentality of San Francisco, through the instrumentality of the will of the nations of the world for peace, we may look forward—I do not say we can look forward with com-

plete confidence, but at least we have the right to look confidently forward—to the days when there will be an answer to the prayers of those millions of people who knelt at their bedsides the world over while the San Francisco conference was in progress and prayed that we would see an end to the marks and scars which war leaves upon humanity, in every country of the world. Those people, our people, prayed that there would come a time when a permanent, just and lasting peace with all its sunshine would again spread its rays over the face of the earth, the time which was so prophetically immortalized in the words of Lord Tennyson so many years ago and with which words I close:

Till the war-drum throbb'd no longer, and the battle-flags were furl'd
In the Parliament of man, the Federation of the world.
There the common sense of most shall hold a fretful realm in awe,
And the kindly earth shall slumber, lapt in universal law.

We shall support the resolution.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, we have heard from two of the delegates who attended the San Francisco conference. The Minister of Justice, Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. St. Laurent), has given a comprehensive outline of what was achieved at that conference and has made, I think, a splendid presentation of the charter itself. My hon. friend the member for Peel (Mr. Graydon) has brought some of the atmosphere of the conference into this chamber, the colourful atmosphere, if I may put it in that way, of San Francisco. If there was one thing which perhaps we learned it was that the delegates assembled there, regardless of their race, their creed or their colour, all made a contribution. All, regardless of colour, race or language, seemed to have been endowed by Almighty God, if I may say so, with equal ability to discuss and to understand the affairs of the world in which we live.

If you will permit me, Mr. Speaker, I should prefer not to begin at this hour the contribution which I hope I may be able to make to this debate when it is resumed on Thursday afternoon, and I would therefore ask you to agree to an adjournment of the debate now and to call it eleven o'clock.

On motion of Mr. Coldwell the debate was adjourned.

SUPPLY

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Last night, Mr. Speaker, I intimated that, with the consent of the house, we should like to move two departments into supply, seeing that we have not yet a single department in. There will be no debate upon the items which I shall call. I move that the house go into committee of supply.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee of supply, Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I would call item No. 1, agriculture, and ask that it stand.

Item stands.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I would call item No. 72, Department of Fisheries, and ask that it stand.

Item stands.

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Wednesday, October 17, 1945.

The house met at three o'clock.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

REFERENCE OF ANNUAL REPORTS AND CERTAIN ESTIMATES TO RAILWAYS AND SHIPPING COMMITTEE

Hon. LIONEL CHEVRIER (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I desire to lay on the table the budget of the Canadian National Railways and Canadian National (West Indies) Steamships Limited for the calendar year 1945 and to move:

That the budget of the Canadian National Railways and Canadian National (West Indies) Steamships Limited for the calendar year 1945 be referred to the sessional committee on railways and shipping owned, operated and controlled by the government, together with the annual report of Trans-Canada Air Lines for the year 1944, which was laid on the table of the house on April 11, 1945, and the following annual reports for the year 1944, which were laid on the table of the house on April 12, 1945:

Canadian National railway system;

Canadian National (West Indies) Steamships Limited;

Canadian National Railways Securities Trust;

Auditors' report to parliament;

together with the following items of estimates for 1945-46:

Vote 377. Maritime Freight Rates Act, Canadian National Railways;

Vote 378. Maritime Freight Rates Act, railways other than Canadian National;

Vote 421. Prince Edward Island car ferry and terminals deficit, 1945.

And that the resolution passed by the house on the 7th September, 1945, referring certain estimates to the committee of supply, be rescinded in so far as the said resolution relates to votes Nos. 377, 378 and 421.

Mr. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, may I ask whether this motion does not require notice?

Mr. CHEVRIER: This is the usual motion that follows the establishment of the committee on government-owned shipping. It is usually brought down a day or two after the committee has been set up.

Mr. STIRLING: But does it not require notice?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE: It can be done only by consent.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVILEGE—MR. CHURCH

RAILWAYS AND SHIPPING COMMITTEE—REFERENCE TO PRESS REPORT OF DEBATE OF OCTOBER 16

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. I wish to direct the attention of Your Honour and the house to a libelous Canadian Press dispatch dated October 16, in this morning's *Globe and Mail*. It quotes only one line from about nine paragraphs that I said, and I did not even say that. I was objecting to the method of reviewing railway policies. It says that the setting up of the committee on government-owned railways was opposed by me. That is not correct. When the motion was made for the setting up of the committee I knew that the motion was debatable but I was ruled out of order when I started to speak to the motion. The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon) has always been a fine supporter of the railway employees and their war work, and I am sure that my hon. friend for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), who also referred to this, wishes to be fair. They will note that on September 11, speaking in the house, I was the first to pay tribute this session to the transportation employees of Canada as reported at page 88 of *Hansard*, in these words:

I wish to say a word by way of tribute to the transportation employees of Canada, whether they serve on land, at sea or in the air. I was talking the other day to a conductor on a train who told me he had been working eighteen hours a day continuously. These employees have made a magnificent record in this war and should receive ample compensation and reward and all other allowances for a fine work well performed.

[Mr. Chevrier.]

I have always, in this house, been a supporter of public ownership of the railways run from the commercial point of view, and not from the point of view of politics. I would call the attention of the hon member for Rosetown-Biggar to the fact that I have never, as this article says, had day by day criticism of the Canadian National Railway system. I think he will be fair enough to admit that I have a record for consistently working in this house on behalf of the railway employees and for the system being run from the commercial aspect and free of politics. I just want to keep the record straight. Further, I said the motion was made subject to the right of the committee of supply as to the voting of public moneys.

I contend, Mr. Speaker, that we need protection from some of the press, because according to our rules a libel on a member is a libel on the whole house of which he is a member. I have the strongest grounds for protesting against this garbled report of what I said in the house.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, may I say just a word? I had no intention of reflecting upon what the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church) said, but I was most anxious to place before the house the point of view that we should refrain from allowing politics to enter into the operation of these government-owned organizations.

TAXATION

INQUIRY FOR REPORTS OF ROYAL COMMISSIONS

On the order for motions:

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before leaving motions I would ask the indulgence of the house to direct a question to the acting Minister of Finance. It is a question that I might ask on the orders of the day, but we may not reach them to-day as this is private members' day. I think the question is important enough for me to raise it now. It has to do with the tabling of two reports that were referred to by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) in his budget speech, as reported at page 1007 of *Hansard*, and also referred to by him in answer to a question by the hon. member for Queens (Mr. McLure). The reports are those of the royal commission on the taxation of cooperatives and the royal commission on the taxation of annuities and family corporations. On September 27 the Minister of Finance, in reply to a question by the hon. member for Queens, indicated that the report of the royal commission on the taxation of cooperatives had been received by

the government on September 25 and would be printed and distributed as soon as possible. In his budget speech the Minister of Finance also referred to both these reports. Someone near me says that one of the reports has already been tabled. If it has, I have not seen it. In view of the importance of these reports and the desirability of their being in the hands of members before the budget debate begins, will the acting minister table copies of the reports either at once, or say to-morrow?

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Acting Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I received a few moments ago a note from the hon. member of the opposition dealing with the report of the royal commission on the taxation of cooperatives. I immediately communicated with the officers of the department and was informed that it had not yet been received from the printer, and that the printer would be immediately communicated with to expedite the printing. All I can say is that just as soon as it is possible to get it from the printer I will see that the report is tabled.

Mr. BRACKEN: Would it not be possible for some of us on this side to see that report before we proceed with the budget debate? It may not be possible to make it available to every member of the house before the budget debate, but I think that before important speeches are made on the budget we should have the opportunity of seeing that report.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I think that the request made by the hon. leader of the opposition is quite fair. I will communicate with the officers of the department and see if there are not copies that could be made available to the hon. member and to such other members as may wish to see it, unless of course, I am assured that the report will be available in print almost at once.

Mr. BRACKEN: Perhaps copies could be furnished to the leaders of the groups on this side at least.

Mr. COLDWELL: Thank you.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk)

*PRAIRIE FARM REHABILITATION—PEACE RIVER BLOCK

Mr. IRVINE:

1. Has the government received a request from the people of the Peace River block, that the benefits of the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act be applicable to that territory?

2. If so, what action has been taken or proposed?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. Yes.

2. As hon. members will know, the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act applies only to what is known as the Palliser triangle in the three western provinces. Two sessions ago, I think it was, a report was made by a committee of this house to the effect that the principle of the act be applied to all parts of Canada. That matter has been under consideration and the whole question has been submitted to the dominion-provincial conference and will still be under consideration when the conference resumes.

RESEARCH ENTERPRISES LIMITED

Mr. FLEMING:

1. What is the total expenditure made by or on behalf of Research Enterprises Ltd., Leaside, for purchase or acquisition of, (a) land; (b) buildings; (c) machinery and other equipment?

2. How much of the same has been sold, and to whom, and at what price, as compared, in each case, with the original purchase price?

3. What undertaking or agreement has been given or entered into by any purchaser of any of the said buildings as to, (a) employment of employees of the said company; (b) maintenance of rates of wages; (c) union recognition?

4. How many persons were employed by Research Enterprises Ltd., (a) at the peak of employment; (b) the day before V-E day; (c) the day before V-J day; (d) on October 1, 1945?

5. (a) How many persons (by countries) were brought to Research Enterprises Ltd., from outside Canada to work at the company's plant at Leaside; (b) how many of them (by countries) have been released from such employment in 1945; (c) how many of them (by countries) still remain in the company's employment; (d) what provisions or plans have been made by the government to retain the services of such persons in the class of work on which they were engaged at the said plant?

6. What provisions or plans have been made by the government to continue at the said plant processes and techniques carried on and developed at the said plant during the war?

7. What provisions or plans have been made by the government to retain the services of employees at the said plant?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. (a) Land, $134,992.72; (b) Buildings, $3,525,181.77; (c) Machinery and other equipment, $5,400,053.70.

2. Building #14 was sold to Corning Glass Company; price $150,000.00. The original purchase price was $522,000.00.

3. None.

4. (a) 7,518 employees; (b) 5,552 employees; (c) 4,986 employees; (d) 3,187 employees.

5. (a) 15. From the British isles 13, from the United States 2; (b) None; (c) All; (d) No definite provisions or plans have been made.

6. An effort is being made to sell portions of the plant to owners who will continue the development of similar processes and techniques.

7. Arrangements are in progress to transfer a few employees having special skills to the laboratories of the National Research Council.

PRAIRIE FARM ASSISTANCE—SASKATCHEWAN

Mr. BURTON:

1. Is there an inspector in charge of P.F.R.A. work in the rural municipalities of Leroy, No. 339; Wolverine, No. 340; St. Peter's, No. 369, and Humboldt, No. 370, in the province of Saskatchewan?

2. If so, what is the name of such inspector and where are his headquarters?

3. If not, when will one be appointed?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. Yes, on small water development work and on land utilization work (community pasture).

2. Jas. Pendergast, Federal Building, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, on small water development work.

Raymond Youngman, pasture supervisor, Secretan, Saskatchewan, who makes a periodical inspection of Wolverine Community Pasture No. 340.

3. Answered by questions 1 and 2.

BRITISH COLUMBIA LIGHTHOUSE KEEPERS

Mr. MacINNIS:

1. How many persons are in the employ of the government as lighthouse keepers on the British Columbia coast?

2. What is the wage or salary paid in each position, stating, (a) the amount paid in money; (b) the amount in shelter, food, fuel, etc.?

3. What are the number of duty hours per week for each position?

4. Are annual holidays provided in the conditions of employment?

5. If holiday leave is granted, is it with pay?

Mr. CHEVRIER:

1. Forty-five.

2. (a):

Number of Positions	Salary range (Annual)	Bonus (Monthly)	Bonus for assistants (Monthly)	Special Allowance towards payment assistants (Monthly)	Living Allowance differential Prince Rupert district (Annual)	Allowances other services (Annual)
3	$2,700–$3,060 2 assistants required	$18.42	$15.30–20.40	$25	—	—
1	"	6.51	15.30–20.40	25	$240	Up to $600
1	$2,100–$2,280 1 assistant required	13.19	6.80– 9.35	25	240	Up to 600
4	$1,860–$2,040 1 assistant required	18.42	3.40– 5.95	25	—	—
1	"	18.42	3.40– 5.95	25	240	—
2	"	18.42	3.40– 5.95	25	—	Up to 600
1	"	6.51	3.40– 5.95	25	—	Up to 1,200
6	$1,800–$1,980 1 assistant required	18.42	4.25– 6.38	25	—	—
1	"	18.42	4.25– 6.80	25	240	—
1	"	6.51	4.25– 6.80	25	—	Up to 600
1	"	6.51	4.25– 6.80	25	240	360 Up to 600
1	$1,740–$1,920 1 assistant required	18.42	3.40– 5.95	25	—	—
7	$1,260–$1,500	18.42	—	—	—	—
5	"	18.42	—	—	240	—
1	"	18.42	—	—	—	240
3	$1,110–$1,200 plus $36.00	18.42	—	—	—	—
1	$1,110–$1,200 plus $37.50	18.42	—	—	240	—
1	$1,110–$1,200	18.42	—	—	240	—
1	$1,020–$1,110	18.42	—	—	240	—
1	$930–$1,020 plus $36.00	17.37	—	—	240	—
1	$360–$420	5.95	—	—	—	—
1	$180–$240	2.55	—	—	—	—

2. (b) At all major stations free housing for both keeper and assistants is provided. For purposes of superannuation the earning capacity of the lightkeeper himself is increased by $200 per annum to cover such housing. Free lighting is provided, and arrangements made for transportation by departmental steamer of food, fuel, etc. In some cases mail contracts exist to augment this delivery service.

3. There are no prescribed duty hours per week but the lightkeeper is required to maintain the aids under his charge as called for by general instructions to lightkeepers.

4. Yes.

5. Yes—at full time isolated light stations; also under exceptional circumstances.

AIR TRANSPORT BOARD

Mr. TUSTIN:

1. Who are the members of the air transport board?

2. What salary is paid to each such member?

3. What are the qualifications of each such person?

4. Are any of the members in receipt of pension or superannuation in respect of previous government service?

5. If so, how and what is the amount of such pension or superannuation?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. R. A. C. Henry, chairman; J. P. R. Vachon, member; A. Ferrier, member.

2. Chairman, $12,000 per annum "provided that, for a period to December 31, 1945, during which time it will be necessary for him to devote part of his time to his business activities, his remuneration shall be at the rate of one-half the aforementioned salary". (Ref. P.C. 6974); members, $8,000 per annum.

3. R. A. C. Henry, CMG, chairman, B.A., B.Sc. McGill, many years in engineering and administrative posts, especially in the transportation and public utility field; director of bureau of economics of Canadian National Railways 1923-1929; deputy minister, Department of Railways and Canals 1929-30; vice-president and general manager of Beauharnois Light Heat and Power Company, also vice-president, Montreal Light Heat and Power Consolidated. During war years, held several very responsible posts under Minister of Munitions and Supply from 1940 to 1945; has recently resigned the post of deputy minister of reconstruction, to which post he was appointed October 13, 1944. Member of Engineering Institute of Canada. Member of Corporation of Professional Engineers, province of Quebec.

J. P. R. Vachon, member; served in the Royal Canadian Navy during the first great war and afterwards joined the Royal Canadian Air Force. On release from that force, he has been in civil aviation from 1921 and has had a long and varied experience as technician, pilot and executive in both scheduled air transportation and in charter flying in the bush; was awarded the McKee trophy in 1938 for the most outstanding contribution to Canadian civil aviation for his work as operations manager of Quebec Airways from 1934-38. From 1938-45, he served on the staff of Trans-Canada Airlines in various responsible posts and, at the time of his appointment as a member of the air transport board, was a special representative with an office in Montreal.

Air Vice-Marshal A. Ferrier, CB, MC, retired, member; B.Sc. McGill, diploma of the Imperial College, Royal Engineers 1914-19, after 2 years civil engineering joined Canadian Air Board 1921; commissioned in C.A.F. 1922; 1937-39 on loan to Department of Transport as chief aeronautical engineer; during the war, after successive posts became member of the air council in charge of all aeronautical engineering and maintenance for the R.C.A.F.; chairman of the associate committee on aeronautical research of the National Research Council; fellow of the Royal Aeronautical Society; member of the Engineering Institute of Canada and of the Institute of Aeronautical Sciences.

4. Yes.

5. A. Ferrier, $71.99 a month in respect of 28 years service in the permanent force (subject to income tax).

WAR ASSETS—DEFENCE INDUSTRIES LIMITED—SALABERRY ISLAND

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie):

1. Are the buildings used by the Defence Industries Limited, at Nitro, on Salaberry island, for sale?

2. If so, by whom and in what manner will the sale be made?

3. If not, what will be their future use?

4. Will the houses built for the workers employed at Nitro plant be sold? If so, in what manner?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Dominion government arsenal.

4. Consideration is being given to this matter but no decision has yet been made.

POSTAL RATES ON PARCELS OVERSEAS

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie):

What are the postal rates for parcels weighing from one to eleven pounds sent from Canada to the following countries: Great Britain, France, Belgium, Switzerland, Holland, Sweden and Luxemburg?

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier):

From Canada to:

	Britain	France	Belgium	Switzerland	Netherlands (direct route)	Sweden	Luxembourg
1 lb.	$ .24	$ .60	$ .55	$ .50	$ .30	$ .75	$ .65
2 lb.	.42	.70	.65	.65	.40	.85	.80
3 lb.	.60	1.05	.85	1.00	.60	1.00	1.20
4 lb.	.78	1.15	1.10	1.10	.70	1.45	1.30
5 lb.	.96	1.30	1.20	1.25	.85	1.55	1.45
6 lb.	1.14	1.40	1.30	1.35	.95	1.70	1.55
7 lb.	1.32	1.55	1.45	1.50	1.05	1.80	1.70
8 lb.	1.50	1.85	1.70	1.75	1.25	2.25	2.00
9 lb.	1.68	2.00	1.80	1.90	1.35	2.40	2.10
10 lb.	1.86	2.10	1.95	2.00	1.50	2.50	2.20
11 lb.	2.50	2.25	2.05	2.10	1.60	2.60	2.35

Note:—Limit of weight for gift parcels to Great Britain temporarily restricted to 5 lb.

MUNITIONS AND SUPPLY—RENTAL OF BUILDINGS FOR STORAGE SPACE

Mr. FRASER:

1. Does the Department of Munitions and Supply rent any buildings for storage space?

2. If so, where are they located?

3. What is the rental for each of these buildings?

4. To whom is it paid?

5. Does the Department of Munitions and Supply rent any land for use as storage space?

6. If so, what is the rental for each such piece of land?

7. To whom is the rental paid?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. Yes.

2, 3 and 4.

Location—Annual rental—To whom paid

Sarnia, Ont., $15,000.00, Dominion Alloy Steel Co.

Beebe, P.Q., $2,661.00, Stanstead Granite Quarries Ltd.

Brantford, Ont., $3,750.00, General Steel Wares, Limited.

Hamilton, Ont., $25,000.00, Standard Underground Cable Co. of Canada.

Trenton, Ont., $1,563.00, Canadian Pacific Railway.

Montreal, P.Q., $11,848.00, Canada Steamship Lines Limited.

Quebec, P.Q., $5,520.00, Quebec Navigation & Warehouse Limited.

Toronto, Ont., $25,000.00, Canada Cut Stone Limited.

5. No.

6. Answered by 5.

7. Answered by 5.

R.C.A.F.—RETIREMENTS—AIR COMMODORE OR HIGHER

Mr. WHITE (Middlesex East):

1. What are the names of all persons holding the rank of air commodore, or higher, who have been retired from the Royal Canadian Air Force since January 1, 1943?

2. What was the date of each such person's retirement?

3. What annual pension or superannuation has been granted to each such person?

[Mr. M. Raymond.]

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West):

1, 2 and 3.

Air force number	Rank at retirement	Name	Date of retirement	Gross annual pension (subject to recovery of unpaid pension dues)
C.9	Temporary A/V/M	Cowley, A. T. N.	12-7-45	$4,668.53
C.11	Temporary A/V/M	Ferrier, A.	23-3-45	5,027.65
C.18	Temporary A/C	MacLeod, E. L.	1-9-44	4,636.03
C.19	Temporary A/C	Hull, A. H.	10-8-44	4,581.58
C.23	Temporary A/V/M	Cuffe, A. A. L.	1-7-44	5,026.80
C.30	Temporary A/M	Edwards, H.	29-9-44	5,845.25
C.31	Temporary A/V/M	Stevenson, L. F.	9-7-45	5,477.04
C.33	Temporary A/V/M	Howsam, G. R.	5-2-46	5,026.80
C.38	Temporary A/C	Mossop, N. F.	10-3-46	4,438.81
C.39	A/M (A/C/M effective 25-11-45)	Breadner, L. S.	25-11-45	6,786.61
C.40	Temporary A/V/M	Anderson, N. R.	11-12-45	5,332.49
C.42	Temporary A/V/M	Brookes, G. E.	22-11-44	4,770.33
C.44	Temporary A/C	Grant, R. J.	3-9-44	4,072.51
C.46	Temporary A/C	Collis, R.	29-10-44	4,671.78
C.50	Temporary A/V/M	De Niverville, J. L. E. A.	11-2-46	5,443.85
C.59	Temporary A/C	Ashton, A. J.	21-5-45	4,751.26
C.65	Temporary A/M	Croil, G. M.	2-7-44	5,600.00
C.66	Acting A/V/M	Godfrey, A. E.	8-6-44	5,830.40
C.68	Acting A/V/M	Shearer, A. B.	1-10-44	4,999.96
C.235	Honorary A/M	Bishop, W. A.	23-2-45	*
C.450	Acting A/C	Irwin, G. N.	1-2-45	*
C.585	Temporary A/V/M	Nairn, K. G.	28-4-45	*
C.621	Temporary A/V/M	Raymond, A.	Retirement pending	*
C.640	Acting A/C	Russell, A. H. K.	13-2-45	*
C.686	Temporary A/V/M	Sully, J. A.	27-6-45	*
C.1253	Temporary A/V/M	Collard, R. R.	28-2-45	*
C.2047	Acting A/C	Clappison, H. G.	Retirement pending	*

*Not pensionable under Militia Pension Act.

ACCIDENTS

Mr. CHURCH:

1. How many people have been, (a) killed; (b) injured, on highways in Canada since the beginning of the war in 1939 to August, 1945?

2. How many fatal accidents from drowning have there been in Canada during same period?

3. How many, (a) fatal accidents; (b) injuries, have been caused at level crossings in Canada during this period?

4. How many have been killed or injured from other causes in Canada for the same period?

Mr. MacKINNON:

1.

(a)

	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944(1)
Total accidental deaths	6,063	6,314	7,409	7,202	7,385	6,806
Motor vehicle accidents	1,584	1,723	1,852	1,409	1,437	1,365
(a) Collisions with trains	(2)	(2)	116	135	95	(2)
(b) Collisions with street-cars	(2)	(2)	18	8	25	(2)
(c) Automobile accidents (excluding trains or street-cars)	(2)	(2)	1,690	1,241	1,287	(2)
(d) Motorcycle accidents (excluding automobiles)	(2)	(2)	28	25	30	(2)

(1) Preliminary figures. (2) Information not available.

(b) 1940 29,504
* 1941 30,984
1942 22,809
1943 20,390
1944 20,228

*Reported by provincial motor registrars, police, etc.

2.(1) 1939 869
1940 807
1941 979
1942 960
1943 1,001
1944 (2)

(1) Excluding drownings where a motor vehicle was involved.
(2) Information not available.

3.**

(a)	Killed			(b)	Injured	
	Motorists	Other	Total	Motorists	Other	Total
1940	93	19	112	338	32	370
1941	120	16	136	397	33	430
1942	122	15	137	390	34	424
1943	96	18	104	364	34	398
1944	118	17	137	336	15	351

**Reported by steam railways.

4. 1939 3,610
1940 3,784
1941 2,726
1942 3,424
1943 3,510
1944(1)

(1) Information not available.

WAR ASSETS—SHOE MANUFACTURING EQUIPMENT

Mr. ISNOR:

1. Has the federal government, through the War Assets Corporation, sold to the Saskatchewan provincial government, or to Saskatchewan Leather Products Corporation, or to any other crown company of the province of Saskatchewan, equipment suitable for the operation of a shoe factory?
2. If so, what was the cost of said equipment to the federal government or to the federal crown corporation purchasing same?
3. What price was paid by the province of Saskatchewan or its crown corporation for same?
4. What are the details of such equipment?
5. Was the sale by tender? If so, (a) how many tenders were received; (b) from whom; (c) what was the amount of each tender?
6. Is any more similar equipment available?
7. If so, (a) where may this equipment be inspected; (b) will it be sold to others on the same basis and price?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. No.
2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7. Answered by No. 1.

POSTAL SERVICE—NEW BRUNSWICK OFFICES

Mr. HATFIELD:

1. What was the revenue of the following post offices in New Brunswick for the year ending March 31, 1944: Atholville, Bath, Gagetown, Hillsboro, Rexton, Rogersville, St. Leonard, South Nelson?

[Mr. MacKinnon.]

2. Are the above post offices located in a government-owned building or in a rented building? If in rented buildings, what is the yearly rent paid?

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier):

1. Atholville, N.B..... $3,380 19
Bath, N.B..... 4,871 25
Gagetown, N.B..... 2,967 19
Hillsboro, N.B..... 4,455 36
Rexton, N.B..... 3,307 26
Rogersville, N.B..... 2,686 90
St. Leonard, N.B..... 4,070 25
South Nelson, N.B..... 2,644 78

2. All are in government owned buildings.

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT—CONTRACTS

Mr. WRIGHT:

What are the names of all individuals, firms, or corporations with which the government has entered into contracts under sections 15 and 16 of the National Housing Act, 1944?

Mr. MAYHEW: None.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

HALIFAX V-E DAY RIOTS

Mr. NICHOLSON:

1. What commitments have been made by the federal government to compensate for damage done in Halifax on V-E day?
2. What commitments have been made by the federal government to compensate for damage done in Halifax area by the recent explosions?

Mr. MAYHEW: Return tabled.

SURPLUS WAR ASSETS—DISPOSAL TO OTHER NATIONS

Mr. WRIGHT:

1. What quantity of, (a) new war equipment; (b) used war equipment, or supplies have been disposed of by the Canadian government to other nations since V-E day?

2. What quantities of equipment have been delivered to each of these nations to date?

3. Under what terms was this equipment or supplies disposed of?

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

INCOME TAX—INDIVIDUALS

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough):

For a statement showing the number of individual income taxpayers, the amount of net income on which assessments were approved and taxes assessed during each of the fiscal years, 1939 to 1945, inclusive, classified according to income class groups; and the percentage amount which the number of taxpayers in each group, and the amount of taxes assessed against individuals in each group bears to the total number and the total taxes assessed, respectively.

Mr. McCANN: There is no objection to the passing of the motion, but I should like to ask the hon. member in whose name the motion stands if he will accept, as sufficient to meet his needs, the personal income taxes reference book of the dominion-provincial conference. I believe that it contains all the information asked for in his motion.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): That will be satisfactory.

Motion agreed to.

REDISTRIBUTION

READJUSTMENT OF REPRESENTATION OF THE PROVINCES IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Mr. FREDERIC DORION (Charlevoix-Saguenay) moved:

Whereas, on July 5, 1943, a resolution was adopted by this house that an Address be presented to His Majesty the King for the purpose of securing an amendment to the British North America Act as follows:

Notwithstanding anything in the British North America Acts, 1867 to 1940, it shall not be necessary that the representation of the provinces in the House of Commons be readjusted, in consequence of the completion of the decennial census taken in the year one thousand nine hundred and forty-one, until the first session of the parliament of Canada commencing after the cessation of hostilities between Canada and the German Reich, the Kingdom of Italy and the Empire of Japan.

This act may be cited as the British North America Act, 1943, and the British North America Acts, 1867 to 1940, the British North America Act, 1907, and this act may be cited together as the British North America Acts, 1867 to 1943.

And whereas the first session of the parliament of Canada following the cessation of hostilities between Canada and the German reich, the kingdom of Italy and the empire of Japan, is now under way;

Therefore be it resolved,—That, in the opinion of this house, the government should conform to the aforesaid resolution and take into immediate consideration the advisability of proceeding during the present session with representation ot the provinces in the House of Commons, pursuant to the provisions of the British North America Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in July, 1943, when the house decided to amend our constitution for the postponing of the redistribution, I was one of the few members who opposed that amendment. I believed at the time, and I still believe to-day, that the reasons given in support of that amendment were futile, and that the measure created an injustice to an important part of the Canadian population. That is the reason why, at the beginning of this new parliament, I thought it was my duty to present this resolution.

Before coming to the merits of the resolution itself I should like to emphasize certain ideas which are at the basis of this motion.

We are just out of the most terrible war that humanity has ever experienced. The united nations have fought it to keep in this world the civilization which we have enjoyed in the last centuries, and also to safeguard the democratic system and the responsible government. Everybody knows that democracy is essentially based on government by the representatives of the people. There are to-day in the whole world two great systems of democracy: the British commonwealth of nations and the United States of America.

We in Canada must admit that we enjoy the most perfect system of democracy that has ever been known in the history of the world; and I do not hesitate to declare that every single individual living in this country expects to enjoy, in the full, this freedom for the attainment of which we have suffered in the past.

One of the essential elements of this democratic system is the right of every individual to be represented in the parliament of the nation, and to have, through his representative, the right to make legislation in the interest of the whole community. Therefore, each individual in the country must be placed on the same footing, because he has the same right as any other in regard to representation in the House of Commons. There cannot be two or three different classes in Canada with certain classes having superior rights over others.

In our country this problem presents some peculiarities on account of our system of representation which was adopted in the British

North America Act. In fact, since the very beginning of the struggle of our forefathers for the establishment of a responsible government in this country, it has been contended that the representation of the country in parliament should be based on territorial divisions known as provinces.

Even under the union government of 1840 the representation in the parliament established for the two Canadas together was based on the two previous provinces, that is, Upper Canada and Lower Canada. At that time, in spite of the protest from Lower Canada, the same number of representatives was allotted to the two provinces; notwithstanding the fact that the population of Upper Canada was much less than the one in Lower Canada.

The period of 1847 to 1867 is remarkable for the struggles of Papineau, Lafontaine, William Lyon Mackenzie, Baldwin and Howe, in favour of the establishment of responsible government.

I wish to cite here a page of that most remarkable book of the joint law clerk of the house, Doctor Maurice Ollivier, entitled "Problems of Canadian Sovereignty", page 7 of the introduction:

From 1840 until now, Canada and the other possessions have struggled without cease in favour of autonomy. The inauguration of the period of responsible government in 1848 at the time of the reorganization of the Baldwin-Lafontaine ministry, the putting of tariff barriers on British merchandise in 1859 by Sir John A. Macdonald, the struggles and successes of Cartier, Macdonald and Blake, at the moment of confederation and during the years which followed, all the questions relating to the right of the dominion to govern itself without the intervention of the mother country are highlights, at the end of the second period, of our progress towards independence.

From 1867 to the present day, there must be noted also the series of events either relating to the powers of the governor general or to our right to negotiate our own treaties, or to adopt, without external intervention, the legislation required in this country. The progress accomplished is reflected and recognized in the course of the diverse colonial conferences from 1907 to 1930.

A few years before confederation, namely, around 1862, the people of Upper Canada, desiring more and more the full enjoyment of responsible government, started to make representations to the effect that the mode of representation in parliament, which had been established by the Union Act of 1840, should be changed on account of the continuous increase of population in that part of the country; they had come to the point where the population of Upper Canada outnumbered that of Lower Canada. Then they conceived the idea of another constitution, and in 1864 a convention was held in Charlottetown for the purpose of studying the project of a new constitution.

This convention was soon followed by another one in Quebec, where seventy-two resolutions were adopted to be used as a basis for the future constitution. It is noticeable that at each of these conventions every decision reached was on the basis of territorial divisions known as provinces.

Out of the seventy-two Quebec resolutions, one may notice that six of them had reference to the representation in the House of Commons, and it never was in anyone's mind that this representation should be established on another basis than the provincial. Therefore we must admit that at the very beginning of the discussions relevant to the representation in the House of Commons, nothing but a provincial representation was considered. This gives the people of this country the right to see to it that, in this parliament, each province is represented in proportion to its population as enacted in the British North America Act.

Two years later, in 1866, the representatives of the Canadian provinces gathered in London, where new resolutions were drafted based on the Quebec resolutions. There again one may notice that special consideration was given by all the representatives to the representation in the House of Commons by provinces, and again we do not observe that there was any discussion on this matter. Everyone knows that these London resolutions were used as the basis of the British North America Act.

It is worth while here to draw attention to the preambles of the Quebec and the London resolutions which read as follows. Quebec resolutions:

Report of resolutions adopted at a conference of delegates from the provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, and the colonies of Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island, held at the city of Quebec, October 10, 1864, as the basis of a proposed confederation of those provinces and colonies.

London resolutions:

Resolutions adopted at a conference of delegates from the provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, held at the Westminster Palace hotel, London, December 4, 1866.

This goes to prove that the statemen who drafted these resolutions were essentially representatives of the several provinces of Canada and not the representatives of Canada as a whole.

After having finally agreed on the terms of the new constitution, the British North America Act of 1867 was adopted by the British House of Commons on the 29th of March, 1867. Here again it is very important to look at the preamble of this act, which reads as follows:

Whereas the provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick have expressed their desire to be federally united into one dominion

under the crown of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, with a constitution similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom:

And whereas such a union could conduce to the welfare of the provinces and promote the interests of the British empire:

And whereas on the establishment of the union by authority of parliament it is expedient, not only that the constitution of legislative authority in the dominion be provided for, but also that the nature of the executive government therein be declared:

And whereas it is expedient that provision be made for the eventual admission into the union of other parts of British North America:

Be it therefore enacted and declared by the Queen's most excellent majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the lords spiritual and temporal, and commons, in this present parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:

I do not need to emphasize the care that has been taken to establish as the basis of this constitution the agreement between the Canadian provinces.

Now, we come to section 51 of this act, which deals with the representation in this House of Commons. I deem it proper to cite here this section 51, familiar to everyone, but so important, in the course of a discussion like this, as to justify its being cited again:

On the completion of the census in the year one thousand eight hundred and seventy-one, and of each subsequent decennial census, the representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted by such authority, in such manner, and from such time, as the parliament of Canada from time to time provides, subject and according to the following rules:

1. Quebec shall have the fixed number of sixty-five members:

2. There shall be assigned to each of the other provinces such a number of members as will bear the same proportion to the number of its population (ascertained at such census) as the number sixty-five bears to the number of the population of Quebec (so ascertained):

3. In the computation of the number of members for a province a fractional part not exceeding one half the whole number requisite for entitling the province to a member shall be disregarded; but a fractional part exceeding one half of that number shall be equivalent to the whole number:

4. On any such readjustment the number of members for a province shall not be reduced unless the proportion which the number of population of the province bore to the number of the aggregate population of Canada at the then last preceding readjustment of the number of members for the province is ascertained at the then latest census to be diminished by one twentieth part or upwards:

5. Such readjustment shall not take effect until the termination of the then existing parliament.

Now if we come to examine the actual representation in the House of Commons in the light of this section, we come to the following conclusion: We have now 245 members divided as follows: Prince Edward Island, 4; British Columbia, 16; Saskatchewan, 21; Nova Scotia, 12; Manitoba, 17; Ontario, 82; New Brunswick, 10; Alberta, 17; Yukon, 1; Quebec, 65.

If we had an exact proportional representation, as no doubt it was intended to establish at the time of confederation, we should have at the present time the following number of representatives for each province: Prince Edward Island, 2; British Columbia, 16; Saskatchewan, 17; Nova Scotia, 11; Manitoba, 14; Ontario, 74; New Brunswick, 9; Alberta, 16; Yukon, 1; Quebec, 65. That is to say, a total of 225.

But, pursuant to the fourth paragraph of section 51, and also to the amendment of the constitution of 1915, the number of representatives must be as follows: Prince Edward Island, 4; British Columbia, 16; Saskatchewan, 17; Nova Scotia, 12; Manitoba, 14, Ontario, 82; New Brunswick, 10; Alberta, 17; Yukon, 1; Quebec, 65. That is to say, a total of 238.

The first conclusions that one must draw from the figures I just gave is that the citizens of this country are not on the same footing as regards the representation in the House of Commons. This constitutes an injustice and is contrary to the basis of responsible government and democratic system. One may ask himself if the fathers of confederation acted wisely when they inserted in the constitution this fourth paragraph of section 51.

I am bound to come to the conclusion that, in this matter as in many others, it is always the province of Quebec that must suffer from such conditions. However, I personally believe and, according to the general opinion of the people of the province of Quebec, I can state that we are ready to abide by this disposition of the law. On this point, like on any other, we do not demand more than that the law be respected, but we insist upon this. That is why I took it upon myself as a duty at the beginning of this first session of a new parliament to place on the order paper the resolution that is now before the house. I do not intend to go all over what was said during the debate of July 1943, when the amendment to the constitution was adopted by this house, as I am of the opinion that the whole question was fully disposed of at the time. I must, however, for the sake of full comprehension of my argument, refer to the resolution itself, which reads as follows:

To the King's Most Excellent Majesty:

Most Gracious Sovereign

We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of Canada in parliament assembled, humbly approach Your Majesty, praying that you may graciously be pleased to

cause a measure to be laid before the parliament of the United Kingdom to be expressed as follows:

An act to provide for the readjustment of the representation of the provinces in the House of Commons of Canada consequent on the decennial census taken in the year one thousand nine hundred and forty-one.

Whereas the Senate and the House of Commons of Canada in parliament assembled have submitted an address to His Majesty praying that His Majesty may graciously be pleased to cause a bill to be laid before the parliament of the United Kingdom for the enactment of the provisions hereinafter set forth,

Be it therefore enacted by the King's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the lords spiritual and temporal and commons, in this present parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same as follows:

1. Notwithstanding anything in the British North America Acts, 1867 to 1940, it shall not be necessary that the representation of the provinces in the House of Commons be readjusted, in consequence of the completion of the decennial census taken in the year one thousand nine hundred and forty-one, until the first session of the parliament of Canada commencing after the cessation of hostilities between Canada and the German reich, the kingdom of Italy and the empire of Japan.

I think it timely to set aside right now an argument that could come to some hon. members' minds to the effect that, as the government has not yet decided to declare officially the end of the war, this should be a reason why the redistribution could not be submitted to the house during the present session. On this point let me remind you that this is not a measure that was passed under the War Measures Act. It is altogether different and apart from all the decisions taken by the government under the War Measures Act. The decision referred to was taken by parliament itself. It is not a matter of considering what the government has in mind, or deciding about the official end of the war; rather it is a matter for parliament to state if the conditions mentioned in the amendment of 1943 are fulfilled. Thus, the only question is: is the present session the first one after the cessation of hostilities? The reply cannot be other than affirmative. On this point I do not wish to refer to any other authority than that of the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) who, speaking on October 2, said, as reported at page 680 of *Hansard:*

Actual hostilities have ceased, but the state of war still exists at the present time.

And a little further down, referring to the powers delegated to the governor in council, he said:

They will be diminished; they have been diminishing by the cessation of hostilities.

Also in a speech delivered in this house by the Minister of National Defence for Air (Mr. Gibson), on October 4, as reported at page 763 of *Hansard,* he said:

Following the cessation of hostilities in Europe. . . ."

And on Friday last, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) said as reported at page 997 of *Hansard:*

A budget which is the first to follow the cessation of hostilities, both in Europe and in the Pacific.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I contend that it is the duty of this parliament, particularly the duty of the government, to proceed, during the present session, to the redistribution of the representation in this House of Commons. If we want the people to believe in parliament, we must adhere to the decisions of parliament.

Mr. PAUL EDMOND GAGNON (Chicoutimi) (Translation): I am pleased to support the resolution moved by the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay (Mr. Dorion) and I am glad to have an opportunity to champion the rights which the British North America Act confers on the provinces, in connection with their representation in the House of Commons.

May I first tender my hearty congratulations to the hon. members who, in 1943, protested so energetically and eloquently against the spoliatory measure then introduced by the government, and to express the wish that the seeds they have sown may produce an abundant harvest at the end of this debate.

Reading again the motion moved by the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) on July 5, 1943, I find that one of the main reasons put forward by the authorities for postponing the proper readjustment and delimitation of electoral divisions was the fear that the differences of opinion to which that measure might give rise would harm our war effort. So, Mr. Speaker, under the pretext of national unity and good understanding, a serious injustice was done to the province of Quebec, and parliament—as was then said by the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Bertrand)—"took the means at its disposal with a view to checking the influence which Quebec was entitled to have on the political destinies of this country". In order to avoid stirring up the resentment of orangemen and imperialists ever ready to cry shame and to assume a "holier than thou" attitude when it comes to granting to the French Canadians that to which they are entitled in the legislative, economic and cultural spheres, the government sacrificed on the altar of race and creed prejudice the sacred principles of the Canadian constitution.

The time has now come to rectify the mistakes made in 1943 and I hope that other fallacies will not be put forward for delaying

the redistribution of electoral divisions in accordance with the procedure clearly stated in section 51 of the Confederation Act.

In asking and demanding that the government observe the provisions set forth in the British North America Act, we are requesting not a privilege, or a favour, but simply and solely full respect for the prerogatives which were guaranteed to us by the Fathers of Confederation. It is important that the hon. members who represent the maritime provinces, the western provinces and Ontario should not forget that the injustice done to the province of Quebec affects them directly inasmuch as it established as a precedent through which the government will later be enabled to mete out to them a partial and arbitrary treatment.

We do not intend to bother anyone with this problem which must be solved without delay. Every day since the opening of the session, the house has heard hon. ministers complain of the hard times we are going through and admit their helplessness in transforming the dictatorship they inflicted on the country in war time into a real working democracy. I have every sympathy for the government and am willing to cooperate with them so as to ease their burden, but these feelings of mine cannot make me forget that those who brought about the present social and economic chaos are the very ones who now complain of the logical results of the instructions, enactments, orders and abuses approved or issued by them as the case may be during the past six years.

Mr. LESAGE: To what great economic chaos is the hon. member referring?

Mr. GAGNON (Translation): Because of weakness or childish fear, no one would assume, in 1943, the responsibility of guaranteeing to each province the fair share of representation to which it is entitled. We waited in the hope that time would settle everything and that the people, burdened by war and unable to cope with the impending crisis, might, in 1945, allow the central authority to solve the problem as it saw fit. Unfortunately, the evil, to which the wrong remedy was applied, still remains very acute.

The temporary measure voted by the government in 1943 has now reached its date of expiry since it is clearly mentioned in the bill submitted to the privy council that the amendment to the constitution ceases to be effective at the first session held by parliament after the end of the war between Canada on the one side, and Germany, Italy and Japan on the other. I understand that according to the figures obtained through the 1941 census, Manitoba and Saskatchewan will now have a smaller number of representatives in the House of Commons; the former will elect only 14 members instead of 17, the latter 17 instead of 21. I maintain, however, that as long as the provisions of the British North America Act are not modified, we must abide, in every respect, by the terms of the pact agreed to by the fathers of confederation. At this time, it may be fitting to recall that in 1881, the province of Nova Scotia had 21 members; in 1891, 20; in 1901, 18; in 1911, 16, in 1921, 14 and in 1931, 12. Therefore, if in Nova Scotia, we applied the principle of representation according to the 1867 basis, it is only fair, nowadays, to put the law into effect as regards Saskatchewan and Manitoba. When this latter province joined confederation, it was granted a representation of 4 members and, in 1881, if the legislators of the time had abided strictly by the figures, Manitoba would have been entitled to only three members while it was allowed 5. The same thing holds for British Columbia which secured, on joining confederation, the privilege of sending to Ottawa 6 members representing no more than 40,000 inhabitants. Nowhere is it mentioned in our historical records that these favours brought about any revolution, raised the race cry or destroyed the harmonious understanding of the Canadian people. At present, under subsection 4 of section 51 of the British North America Act, which provides that the number of representatives of a province shall not be reduced unless its population decreases by one-twentieth of the Canadian population, the province of Ontario will still elect the same number of members, 82, that is, one per 46,191 inhabitants, while the electoral quota of the province of Quebec is one member per 51,213 inhabitants. As I said a while ago, however, this advantage in favour of Ontario which, normally, would be entitled to only 74 representatives, will be detrimental to Quebec and the other provinces of the dominion as long as the constitution has not been amended.

In order to amend the constitution, the unanimous consent of the provinces is required. The former minister of justice, the Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe, pointed this out in the House of Commons in 1925 when he stated that confederation is the result of a pact between the provinces which reached a compromise and relinquished certain rights to the central authority, and the dominion cannot amend its constitution without securing the consent of the provinces which have created it and which complement the dominion government in the exercise of their powers. Sir Robert Borden stated during a debate several years ago: "that there is no reason to modify in any way the terms of our constitution and I am inclined to think that it is necessary to consult the

provinces". This was also the view held by Mr. Arthur B. Keith, an authority on constitutional law, who wrote in his book entitled "Responsible Government and the Dominion", that it was expressly recognized in 1907 by the imperial government that confederation is a pact which cannot be amended, except with the consent of the provinces. Lord Carnarvon and Viscount Haldane, jurists of repute, have shared that view, as well as the fathers of confederation, Sir John Macdonald, George Brown and Mr. McGee who said: "What we have on the clerk's table is a contract."

And yet, in 1943, not only the advice of the provinces has not been sought, but those from Quebec who protested were told that the matter concerned the dominion authorities only and that the prime minister and the leader of the opposition of the Quebec legislature had nothing to do with this matter.

I trust therefore that if some day it is decided to amend further the pact of 1867 more concern will be given than in 1943 to the legal procedure to be followed.

In the meantime, however, political or sentimental considerations should not be allowed to delay further the adoption of this resolution, and I trust that this house will deem it its duty to support wholeheartedly this resolution based on justice and security.

Mr. LESAGE (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the hon. member for Chicoutimi (Mr. Gagnon). But, before I would say that I am not opposing the basic opinions he expressed in his speech, because I feel that the redistribution of electoral seats by provinces should be attended to as soon as possible. In the course of his statement, he spoke of the economic chaos attributable to the present government. I wish to know what exactly is this chaos; let him define it; by economic chaos does he mean the present condition when, in Canada, the purchasing power is higher and more fairly distributed than ever?

Mr. GAGNON (Translation): I do not intend to make another speech in answer to the question of the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Lesage) concerning the present economic condition of our country. We may have another opportunity of dealing with this matter in the budget debate.

Mr. RENE JUTRAS (Provencher) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I wish first to congratulate the hon. member for Chicoutimi (Mr. Gagnon) who has just spoken.

I have been greatly pleased to hear his eloquent words, for they have been doubly gratifying to me, for having been uttered in French. I must admit that I concur, in a large measure, with the views expressed by himself and the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay (Mr. Dorion); however, I must say that I do not agree with these hon. gentlemen as to the means to attain the results sought.

(Text) I wish to deal with this subject briefly, Mr. Speaker, and more or less from the western point of view. We have just heard the question discussed more or less from the point of view of the province of Quebec. We have a great deal in common—

Mr. LALONDE: The hon. member for Chicoutimi was speaking for himself, not for the province of Quebec.

Mr. JUTRAS: That general view is held in some quarters in eastern Canada. When this question came before the house, I believe in 1943, I was away and did not have an opportunity of discussing it, so that I should like to avail myself of this opportunity to place on record a few facts in connection with redistribution.

Personally I feel it is unfortunate that this resolution has been brought before the house at this time, because we are not in position to deal with it as it should be dealt with. There are many great problems that we have to face at the present time. The budget has not yet been discussed, and none of the main estimates have come before the house. There is a certain feeling of unrest throughout the country, and I think it would be best to leave this matter, which is bound to be contentious and will raise many sharp differences, until a later day. To my mind this presents a serious problem and it is something that should be discussed fully and not rushed through the house. It is not just a matter of arithmetic, dividing and subtracting—mostly subtracting, in the case of the west; it is a technical problem, a problem which almost assumes constitutional proportions.

I should like to deal briefly with the census of 1941, which would be the basis of redistribution. What value has that census? We must not forget that it was taken when the country had been at war for a little over two years. Many of our young men had enlisted in the armed forces, and while those who took the census tried to show the original domicile of those men, there is no doubt a large number of them were registered in provinces other than their own. There was also a considerable migration of population from one province to another, and I shall attempt to show that this migration was to the detriment of the western provinces.

Many of our people left the western provinces to take war jobs in the industrial plants of eastern Canada or on the west coast, and there is no question that many of them were registered as living in those provinces. I do not think we can criticize the western provinces for allowing their people to go to the other provinces. They left to work in war plants and thus make their contribution to the war effort of this country. While the census may be true for Canada as a whole, I hold the definite view that it is not true as far as the individual provinces are concerned, especially when it is considered in the light of the relevant circumstances.

What was the trend in the population of the western provinces from 1931 to 1941? As I pointed out before, the census of 1941 does not present a true picture of the population trend in western Canada. The west went through some dark days in the decade from 1931 to 1941. It suffered severe drought periods during that time, and no doubt some of the younger men lost heart and moved to other provinces. We also went through another difficult period known as the grasshopper period, although that was nothing new in Manitoba. I was reading the other day that the first crop failure suffered by the Selkirk settlers in Manitoba was on account of grasshoppers. Then, like all other provinces, we in the west went through a severe economic depression which no doubt had a certain effect upon our population.

To-day the picture is altogether different. As everyone knows, agriculture is on a stabilized basis. The prairie farm rehabilitation scheme has done much to prevent drought, and I do not think we shall see a repetition of that difficult period. Just in passing, I should like to say that the story of the prairie farm rehabilitation scheme has not as yet been fully told. When it is, I am sure all hon. members will be impressed by what has been done. It fills a glorious page in the history of western Canada; it is something that is truly to the credit of the present Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner).

The quality of farm production has greatly improved, and during the war years production was on a more varied basis than it had been before. Safeguards have been set up against destructive pests such as the one I have mentioned. Farmers are better organized, and on top of all this we have the herculean efforts of the government to provide more steady and larger markets for the products of western Canada. I mention all this in passing simply to show that the figures of the bureau of statistics do not convey a true picture of present conditions. No doubt many of those who left during the war will return to the west in a year or so, if they have not returned already.

Therefore the conditions that exist to-day are entirely different. But these economic and climatic conditions do not account for the glum picture of population trend in the prairie provinces presented by the 1941 census. It is noticeable that not one of the three western provinces during this decade retained its natural increase of population. Saskatchewan had an actual decrease of 25,793. Let us compare the natural increase with the actual increase or decrease in the three western provinces. While Manitoba had a natural increase of 70,000, she had an actual increase of only 29,000—I am giving only round figures—which would mean that Manitoba experienced a loss of 41,000 in that decade. Saskatchewan had a natural increase of 129,000, but an actual decrease of 26,000, making a total loss of 155,000. Alberta had a natural increase of 95,000, but an actual increase of 64,000, and consequently a total loss of 31,000.

These figures show that the actual increase in all of the three western provinces would be approximately only 60,000, and if we consider both together it means that western Canada lost in that decade pretty close to one-quarter of a million people. So that, as I mentioned before, the picture presented by these statistics is certainly not a bright one, and I still contend that it is not a true one. But even if the picture were adopted as the one upon which to base redistribution, if we accepted these statistics for the lack of better, what would be the results in the matter of redistribution?

I shall not quote again the section of the British North America Act because that has already been done by the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay (Mr. Dorion), but I would just refer the house to section 51, subsections 1, 2 and 3, which provide that Quebec is to have a fixed number of sixty-five representatives and there is to be assigned to each of the other provinces such a number of members as will bear the same proportion to the number of its population as the number sixty-five bears to the number of the population of Quebec. The other subsection is to take care of the fractional part that may be left.

Let us take the population of the different provinces: Prince Edward Island, 95,047; Nova Scotia, 577,962; New Brunswick, 457,401;

Ontario, 3,787,655; Manitoba, 729,744; Saskatchewan, 895,992; Alberta, 796,169; British Columbia, 817,861; Quebec, 3,328,815.

Dividing Quebec's population of 3,328,815 by 65, according to the section, we get a unit of representations of 51,213, and that would give to Prince Edward Island, two members; Nova Scotia, eleven; New Brunswick, nine; Ontario, seventy-four; Manitoba, fourteen; Saskatchewan, seventeen; Alberta, sixteen; British Columbia, sixteen, and Quebec, of course, sixty-five.

There is the other amendment which was also quoted by the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay, the amendment made in 1915, providing that the number of members from a province shall not be less than the number of senators representing such province. If we apply that amendment to the figures I have already quoted, it changes the picture quite materially because then Prince Edward Island, instead of having two members, would have four; Nova Scotia, instead of eleven, would have twelve; New Brunswick, instead of nine, would have ten; Ontario, instead of seventy-four, would have eighty-two; Manitoba, with fourteen, would still have fourteen; Saskatchewan, with seventeen, would still have seventeen; Alberta, with sixteen, would have seventeen; British Columbia, with sixteen, would still have sixteen, and Quebec's number naturally would not change. That makes the picture altogether a different one, because if we repeat the operation we performed when we first started and were to divide the population by the number of representatives, we would get an entirely different quotient from the one we started with of 51,213. The quotients for the different provinces would vary, in round figures, anywhere from 24,000 to 53,000, and that 53,000 applies to the province of Saskatchewan, and 52,000 to the province of Manitoba. So that Manitoba, which gets a reduction of three members, and Saskatchewan, which gets a reduction of four members, still have the highest unit of representation of all the provinces.

According to that picture, if we were to take, for instance, the Prince Edward Island ratio of representation, Manitoba would be entitled to twenty-five members, Quebec would be entitled to 139 members and Ontario to 158 members. That is one extreme.

Suppose we take the ratio of the province of Ontario, that would give Manitoba sixteen members instead of fourteen, and would give Quebec seventy-two members instead of sixty-five.

I am in full agreement with the hon. member who has just spoken. The province of Quebec at the present time under the constitution is left with sixty-five members, with a population of 3,329,000, as against 3,778,000 in Ontario, and yet has seventeen fewer members than Ontario. That to my mind does not really give a fair representation.

It is quite apparent that the fathers of confedration when they put these sections in the British North America Act had the full intention of providing representation by population, and I contend that the constitution at the present time does not carry out that intention of the fathers of confederation. If we are to proceed with redistribution at the present time, fair play should be given to all the provinces, and if we embarked upon redistribution obviously we would have quite a problem to face. I still contend that this of all times is not the time to deal with redistribution at this session, because it certainly does not affect the present representation in this house. That cannot be changed until after the next election; and so far as the western provinces are concerned, we are having a census next year, which may throw a good deal of light on the subject. I would therefore strongly urge that the enactment of this legislation, if it be done at all, be delayed until such time as we can do full justice in this house to all the provinces in the light of all the circumstances.

One of the main arguments which were brought forward at the time that the amendment was presented to the British parliament for ratification was that a time of war was not the proper time to do such a thing. That was really a good argument and a serious one. It was felt also that the matter was too contentious to be dealt with in war time. I fully agree. I still ask myself the question, why enter into such a discussion at the present time? I for one fail to see why the western provinces should be penalized for having allowed their young men and their young women to go and work in the war plants of eastern Canada and the west coast. Some allowance should be made for these circumstances. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the question is one that is full of implications and likely to give rise to sharp and acrimonious differences, and I most sincerely suggest that neither is this an opportune time to consider the motion, nor have we time at present to do it full justice. For these reasons I submit that we should delay the matter until some later occasion.

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Minister of Justice): I had not intended to speak at this moment. I had been informed that several others wished to take part in the debate. But

I should not like the motion to be put without having had an opportunity of making some observations to the house.

I fully appreciate the interest of hon. members in this important matter of proper representation of the people of all the provinces in this Canadian parliament, but I do not think it would be proper for the house to adopt this motion in the terms in which it is couched. The operative part of the motion is in the following terms:

> Therefore be it resolved,—That in the opinion of this house, the government should conform to the aforesaid resolution and take into immediate consideration the advisability of proceeding during the present session with representation of the provinces in the House of Commons, pursuant to the provisions of the British North America Act.

Although I am at the present time a member of the government, I am also, and first of all, as a qualification to be enabled to participate in the government, a member of the House of Commons, and it is my view that it is not the government that controls redistribution, but that it is the Canadian parliament, and that to pass this resolution in the terms in which it is drawn would be indicative of an abdication of the rights and privileges of this house. There is nothing in the British North America Act which gives the government of Canada any control over the representation of the Canadian people in this parliament. The government is charged with the execution or the carrying out of the laws passed by parliament. But the matter of determining the proper proportional representation of the public of Canada in this parliament is within the jurisdiction of parliament itself, and I do not think it would be a democratic expression of opinion to say that it is for the government to provide for redistribution. That is the first observation I wish to submit to the consideration of hon. members.

Of course the government is composed of members of this house, and consideration was given to this matter of redistribution when it became apparent toward the end of August that there was likely to be unconditional surrender of the Japanese armies to the allied forces. At that time the legislative programme for this session of parliament had been determined; and I think the experience of all of us is that there is a pretty heavy legislative programme to be dealt with. Although we have been in session for some considerable time, there is on the order paper and there has been forecast in the speech from the throne a number of matters which have not yet been dealt with, or at any rate fully dealt with, and which require our attention at this session. Nevertheless, personally I was disturbed over the recollection I had of the terms in which the amendment to the British North America Act had been drawn in 1943, and I discussed the matter with other members of parliament who happened to be also members of the government. The situation was envisaged in the light of the legislative programme which had been prepared and which it appeared necessary to have parliament act upon at the earliest possible moment. I then asked the law officers of the Department of Justice to consider the matter of the terms of this 1943 amendment. Their opinion conforms with that expressed by hon. members who so far have taken part in the debate. We do not propose to be technical, but the expression used in the statute is "the cessation of hostilities with the German reich, the kingdom of Italy, and the empire of Japan." I think that for the purposes of ordinary comprehension most people regard the unconditional surrender of Japan as amounting to a cessation of hostilities. That would not be a cessation of the state of war as envisaged in the War Measures Act; but, as has been pointed out by the hon. member who moved the resolution, this matter is in no wise connected with the interpretation or application of the War Measures Act, and the cessation of hostilities as expressed in the 1943 statute is, I think, a matter of fact and not a matter of a technical declaration of the existence or non-existence of a continued state of war. It is well known that the existence of a state of war according to international law does not end with the surrender of one of the participants in that war. I do not think that that technical existence of a continued state of war after the actual surrender of one of the participants in the war is identical with the situation described by "cessation of hostilities". I assume we should take it for granted that when the unconditional surrender had been made and accepted we could regard active hostilities as having ceased, and it was on that basis that I asked the law officers of the department to examine the question whether or not there was an obligation, not on the government but on the Canadian parliament, to provide at its first session for a redistribution of its membership to become effective at the expiry of that parliament.

It really is a question of law rather than one of any practical consequences, because a redistribution does not operate for by-elections during the life of a parliament. It comes into effect only at the expiry of the parliament that makes the redistribution. Perhaps I may have been optimistic, but I did not anticipate that there would be another

general election immediately after this session of parliament. I did not anticipate that there would not be, before another general election, opportunity for one or more sessions of parliament, during which parliament could discharge its responsibility of providing for the redistribution of its membership.

But the technical legal question did give me some concern. The opinion that was given to me by the law officers of the department is almost in the language that was used by the hon. member, the mover, and his colleague, the seconder of the motion: that the effect of the 1943 amendment expired with the cessation of hostilities, that parliament then fell back upon the situation as it existed under the terms of section 51 of the British North America Act, and that that did not mean that redistribution had to be provided for at the first session. It meant that there was no longer any special legislation in force which prevented the application of section 51, but that after the effect of the special legislation disappeared, section 51 operated. as it always operated after every previous census which has taken place, and that parliament provided for redistribution, but not necessarily at the first session when it would be legally possible to carry it out because the census results had been compiled and published.

The note that was given to me is that the British North America Act, 1943, provides that it shall not be necessary that the representation of the provinces be readjusted in consequence of the completion of the 1941 decennial census until the first session of parliament commencing after the cessation of hostilities. Section 51 of the British North America Act, 1867, provides that on the completion of each decennial census the representation shall be readjusted.

The amendment of 1943 relieves the duty imposed by section 51 until after the cessation of hostilities, and thereupon the duty imposed by section 51 again arises, that the representation be adjusted on the completion of the census. Subject only to section 51, the readjustment can be effected in any session after the cessation of hostilities. Legislation for decennial readjustments was passed, after the 1931 session, in 1933.

Mr. MacNICOL: May I ask the minister a question? Do we understand, then, that redistribution must take place before another general election?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: That is the requirement of section 51 as I construe it. The section says that redistribution shall be made from such time as parliament shall determine. But I think the whole sense of the section is that it is the duty of the parliament in existence when the census is completed to provide for a redistribution to be effective for the election of the following parliament. Following the 1921 census, the redistribution was made in 1924; following that of 1911, it was made in 1914; and so forth.

I may assure hon. members that the members of the government, as members of the house, realize the responsibility that results from the terms of the British North America Act and are anxious that that responsibility be discharged and that parliament do redistribute before another general election; and I hope that it will be done at the session of parliament which it will be necessary to have begun early in 1946. I do not think it would be possible to have redistribution enacted during this session if we are to have, as we shall normally be required to have, another session commencing early in 1946.

Hon. members will realize that the current fiscal year will expire on March 31, 1946, and that the budget with respect to which resolutions were submitted last Friday is the budget for the current fiscal year and that another appropriation will be required for the year that will commence on the 1st of April, 1946; and I think it would be unheard of to have two budgets provided in the same session. My anticipation is that this session will come to an end before the fiscal year comes to an end and that there will be another one which will begin before the next fiscal year begins and that there will be an opportunity to bring down estimates; and if they are not passed, an opportunity will be provided to ask the house to furnish interim supply based on those estimates, before the 1946-47 fiscal year begins.

When this matter of redistribution is being dealt with by parliament, whether it be on a bill introduced by a member of the government, or introduced by some other member of this house—because I know of no provision which would prevent any member of this house from introducing a redistribution bill—when that bill is introduced and is under consideration, speaking as a private member I would hope that serious consideration would be given to the situation as it exists under the construction put by the privy council upon the application of the fourth rule of section 51.

Hon. members who were in the last parliament will remember that in 1943, when a resolution for a special act postponing redistribution was under discussion, the decision in the case with respect to Prince Edward Island, the case of the attorney general of Prince Edward Island and the Attorney General of Canada, reported in Law Reports of 1905, Appeal Cases, at page 37, was referred to and

discussed. It was pointed out that under that decision the privy council had held that the language of the fourth rule of section 51, which contains the following words:

. . . at the then last preceding readjustment of the number of members for the province—

—does not require a change in the number of members for a province, but that when, after a census, the number of members for a province was compared with the result of the census it amounted to a readjustment of the representation. That was said in a case in which the attorney general of Prince Edward Island was contending that there could not be any reduction in membership for a province until there had been some increase. He was contending that until there had been some increase there had been no readjustment. Their lordships held that that contention could not be admitted and they said this:

Their lordships think this is to give too narrow a meaning to the words.

In their opinion, when as a result of a census the representation of the provinces is reconsidered and the necessary changes, if any, made to bring it into harmony with the results of the census, that is a readjustment within the meaning of subsection 4 whether there be or be not any change in the case of any particular province.

Mr. MacNICOL: May I ask the minister if this house has not on one or more occasions passed legislation to the effect that no province shall have its membership reduced below the number of senators allowed to such province by the constitution? Because of that Prince Edward Island was allowed to retain four members to conform to the four senators; New Brunswick, which ordinarily would have lost membership in this house, was not to be reduced below ten the number of senators that come from that province, and similarly Nova Scotia was not to have fewer members than senators.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: The hon. member is quite right. That was provided for by an amendment to the British North America Act which was made in 1915. There was a special provision enacted that year that in no case was the number of representatives for the people of a province in the House of Commons to be fewer than the representatives that that province is entitled to have in the senate. That, of course, had to be done by a statute of the parliament of Westminster, because it was a modification of the British North America Act. It is because the statute of Westminster of 1931 was, at the request of the provinces, declared to be inapplicable to the amendment of the British North America Act that it was necessary in 1943 to have the parliament of the United Kingdom say that this parliament would not be required to proceed with redistribution during the war.

If there were to be any other change in the application of section 51, as it exists and as it has been construed, it would require legislation of the parliament of the United Kingdom to give it effect.

But to proceed with the argument I was trying to develop when the hon. member suggested his question, this language used by the privy council has been applied to the whole of rule 4 of section 51. Rule 4 provides that the representation of a province will not be reduced after a census unless its proportion of population compared with the population of the whole of Canada has diminished by as much as five per cent.

Mr. KNOWLES: Five per cent of the previous proportion?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Five per cent of the previous proportion.

Mr. KNOWLES: It is pretty complicated.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Yes, it is quite complicated; but the part of the rule which has brought about the situation described by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Jutras) is due to the construction put upon its terms by the privy council in 1905. It means that although there may be an accumulated difference of more than five per cent of the proportion, but if it does not occur in one decade it is ineffective. If it happened to be four per cent for five successive decades, amounting in all to as much as twenty per cent, it would still be inoperative because no five per cent of it would have taken place within a single decade.

The application of the rule has worked in the manner which has been described. When I spoke on the resolution in 1943 I cited the cases of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Ontario and Quebec. There is one that I did not mention at that time. According to the returns of the last census, the population of British Columbia is 817,861; that of Alberta is 796,169. As a result of the application of this rule, in the next parliament, if no change is made in the rule, Alberta will have seventeen representatives and British Columbia, sixteen, although British Columbia has, according to the census of 1941, a larger population than Alberta by some twenty thousand. As has been already pointed out, on a strictly proportionate basis the number of representatives for several provinces would not be the same as if the redistribution proceeded upon the basis on which it will have to proceed if no constitutional change is made.

Mr. MacNICOL: To complete the record, is the minister able to give the citation for the special consideration given to the Yukon?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I know that the Yukon is entitled to at least one representative, but I do not happen to have the text at hand which provides that.

Mr. KNOWLES: It is not determined by the British North America Act; it is within the competence of parliament to decide. I quote from the document published in connection with that matter.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Therefore I am not making any plea to-day for any special interest or issue; I am merely suggesting, as one of the members of parliament, that when the matter of redistribution comes up I would expect parliament to give consideration to the question whether or not the old rule should continue to be applied, or whether there would be at that time a proposal to put representation back on a proportionate basis for each and every one of the provinces. I would expect that to be a matter which would be given serious consideration by parliament because, speaking personally and not as Minister of Justice, I think there is a good deal in the suggestion that this is what was intended by the fathers of confederation. We do not personally remember what the controversy was in regard to "rep by pop," but we have all read about it and we all know that the desire of Upper Canada to have proper proportionate representation was one of the motives which started the discussions for a new constitution to replace that of the union under which both Upper and Lower Canada were given the same number of representatives in their joint parliament.

The matter of redistribution certainly will have to be dealt with by parliament, or parliament will be failing in the responsibility which results from the constitution itself. In 1943 the government took the responsibility of recommending to parliament an address to His Majesty to have an amendment passed postponing redistribution until after the cessation of hostilities. There has been no thought in the mind of anyone to take the responsibility of requesting a further postponement of redistribution. It may well be that this house itself will wish to take that responsibility if it comes to the conclusion that it would be unfair to carry out a redistribution which would bring about the results that have been indicated by some hon. members. That is something which will have to be determined by the house itself, by the members of the house; and whatever the determination is, I confidently expect that there will be a redistribution which will conform with the constitution either as it is or as it is made to be after proper amendment. It is my earnest hope that when this is done it will not be regarded as a government proposal, but as something done by the parliament of Canada itself to discharge its responsibility to those who elect members to this house, something that will be done completely without any partisan feeling, because we all owe it to our constituents to do everything possible to keep this institution in the high regard to which it is entitled as a truly democratic, representative institution of the people of Canada. I think it would be detrimental to the best interests of Canadian democracy to have it felt that this was being dealt with as a football to be tossed about in partisan discussion or conflict. It is much more than that. It is the true representation of the Canadian people in a free parliament which is required, and that should be the only object each of us will seek to attain when we come to deal with the redistribution of its membership.

I wished to mention one further point, although not for the purpose of raising any controversy about it. The suggestion has been made that there can be no amendment of the British North America Act which would affect the representation of the people of the provinces in this house without the consent of the provincial legislatures.

Mr. MacNICOL: Does that not mean only the consent of the four provinces which originally entered into confederation?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I am not sure what it means, but even if it means that much I would not agree with it, because in my view that is not something which by the British North America Act is confided to the jurisdiction of the provincial legislatures. The provincial legislatures have to deal with matters assigned to them by that act; but the representation of the Canadian people in this parliament, no matter in what province they live, is not something which has been placed under the care of the provincial legislatures. It is within the jurisdiction of this house and of the members elected to this house by the inhabitants of the several provinces.

Mr. BRACKEN: Before the minister sits down I wonder if he would mind making clear the answers to two questions. His remarks satisfied me on these points, but perhaps he will not object to making himself perfectly clear with respect to them. These questions do not deal with the technicalities of the present situation but with the practical matter of whether or not we are to have redistribution before the next election. First, does the minister recognize a responsibility on the part

of the Canadian parliament to have redistribution before the next election? Second, will the government say now that there will be such a redistribution?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: To the first question I would reply in the affirmative without the slightest hesitation. As to the second question, I would hope the government would take the initiative in having that responsibility of parliament to the people of Canada satisfactorily discharged before another election.

Mr. BRACKEN: From some remarks of the minister in the earlier part of his speech I gathered there was some responsibility devolving upon parliament as distinguished from the government. Surely the minister does not mean to leave the impression that there is a responsibility upon parliament which the government itself can avoid?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Not at all. I hoped I had clearly stated that those who are members of the government, with the exception of its leader in the other place, are members of the house. They all, I think, feel their responsibility, not only equally with other members of the house but probably to a greater degree, because they have some control over the disposition of the time of the house in dealing with legislation.

Mr. MacNICOL: If I may I should like to ask the minister one more question, because I did not quite understand his reply to the observation I made a few moments ago as to the necessity of obtaining the consent of the legislatures of the four provinces originally entering into confederation before the British North America Act can be amended, in regard to any amendment pertaining to anything to which they consented when they formed confederation.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Of course I am not making a judicial pronouncement; I am merely expressing my own opinion. In my opinion there is no necessity to get the consent of any of the provincial legislatures in regard to any amendment which would affect the representation of the people in this parliament.

Mr. MacNICOL: I had not reference to the representation in this parliament but to any amendment of the British North America Act pertaining to matters to which the four original provinces consented when they formed confederation.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: On that point I do not think the jurisdiction which was assigned to the provincial legislatures by the British North America Act can be taken away from them in any way without their consent.

Mr. MacNICOL: I agree.

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Temiscouata): Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the mover (Mr. Dorion) and the seconder of the motion, also the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Jutras), and the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) who have spoken so well on this matter. I congratulate also the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) and my good friend, the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol), upon the very able questions they have put to the minister in an effort to clarify the situation. That having been said, may I be permitted to express the opinion of the man on the street. In doing this I shall try to keep away from subtleties and legal distinctions, but I shall remind the house of what happened in the past.

In the first place, let me say that the present system is unjust. Why is it unjust? It is unjust because it was pronounced to be unjust by the Liberal party in 1933. I remember what happened when the Redistribution Act was brought down by the federal government of that day. It was a shame. The whole thing was wrongly done. Those in charge for the province of Quebec were a gentleman who was a minister at the time and who is now a judge, and another gentleman who has since died. He was a millionaire and he now rests in the Lord, I hope. They were together and they helped to frame that awful and shameful piece of legislation. That is the system that is at present in force.

The minister was very candid when he said that this matter should be considered from a high plane. Theoretically he is right, but practically it has been done otherwise except by the Liberal party, which has always been just and fair. Hon. members should read in *Hansard* of the Tory gerrymander of 1893, which was described by no less a person than Sir Wilfrid Laurier as gerrymander with a vengeance. What did he do in 1903 when he was Prime Minister of Canada? He saw that it was corrected. Then we had the same experience in 1933. Mr. Bennett thought that he would remain in power by carving the constituencies into the most incredible designs. It would be interesting if hon. members of the house would go to the office of the chief electoral officer and ask for plans of the constituencies to see what was done to bring a Tory parish into another constituency in order to give an unpopular member a chance to be elected against the will of the people. All hon. members complained about it in the session of 1932-33, and I remember the last week of that session was spent in discussing this very matter. Of course the government changed nothing.

I know about it because somebody had been asked by the party to do the work on the committee. I had asked to sit on the committee but someone else from Montreal was appointed. He was my deskmate at the time. He had played golf with the Prince of Wales. One day he had to make a speech on the Ottawa agreements. He was a very hard worker. He read four pages of a speech made by Mr. Bennett, who was Prime Minister, and then he read four pages of a speech by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), who was then leader of the opposition; he read those eight pages and concluded by saying, "I agree with my chief, the leader of the opposition, against the leader of the government," and he sat down. That was his speech. He met the man who was sitting on the committee for the province of Quebec, a solicitor who worked very hard, but he did not work very hard.

One day I was coming up to the house and the late Mr. Lapointe met me. He said, "Jean-François, you will have to do that work." I said, "I was not put on the committee; I know it is going to be a hard job, but I have not been appointed." Finally I gathered all the old statutes from 1853 to 1923, which was the time of the previous redistribution, and I prepared a history of the redistributions during those eighty years. I prepared the story of the effect of each redistribution upon each constituency in the province of Quebec. I gave it to the late Mr. Lapointe and to Mr. Cardin, and it was used in discussing the matter with the two Tory bigwigs who were representing their party. I supplied the stuff that they had to work with. Many hon. members expressed their opinions about the whole matter and described the gerrymander as a scandal, which it was.

We should have changed it after the last census. However, we were at war, and what humiliated me profoundly was the fact that this parliament approved a motion to kneel down humbly before the British government to ask them to make an exception and allow us to wait until the war was over, to permit the dominion government not to proceed at once with the redistribution which should have been done by virtue of our constitution. Some one has said that business is pressing, that there are many things to do, but in my humble view the first thing we should do is to comply with the constitution of this country.

The legislation which was passed two years ago exists no longer. That legislation passed by the imperial parliament was good only for the time of the war. As soon as the war was over with our three enemies, Germany, Italy and Japan, that legislation, which changed the constitution for a limited period, no longer had effect. We are now in this absurb situation: the time to revise the boundaries of the constitutencies, otherwise to pass a Redistribution Act in accordance with the census, has passed; the limited period of delay granted to Canada by the imperial parlament has passed, and nothing has been done. That is an anomaly. It is something that cannot be explained. We are in a false situation.

Whether elections take place in the near future or at a later date, the fact remains that at a time when economy is being preached everywhere we have in this House of Commons twenty members who would not be sitting here if the constitution were being applied. Therefore we are expending twenty times $6,000, or $120,000, plus travelling expenses, which should not be expended at this time.

Mr. BRACKEN: Where do you get the $6,000?

Mr. POULIOT: I am an optimist. Even putting it at $4,000, we have a total of $80,000. That is a lot of money to pay to gentlemen who are not entitled to sit among us. Moreover, we should take advantage of the rules of the house to point out these strangers, not in the gallery, but on the floor of the house. Who are these strangers? Here again it is the old story. We have to please first one and then another province, instead of doing what is right. That is the thing I have always complained of. Here we are to please or not to displease some one province or other. When we have something to do which is the right thing to do, we should do it. It is of no importance at all for us to consider: Let us please, let us be pleasant, let us appease somebody or other. That was Chamberlain's motto—let us appease. When you appease one province, then you have to appease another. It is no good to appease Manitoba, let us say, at the expense of Quebec, and afterwards to appease Quebec at the expense of another province. Let us be more serious. Let us abide by the constitution. Let us go on our knees to London to the least extent possible by way of asking them to change our constitution on such a pretext as was used the last time. The war was made the pretext, but the real reason was not to indispose Saskatchewan. And what was the gratitude of Saskatchewan to the government for that? None at all; it was not appreciated. Probably it would have been much more in the practical interests of the government to act in accordance with the constitution and to have that redistribution submitted to the house. The government would have lost no seats by that, and per-

haps it was precisely because the fair-minded people of Saskatchewan were offended by that encroachment upon the constitution that they defeated more Liberal candidates at the last election.

Here we are discussing legal subtleties, citing a section here and a paragraph there, a subsection here and a subparagraph there, so the whole thing has to be examined with a magnifying glass to see where is the legal light hiding under the bushel. Let us be more practical than that. Let us stand by the constitution, or let us change it entirely—and let us do the work ourselves here at Ottawa, not have it done outside. It is an absurd situation, as has been described by all hon. gentlemen who have spoken before me, including my good friend the Minister of Justice. The situation is absurd, but it will not be absurd any longer once we have the guts to correct it.

It has been suggested to the mover of the motion that it should be addressed to parliament instead of to the government. That is a little too Philadelphian for me. The purpose of the motion is to ask the support of the house in pressing upon the government the urgency of such a redistribution. One has only to read the motion to understand it.

The complaint has also been made that this motion is brought in before the estimates have been considered. It is obvious that there is a good reason for that, because once we start to consider the estimates, private members' days will be over and no such motion as this could be brought before the house.

As my good friend the Minister of Justice has spoken on the subject in such an unprejudiced and unbiased way, and considers it as being above partisan considerations, I hope that a redistribution will be brought in by the government before the end of this session. In 1943 the Prime Minister said that we would have a redistribution. It was mentioned in the speech from the throne that year, but we had none. This year the government have said that we cannot have a redistribution. I hope that the reverse of what happened in 1943 will take place and that the government will give us a pleasant surprise before the end of the session by bringing in a redistribution measure. It is very easy; the thing is most simple. The government has only to appoint a committee to study the past redistribution act and correct it in accordance with the last census. Otherwise where shall we go?

You know, sir, that we have some powers by virtue of the constitution, and those powers are completed by other statutes passed by this parliament. The first of these is the redistribution statute establishing the boundaries of the constituencies, the polling stations and where the electors shall vote. There is also the Senate and House of Commons Act and some other acts, but the Senate and House of Commons Act applies for the most part after the member is elected by virtue of the redistribution act and the elections act. The elections act has been improved a lot. The only thing wrong with regard to the election of members of parliament is the Redistribution Act. Let us correct it in order that there shall be no complaint about any member of parliament who sits in this house.

To conclude, sir, I sincerely hope that this government will reconsider, not its decision, because no definite decision has been reached, but its views on this matter. I hope the government will reconsider it in due course and give a good example of complying with the law.

Mr. W. A. TUCKER (Rosthern): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to detain the house very long, but one or two things have been said in this debate on which as a member from Saskatchewan I wish to make some comment.

The original provision of the British North America Act, as has been stated, was based upon the idea that there should be representation by population, but because of the provision that was put in the act in section 51, subsection 4, and the interpretation placed upon it by the privy council, which has already been referred to by the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent), a great discrepancy has crept into our representation. As I pointed out to the house in February, 1943, if a redistribution were made on the basis of the present act the only provinces which would have representation on the basis of population would be Quebec, British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. In other words, as has been pointed out, Prince Edward Island would have two more members than she was entitled to, Nova Scotia would have one more, New Brunswick would have one more, Ontario eight more, and Alberta one more.

I have no quarrel at all with the provision giving a minimum representation to provinces like Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, for this reason, that in Saskatchewan particularly we are beginning to run into the very thing that makes some such minimum requirement fair. The basis of the redistribution is the population of the province of Quebec, and we find that as Quebec rapidly increases in population, the unit of representation is rapidly rising, so that to-day it is 51,213. In provinces like Quebec or Ontario, where there are large cities, certain seats in the cities can be given much larger populations

and the rural constituencies in those provinces can be kept down to a reasonable size. We find that that is happening in the last redistribution of the population. For example, Ottawa West seat to-day contains 94,746; Eglinton, Toronto, 72,953; Spadina, 86,431; Montreal St. Mary, 83,444; Montreal Mercier, 85,380. Thus provinces which have large industrial centres can keep the areas of their rural seats to a reasonable size. But in the case of a province which is almost entirely agricultural, the principle of basing the unit of representation upon populations which are increasing because of the rapid growth of industrial centres means that rural seats—in Saskatchewan for instance—will soon be so large that members cannot do justice to their constituents. That is the consideration which I think justifies the minimum requirement provision which obtains in the case of the maritimes and should apply, I suggest, also to the prairie provinces. As has already been pointed out, Prince Edward Island has four senators, and has been protected for some time by the regulation to which I have referred. Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have each ten senators; one of them will be protected by that regulation in the next redistribution, and the other is in a position to receive the protection right away. But, in the wisdom of those who set up the representation for western Canada in the senate, it was provided that all that section of the country should have twenty-four senators. That means that the representation of Saskatchewan in the senate is six. Therefore there is very little protection for Saskatchewan in that provision, and I submit that some consideration should be given to that aspect of the situation.

The present population of the seat which I have the honour to represent is under 40,000, which means that that seat, already so large as to occupy me pretty continually in keeping in touch with it, will have to be increased in size over twenty-five per cent. As I see the population of Quebec increasing, partly because of the big and growing metropolis of Montreal, I recognize that as a consequence the seats in Saskatchewan will be enlarged to such a size that it will be almost impossible to have them adequately represented in parliament. That does not apply quite so much to Manitoba, because that province contains the big city of Winnipeg. They can therefore provide, as they have done, that the city seats shall have a much larger population, so that the country seats do not have to be quite so disproportionately enlarged. For example, Winnipeg North has a population of over 70,000. As regards British Columbia, of course it has the two cities of Vancouver and Victoria.

Mr. MacNICOL: The Manitoba constituency of Churchill is a very large one.

Mr. TUCKER: Yes; it is a very large seat, but of course the population is mainly to be found in a few areas. The whole problem is one to which any committee assigned to study it will have to give close attention. Alberta is in somewhat the same position as Saskatchewan and Manitoba, except that its two cities of Calgary and Edmonton have a tendency to grow fairly fast, and that helps them out in some measure.

I have here some figures which I found very interesting and which I thought I might bring to the attention of the house. I do so because at one time I thought of suggesting that our representation should be based upon the result of the quinquennial census which will be taken in western Canada next year. Therefore I tried to get some figures on the trend of population in western Canada in the last three years. The only figures I could get from the bureau of statistics were based on the issue of ration books, and I found to my disappointment that the trend which had set in after the outbreak of war up to the taking of the census in 1941, consequent upon so many of our young people having come east to take part in industrial work and the war effort in general, had continued in increasing measure up to 1944. According to a study made by the bureau of statistics, in the period 1941 to 1944 the migration from Saskatchewan amounted to no less than 86,000. If we do not give time for that situation to cure itself—and it will not be cured by the time the quinquennial census is taken next year—if we base ourselves upon that census, instead of losing four seats in Saskatchewan it looks as though we might lose even more, which accentuates the importance of giving consideration to the argument I have already advanced.

The house might be interested in the trend in regard to other provinces.

Mr. BRACKEN: Perhaps the hon. member could give the numbers that left Saskatchewan before 1939. Does he have them?

Mr. TUCKER: No; I just have them from 1941 to 1944. I do not think it would be possible to obtain figures for the period 1939 to 1941, because the statistics which were furnished me were available on account of ration books having been issued, and that gave them the chance to study the trend.

As regards the other provinces, in the period 1941-44, 7,000 left Prince Edward Island, 8,000 had gone into Nova Scotia, 19,000 had left New Brunswick, 11,000 had left Quebec, 58,000 had come to Ontario, and 90,000 went to British Columbia. I found these figures very interesting as showing the migration of the population within Canada. They do not take into account at all the position of the armed services. This is just civilian migration within Canada and it indicates that there is a very important problem which will have to be faced by this house in regard to redistribution.

I urge the house not to take away any of the rights of representation granted the maritimes, but I suggest that if it is found proper to protect the powerful province of Ontario from losing her representation, so that, if we are to redistribute on the basis of the present law, she will have eight members more than she is entitled to—

Mr. MacNICOL: May I interrupt the hon. member to point out to him that the fathers of confederation, when they drew up the British North America Act, were not specifying for Ontario only. The hon. member can never miss taking a fling at Ontario.

Mr. TUCKER: My hon. friend is entirely wrong. I am not taking a fling at Ontario; I am pointing out the manner in which the British North America Act has worked out. I think that fair members from Ontario will go along with me when I say that if the constitution has worked out in such a manner that the powerful province of Ontario will be left with eight members more than the number to which it is entitled, if calculated on the basis applied to a province like Saskatchewan, then something should be done to safeguard the position of a province like Saskatchewan which will lose four seats.

Mr. MacNICOL: Ontario's representation has gone down from ninety-two to eighty-two, but we did not holler about that.

Mr. TUCKER: Yes; but if you insist that we have to go entirely on the basis of our population, then you should be willing to go on the same basis yourself.

Mr. MacNICOL: We did lose ten.

Mr. TUCKER: And you have this added advantage, that you have big cities in the province of Ontario, and in those cities you can set up seats that are very populous, giving the right to rural districts to have adequate representation. We have not that safety valve in Saskatchewan, and I think it is very important that this whole situation should be carefully considered.

Incidentally, it irks me to think that, in order to provide for the representation of our people in this parliament, we have to go to the parliament at Westminster to get that change. That, of course, is not the fault of the parliament at Westminster because it was at our own request that it was done; but my own feeling is that soon we shall have to provide some means whereby we can amend our own constitution, thus relieving the parliament at Westminster of what sometime may prove to be an embarrassing job. I think it would be better for them as well as for ourselves.

I simply rose to make that point and I wish to reemphasize, to my hon. friend the member for Davenport and other Ontario members, that when I cite the case of Ontario I am just citing what appears to have been an anomaly that has developed on the basis of a section in the British North America Act which has been interpreted by the privy council. I am sure that the fathers of confederation could not have intended that Ontario should have the right to retain eight—and perhaps, as the years go on, an even greater number than that—more seats than she is entitled to on the basis on which the number of representatives is fixed for other provinces. I suggest that if that right is to be retained to protect Ontario in the possession of these eight extra seats, then in all fairness some such provision as has been found to protect the maritime provinces should be written into the British North America Act in order to protect the prairie provinces in the possession of adequate representation in this house.

Mr. J. A. BRADETTE (Cochrane): It is perhaps easy for one to say that one agrees entirely with the contents of the resolution presented by the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay (Mr. Dorion), but I cannot sympathize with the impatience shown in having redistribution, as indicated in the words of the motion that "immediate consideration" be given to the advisability of proceeding during the present session with representation of the provinces in the House of Commons.

I do not believe I have the power, but I think I have the right, to suggest a tentative session or date. Personally, I believe that the year 1947 would be appropriate for reasons which I shall mention later on.

I listened attentively to the mover of the resolution, and I was certainly impressed by his sincerity and his force as to what may happen as far as redistribution of the representation in this house is concerned. I do not know whether all members realize how difficult it is to belong to a racial group

within a nation. It is true that in the province of Quebec the racial group to which I refer is in a majority, but I am speaking of that racial group as a minority in the rest of Canada. Even under the best conditions, there is always some fear, although for my part I do not allow myself to cultivate those fears, because I do not believe in them. I believe implicitly in the fair-mindedness of the Canadian people as a whole, and that applies particularly to my own province. I was glad therefore that my hon. friend the member for Charlevoix-Saguenay made no criticism with regard to the representation of Prince Edward Island, which has four members in the House of Commons and four senators. I may say that I represent in my constituency more people than there are in the whole of Prince Edward Island. I represent nearly 125,000.

In our section of the country we are perfectly satisfied with the pact of confederation, and I suggest that if we study it carefully we shall find that it was very largely a matter of give and take. There were many sensibilities that might have been offended, and there was room for friction, racial and religious; but the fathers of confederation found it possible to build their structure, and they builded better than they knew. They built, not on quicksand but on understanding, an understanding of what true Canadianism is.

In that regard I am fully in agreement with the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay. While members from Quebec put the case for that province as forcefully as they can, so far as federal representation is concerned, I suggest that they must see to it that equity and justice shall prevail not only in the interests of Quebec but for the representation of the country as a whole.

I make that statement deliberately because I was astonished in 1943—and if I had not been Deputy Speaker I would have said a few words prior to the passing of the resolution—when the Quebec legislature passed a resolution indicating fear that there might be some injustice in connection with the redistribution measure which would be placed before parliament. I stated a few days ago here that in my opinion every member of this house is primarily what I call a municipalist, because primarily every member is proud of his own locality, the towns and cities in his own district. There exists, for example, a rivalry between Hamilton and Toronto—I cannot profess to know a great deal about Toronto, however; between Toronto and Montreal, between Halifax and Vancouver, and in my opinion that is a healthy state of affairs. Second, I suggested that we are provincialists, every one of us, because everyone of us is proud to belong to his individual province and would be the last to allow this federal government to impinge upon and be unfair to that province in respect of any question affecting its interests. That is why I was surprised at that resolution, although I know that it was proposed in good faith.

I wish to say a few words with regard to the fine presentation made by the hon. member for Chicoutimi (Mr. Gagnon). I cannot agree with some of the statements that he took occasion to make. For instance, he said that financially speaking—those are practically his words—we were in bankruptcy. The hon. member knows much better than that. He knows that this country is not bankrupt; the allies are not bankrupt. It is true we have a huge national debt, but we have preserved our natural resources. But more than that, we have the finest, most industrious and intelligenet population in the world. With that great asset we do not need to worry about the future. If the activities of our population are directed through the proper channels we shall not need to worry about the future. I resent the statement very much.

On many occasions it has been said that my French-speaking compatriots of the province of Quebec are hewers of wood and drawers of water for the rest of the population. If that were so, Mr. Speaker, and if we are in a state of bankruptcy, then we are all starting in from scratch and the people who make those statements should be happy that we are in that position. But it is not true and it cannot be true so far as Canada is concerned. If our efforts are directed in the post-war period as they were to the winning of the war we shall not have any bankruptcy in Canada; we can be positive of that. I make that statement to show how careful our compatriots ought to be in making statements of that kind, whether they be made on the floor of the House of Commons or in a provincial forum.

When we come to the matter of redistribution, perhaps we shall have to make some further amendments. Like the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker), I should like to see Canada in a position where it could deal with that matter itself. I say that not because I have any resentment against the British government. The British government and people would be most happy if we were to deal with all of our own domestic affairs and political problems. There is no doubt about that.

With regard to the question of representation, there exists a certain amount of danger. I well remember when I lived in Quebec in

my youth that the population of Ontario was almost double that of the old province of Quebec. To-day there is a difference of only a few hundred thousand, and perhaps when the great mining development is carried on in northern Quebec in the near future, as it is bound to be, the popuation of Quebec may be equal to that of Ontario. Can you visualize, sir, the people of Ontario being satisfied with a representation of only sixty-five members in the House of Commons? There will be some commotion then, and we must of necessity prevent that. It should be possible to find ways and means, and not merely on a mathematical calculation, of treating the Canadian people as a whole unit. Let me give an example. Suppose some day that Quebec has a population of five million people and Ontario a population of three million five hundred thousand. You would then have a contracted parliament. Instead of a parliament consisting of 245 members there would only be 150 or 175. As my colleague, the hon. member for Rosthern, said a few moments ago, I believe that most members of parliament find their hands full to-day doing the work they have to do. I know that I find it a twenty-four hour job to represent 125,000 people. The fathers of confederation never expected that the representation should become more and more contracted instead of becoming more and more expanded. That is one of the thoughts I wish to leave with the House of Commons at this time.

I should now like to refer to some of the statements that were made by the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot). I believe the best remedy for gerrymandering in a redistribution would be the formation of a judicial redistribution commission. I know that some members of parliament would say that was taking away some of the prerogatives of parliament. That may be true. I am just leaving that thought with the members of parliament and with the country as a whole. We are all human. You cannot change human nature. It is a wonderful thing that you cannot change it altogether. No doubt in a redistribution there would be jerrymandering again, whether it be done by a Liberal administration or a Conservative administration. Surely it should be possible, when dealing with a matter of national importance such as redistribution, to leave politics on the doorstep of the committee and to work for the welfare of the provinces and of Canada as a whole.

As far as I am concerned I should be very glad indeed to have redistribution carried out at an early date, but again I do not see the urgency of it. I am sincerely convinced that, generally speaking, members of this parliament do not want an election next year. They certainly do not wish an election this fall, or at least until we enjoy some of the benefits that were granted to us last week. I know that most hon. members will agree with me on that score. I believe the country as a whole expects parliament, regardless of its political affiliations, to deal with the important matters that are before us and to work for the solution of the post-war problems.

To perform that task will test the energy, ability and capacity of every member of this house and of the cabinet. It is a man's job; it is a national job. I believe I speak for a large percentage of the population of this country when I say that, because I received a fine mandate from my own people. They told me, regardless of party affiliation, to come to Ottawa and to work with all I had within me for the solution of the problems which this country is bound to face in the post-war period.

I say these things because I believe that redistribution during the present session will trouble the minds of hon. members too much. It is too late anyway. I know it is not the intention of the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay to have redistribution accomplished before the end of this session. I doubt if it will be accomplished before the session of 1947. My main reason for saying that—and it is corroborated by the statement made by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Jutras) and also by the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker)—is that our population, generally speaking, is in a state of flux. Take my own constituency, particularly the gold mining section of it. It was practically a war victim. They took a lot of our trained and experienced miners to British Columbia, Sudbury and to other mines throughout Canada. To-day these people are coming back, and they are coming back in greater numbers than ever. The same thing applies to our rural population. Most of our young men and women who were not physically fit to go into actual active military service went to the industrial centres of central Canada. Most of them are not back yet. Our young men will not be entirely demobilized from the three armed forces for at least a year and a half. Surely this should be a sufficient argument to make parliament realize that it would be most unfair to hundreds of thousands of young men and women in this country to carry out redistribution at the present time.

Let us not forget this, that the young men and women who went into uniforms have benefited by their experience in the past six years. Not only have they suffered but they have studied. They learned something about life and they will be keener in public affairs than ever before. That statement is borne out by the representation in the House of Commons of young men who served in the armed forces in the present war. Again, I repeat, we owe it to ourselves and we owe it to our people not to go too fast. So far as the maldistribution of the population is concerned it is bound to be rectified in the very near future. I believe that we owe a debt of gratitude to the mover of this resolution. Hon. members will readily realize how useful private members are. Their resolutions usually bring about nation-wide discussion outside the realm of politics. These discussions generally are constructive and conducive to better legislation and to better government.

Mr. J. R. MacNICOL (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, I am not rising to discuss the resolution. If I were I would first congratulate the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay (Mr. Dorion) upon his splendid speech and upon bringing the matter before the house. But I am sorry to say that from my point of view the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker) shows such an animus toward the province of Ontario that on any and every matter that pertains to Ontario he cannot help—

Mr. TUCKER: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member has no right to say that I have an animus toward the province of Ontario. My father was born in this province and I have the very kindest feelings for it; but I do say they should not ask for special privileges over other people.

Mr. MacNICOL: Well, we are not asking for any advantage over the other provinces.

Mr. TUCKER: I think the hon. gentleman should withdraw the suggestion that I have an animus toward everything in connection with the province of Ontario.

Mr. MacNICOL: The province of Ontario had nothing whatever to do—

Mr. TUCKER: I should like a ruling on my point of order; and I believe the hon. member is out of order anyway.

Mr. MacNICOL: If the hon. member is hurt by my interpretation of his disposition toward the province of Ontario as animus I am happy to withdraw it. He is a big, good-natured man, and I know he would not display any animosity toward the province of Ontario unless he was not feeling very well at the time he made the statement.

I think it is imperative that *Hansard* should record the clause which was placed in the British North America Act by the fathers of confederation, not particularly for the benefit of the province of Ontario. I do not know whether this clause was fathered by the delegates from the province of Quebec or by the delegates from either of the maritime provinces; or by the delegates from Ontario. I do not know, but I have always thought whoever fathered it exercised pretty good judgment in the way they laid it out. I will read it; it is paragraph (4) of section 51:

> On any such readjustment the number of members for a province shall not be reduced unless the proportion which the number of the population of the province bore to the number of the aggregate population of Canada at the then last preceding readjustment of the number of members for the province is ascertained at the then latest census to be diminished by one twentieth part or upwards.

On the basis of that provision the representation of the province of Ontario has been reduced from ninety-two to eighty-two.

Mr. TUCKER: If I may ask a question, would the hon. gentleman suggest that if by a clause of this kind in the confederation pact a big province like Ontario in the result got, as perhaps it may ultimately, twenty more members than it is entitled to have, the province of Ontario should rely on that provision and hang on to those additional members?

Mr. MacNICOL: Well, a moment ago I withdrew the remark about the hon. gentleman's animus, but unless he remains in his seat he will continue to show it. He can hardly rise in his place without showing that feeling against Ontario and he is better sitting down.

Mr. TUCKER: It is a well known rule that if you cannot answer your opponent's case you should abuse the opposing lawyer.

Mr. MacNICOL: It is not a well known rule that the hon. member for Rosthern should be permitted to take part in everything that comes up in this house. I want to tell him that the people of Ontario, and I am one of them, have the very warmest feelings toward the western provinces and all other provinces.

Mr. TUCKER: They should have.

Mr. MacNICOL: You never hear anyone from Ontario denouncing the other provinces; they are too big for that. Paragraph (4) of section 51 is why on one occasion, or perhaps

on one or two occasions, the province of Ontario suffered a loss in its representation from ninety-two to eighty-two, and may lose again not after the last census but after the one following that. That is a result of the fluctuation of the population. If our population does go down I hope it will come back again at some future time. I sincerely hope that the provinces of Saskatchewan and Manitoba, both of which apparently are due to lose some seats if redistribution is carried out on the basis of the recent census, will come back in their population and gain seats. I for one want to see the population of the western provinces greatly increased, thereby increasing their membership in this house.

Mr. L. A. MUTCH (Winnipeg South): Mr. Speaker, in rising at this late hour to say a few words on the motion now before the house I am perhaps motivated more by the spirit of being against something than is usually the case when I rise in this chamber. I hasten to say to you, sir, that in my opposition to this motion I am impelled more by the implication which it arouses indirectly than by the fact that I am a representative of one of the provinces whose representation will suffer if redistribution is carried out in accordance with the existing practice.

This question of redistribution brings very sharply into focus a problem which concerns all of us in this house and the whole of Canada; that is, the right of the Canadian people to amend their own constitution without reference to the parliament at Westminster. I am not a lawyer, and I am not prepared to discuss the legal aspects of that question. I believe, however, that I represent the feeling of a very large proportion of the people of my constituency and, indeed, of the people of Canada when I say that important matters, such as the one confronting us in this motion, should be capable of settlement and solution without reference to any body outside our dominion. Therefore I am opposed to the motion, for the same reason that in 1943 I suggested that in the wording of the recommendation which then went to Westminster the house should defer all consideration of redistribution for two years following the conclusion of hostilities. I shall do what I can during this session or otherwise to bring about such deferment for at least this period of time, if that may be possible. I am opposed to consideration of redistribution at the present time, because I am opposed to any loss of representation from the prairie provinces on the basis of the 1941 census, for the reasons given by other speakers this afternoon and for the further reason that within the next year another census will be held which will give us a much more accurate picture of the population trend in those provinces. I shall oppose the reintroduction of this motion or any other motion with the same intent at this or any subsequent session of parliament, the result of which would be to reduce the representation of the prairie provinces at this time; and I shall be prepared to advocate and support, if the present system is to continue, such necessary amendment of the British North America Act as will secure to the people of western Canada at least the moderate representation they now have.

I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

END OF VOLUME I